

# Survey Results

# Executive Summary

## Introduction

The purpose of this survey was to determine how collection assessment methods, measures, and practices are currently employed and how the results are used at ARL member libraries. Despite recent prognostications of radical changes in form and function of libraries (Taiga Forum, 2014), the center of any current library (physical, virtual, or hybrid) is its collection. There have been notable changes in collection development, management, format, distribution, organization, and accessibility of these collections, but the collection remains at the center of librarianship (Bullis & Smith, 2011; Lehman, 2014). Indeed, because of these changes and the corresponding predictions of radical transformation of library collections (e.g., reduced physical collections, on-demand purchasing, just-in-time collection building, etc.), collection evaluation, analysis, and assessment will be needed to manage these activities that are much more complex than traditional selection.

Librarians have always cared about the quality of their collections (Johnson, 2009; Mosher, 1984), but formal methods of evaluation or assessment have developed primarily from the middle of the last century. Most complex and discussed among these has been the Conspectus method, but other methods developed include White's Brief Tests (White, 2008), circulation and usage analysis (Adams & Noel, 2008; Hughes, 2012), and citation analysis (Hoffmann & Doucette, July 2012; Kohn & Gordon, 2014; Wical & Vandenbark, 2015). While there have been many articles describing these methods and case studies of assessments of specific collections, there have been few surveys of assessment or evaluation practices actually used in libraries.

This survey was developed to better understand and to clarify the processes, procedures, and approaches used by research libraries related to collections data collection, analysis, and reporting. The survey was distributed to the 124 ARL member libraries in May 2016. Seventy-one responses were received by the June deadline, providing a 57% response rate. Although all 71 respondents indicated that data collection and analysis are integral to collection management, the practices they use vary widely.

The assessment of collections involves both the collecting of data and the analysis of that data. Because the processes for these activities may be distinct or converged, depending on the institution, survey questions addressed each activity separately. Attention was paid to the positions of individuals involved in collection evaluation, analysis, assessment, and data gathering because these processes involve numerous individuals.

## Collection Assessment Process

All but two of the responding institutions indicated that they gather collections-related data above and beyond what is required by the annual ARL, ACRL, and IPEDs statistics surveys, with over half doing so on a regular basis, and nearly 40% on a project basis. The most common types of other data gathered include usage and cost data for evaluating resources, and holdings, usage, and expenditures related to subject-based collections. Other categories of data reported include Web analytics (e.g., Google Analytics, EZproxy logs, search logs), analysis of interlibrary loan (ILL) requests to assess needs or gaps, usage patterns (e-resources, circulation, digital repository usage), and citation analyses.

Assessment of library collections (versus the gathering and reporting of data) is also an integral aspect of collection management. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents currently have a process (formal or informal) for regularly assessing library collections, and another 30% are in the process of developing one. Only three institutions reported no process for regular assessment or any intent to implement one, primarily due to insufficient staff, or to lack of time, technical infrastructure, or perceived value. Collection assessments and evaluations are conducted by most respondents annually and/or as needed. A few respondents evaluate “continuously,” semi-annually, quarterly, or monthly. About half of the respondents indicated no limit to the scope of their evaluations, another 20% limit the scope by format and subject, and 13% limit their scope to selected formats. The respondents’ comments regarding the scope of collection evaluations indicate that the evaluations are conducted at varying levels and only for subscribed resources.

Responses concerning the formats and collections included in evaluations indicated that this question was not clearly stated. Based on the comments, it is clear that the verbiage used for format and collection were neither well defined nor differentiated. For the purposes of this analysis, therefore, the responses to the questions concerning *format* and *collection* were merged. It was clear that all respondents have included online resources and all but two have included print materials in their evaluations. Additionally, close to two-thirds have included audiovisual materials or resources, and about half included microform and other physical materials such as government documents, music scores, and open access resources.

Serials and/or monographs—regardless of format—were evaluated by nearly all respondents, followed by demand-driven acquisitions (DDA). Nearly half the respondents have evaluated their government documents collections, while a third have evaluated their open access resources or their archives. Interestingly, eleven respondents (16%) selected all of the options, indicating comprehensive assessment. Conversely, six respondents had only evaluated journals and monographs, and four respondents selected only one collection.

## Locus of Data Collection and Analysis

*At what levels do libraries collect and analyze the data?*

An important goal in conducting this survey was to understand the extent of human resources devoted to collection assessment. Of the 67 respondents who answered the admittedly complex series of questions regarding locus of data collection and analysis responsibilities, most indicated that both data collection and analysis are done at each and every library level: local, system, consortial, and shared collections. However, as the levels broadened, the difference between the number of respondents who *collected* and those who *analyzed* at that level increased. While most of those who analyzed data at the local library level also collected that data, there were fewer who collected the data that was analyzed at the more expansive levels.

The local library is the predominant level for library collection data collection and analysis, as reported by more than three-quarters of the responding libraries. The responses for collection and analysis activities were fairly evenly distributed between the four levels, with the top three levels consisting of the local library, the library system, and the library consortium. Only 15 of the 67 respondents (22%), however, collected and analyzed data at the local, system, *and* consortial levels.

*How centralized or de-centralized are the responsibilities of data collection and analysis?*

Of particular interest is the structure of data collection and analysis, the *who*, of *who is doing what* aspect of data collection and analysis. It is clear that most libraries distribute the responsibilities across individuals, departments, and committees. While there were a wide variety of organizational structures reported, the typical structure is decentralized, with separate committees or groups handling data collection and analysis.

Of the 41 respondents (61%) who *separate* the responsibilities for the collection from analysis of data, the organizational structures are consistent for both tasks. Generally, about 40% of these libraries reported that separate committees are responsible for data gathering, and these committees most often involve librarians and staff from two or more departments. Committee names, if provided, were fairly generic, including “Collections Team,” “Program Management Center,” and “Collections Steering Committee.” The number of people composing these committees ranges from fewer than five to more than 40, with committees for data analysis being two to three times larger (4–40 members) than those for data collection (2–18 members). Most committees are composed of about 10 members for data analysis and between five and 10 members for data collection. Those committees responsible for *only* data collection are composed mostly, if not wholly, from collections management. Some of these also include the assessment analysts or librarians. Conversely, most committees that focus on *analysis* include subject or liaison librarians and others outside of collections.

About a quarter of the libraries centralize the data collection and/or analysis responsibilities, about half of which are concentrated in a single department with about three staff members devoted to each responsibility; the other half are handled by a single position. Finally, over a third of these 41 respondents indicated other organizational structures, most of which are some combination of collections and subject librarians.

Twenty-six respondents (39%) indicated that the same individual, department, or committee handles data collection and analysis. Of these, four reported a single person. Position titles for these individuals are “Collection and Organizational Data Analysis Librarian,” “Collection Assessment and Analysis Librarian,” “Collection Management Librarian,” and “Collections Strategist.” At three libraries collection departments with 2–8 staff members are responsible for assessment. At 11 libraries (42%) data gathering and analysis responsibilities are centralized in a committee, with an average of six members (range: 3–12). In over two-thirds of these committees half of the members are from collections. Interestingly, only three committees with centralized data collection and analysis responsibilities include an assessment librarian.

### **Commitment of Human Resources Toward Data Collection and Analysis**

Our other major concern regarding human resources was the extent of effort or time devoted to collection assessment. As expected, libraries that centralize the responsibilities of gathering and/or analyzing data into a single position devote a greater proportion of that individual’s time (59%) towards these activities than those that use a single department (45%). However, those that use a department devote an average of 1.4 FTE towards these activities.

Most committees meet monthly, but a few meet as frequently as weekly and others only as needed. Only eight respondents provided estimates of time committed to these activities and these varied

widely, from fewer than 50 hours to more than 2000 hours per year for collecting the data, and from 20 to 200 hours for analyzing data. Extrapolating these estimates across all committee members, these libraries devote an average of 2.4 FTE to collection assessment.

### **Purposes of Collection Assessments**

In the survey, we asked about purposes of *initiating* assessments, as well as how completed assessments were *used*. These are not always one-in-the-same, and we were expecting assessments used for more purposes than those initiated.

As expected, nearly all respondents indicated that collection assessments were initiated for reasons associated with collection development, followed by library administration or other library purposes. Academic reviews, whether for accreditation, new programs, or institutional purposes, were also common purposes reported. Initiating development of a shared collection was selected by nearly half, while just over a third indicated that collection evaluations were initiated to *evaluate* a shared collection. The most commonly mentioned other reasons include moving collections or space re-allocation (n=8), other external reporting (n=5), budgetary purposes (n=8), and weeding or de-selection (n=4). Intriguing comments include “understanding user behavior,” “answer questions from departments about library funding and acquisitions,” and “maximizing our utility.”

Nearly every respondent has used the collection evaluations for the selection of materials for moving, weeding, and/or de-selection (cancellation). More than two-thirds have used the evaluations to demonstrate value and/or justify funding increases to library or campus administration, as well as to evaluate collection strengths and weaknesses, and to adjust allocations of funds. Other uses reported by the majority of respondents include accreditation, estimating costs of upgrading or new collections, and identifying core works. We were impressed by the number of respondents who have used the evaluations for comparison with their peer libraries.

Fewer than half of the respondents have used evaluations to demonstrate the value of the library to patrons, develop or manage a shared collection strategy, or target collections for promotion and/or digitization. Only 12 indicated that the results have been used to evaluate selector effectiveness. Other uses include preservation, promoting faculty outputs, identifying patron interests, determining a strategic use of space, and examining expenditures by format over time.

### **Data Collection Tools, Methods, and Frequency**

For our survey, we were interested in discovering the data collection tools that are used and the frequency of their use. The survey asked respondents to indicate which of 13 software and online services their library has used for storing and analyzing data for collection evaluation purposes and any that they would be interested in using in the future. Respondents reported using, on average, five tools and being interested in using one tool, though one respondent reporting using 11 tools. It should be noted that only 24 of the respondents (36%) identified tools that they were interested in (but had not yet used), suggesting that librarians are taking the initiative and applying the tools they need.

Not surprisingly, all respondents use spreadsheets for analyzing data. The use of database programs or servers was greater than the authors expected—45 respondents (68%) use Microsoft Access, a database server, or both (nearly a quarter of respondents have used both). Most of the remaining options have been used by between a quarter and a third of the respondents.

Over 80% of the respondents have either used or are interested in using data visualization tools like Tableau. Between a third and half are either using or interested in using most of the tools, with databases, spreadsheets, and visualization receiving the lion’s share of responses. A moderate number of respondents expressed interest in using SpringShare’s LibAnalytics and/or statistical software like SPSS.

Interestingly, 18 respondents indicated that they have used a “system developed locally/in-house.” Data storage systems were the most common solutions listed by these respondents, but the underlying foundation of these varied from spreadsheets to relational databases to more sophisticated data warehouses. They reported storing a variety of data, including e-resource usage, expenditures, and journal holdings and/or overlap. The emphasis of these local data systems appears to be on integrating data from multiple sources. Web or proxy server logs were also mentioned.

Most respondents indicated that data is collected annually, with only about a third reporting that data is collected monthly or quarterly. The most commonly reported other frequency was “as needed” or “ad hoc,” usually reported in addition to the other frequencies. The data that librarians need for collection evaluation is generally directly accessible. Just over one-third reported that most of the data, and another third reported that some of the data, is accessible. Another 11 respondents reported that the data is accessible upon request, and only four reported that some data is not accessible at all. Among the other responses, a distinction was made with *ease* of access.

### **Data Collection Dream Tools**

The purpose of this question was to stimulate the development of tools not already available or created. In retrospect, this question could have been phrased more clearly, as some of the responses (8 of 42) were for tools that already exist, e.g., any ERM, the WorldShare CAS, Greenglass, and Tableau. Of the expected responses, 17 were for improvements to existing systems, primarily the integrated library systems and the resource usage tools. The requested improvements centered on ease of use and integration with other data, notably cost and print usage. Also requested were improvements in generating reports and the ability to analyze data at levels that are higher (e.g., consortial) and lower (e.g., patron groups) than the individual library. Of the responses that could be considered “dream tools,” the key concern was for data aggregation and integration, between and within systems. Some responses were very general:

“It would blend financial and usage data in an accurate, useful, actionable way and would be open source and scalable to consortial/shared activities.”

“Internal database to allow all collected data to be in one place and have the ability to run reports and combo reports to have a better ‘big picture’ of what data is collected, allow efficiency, and help expedite the annual reporting.”

“Allow data aggregation and analysis from disparate data collection systems.”

Others requested specific combinations, notably for the aggregation of e-resource usage data, print circulation, and expenditures. It is clear that the respondents were requesting data management and analysis tools that brought together data to answer questions related to collection coverage, usage, and efficiencies. This requires bringing data out of the silos and integrating the counts of titles and/or volumes, records of usage, and costs. There were two suggestions that were quite different from the others:

“Would be great if our automated monitoring systems (gate counters, environmental monitors) would auto-report to a server.”

“A tool that scrapes bibliographic information from grant proposals, faculty annual reports, materials in the institutional repository, course management sites, etc. but that allows for anonymity.”

### **Data Analysis Methods and Frequency**

Our survey asked respondents to indicate the use or interest in using a myriad of measures and methods for collection analysis. These were organized into the four categories in the key textbook, *Fundamentals of Collection Development and Management* (2nd ed.) (Johnson, 2009), and adapted here:

Type of Measure	Use/User-based	Collections-based
Quantitative	Circulation In-house usage ILL/document-delivery E-resource usage Cost-per-use	Number of titles & volumes Growth in size Expenditures and trends Citation analyses Ratios (e.g., size to expenditures, print to electronic)
Qualitative	Observation studies of user behaviors Surveys of opinions Usability testing Focus groups	Citation analysis List-checking Collection mapping (e.g., Conspectus) Brief tests of collection strength Peer-comparisons

(Figure 7-1 Methods of collection analysis, p. 229)

Quantitative collections-based measures or methods are the most commonly used in collection evaluations, with nearly three-quarters of the survey respondents having used three or four of the methods at least once. They most frequently reported using these methods at least annually, except for analyzing the collection's currency, which had been done as needed, though a surprising number (15 or 24%) indicated that they had never analyzed collection currency or age. The vast majority of the respondents analyze collection growth and expenditures annually or even more frequently. Most analyze the collection size by subject and/or format annually or as needed.

While the responding libraries have used qualitative measures of the collection, they are not necessarily a *regular* part of collection evaluations for most respondents, nor is the use of these methods widespread. While over three-quarters have used accreditation guidelines, and nearly two-thirds have used peer library comparisons, global citation analysis, list-checking, or direct evaluations, nearly two-thirds of respondents have never used the Conspectus or Brief Tests of Collection Strength methods. Indeed, "Never used" was *the most* or the *second most* selected response for *all* qualitative collection-based methods. While over half of the respondents indicated they have used four or more of the eight methods listed, there was greater variation in the frequency of their use. Most who use these measures applied them as needed, rather than on a regular basis. Furthermore, there was little interest in using these measures, with fewer than a third of the respondents indicating any plans to use these methods, primarily global citation analysis (e.g., impact factor) and comparisons of holdings with peer-libraries.

There was similarly wide variation in the use of the quantitative user-based measures for collection evaluations, with most respondents reporting using between four and six methods. Generally, the more traditional measures of circulation and ILL requests by user groups are used annually, as well as usage of electronic resources (which was the most commonly reported method). Conversely, gap analysis and MINES for Libraries® have never been used by the majority of respondents. Most of the measures are used either annually or as needed. Unlike the other groups, nearly half of the respondents indicated plans to use one to three of these methods. Local citation analysis was the most commonly selected method that respondents are planning to use, followed by gap analysis and ILL requests by patron groups.

There was a greater response to the qualitative user-based methods than the other groups of methods, with nearly 75% reporting using three or more of the methods at least once. This explains the fewer number of respondents who indicated that they are planning to use at least one of the methods. The two key exceptions are the comparison of syllabi to holdings and the mapping of courses to the collection, both of which are very labor-intensive. However, a modest number of these respondents are planning on using these methods (10 and 18, respectively). Most gather feedback from the primary stakeholders (patrons and librarians) on some kind of regular basis, about a third reported doing so more frequently than annually.

Only fourteen respondents reported other methods, many of which were variations on those listed in the survey questions. For example, respondents rank journals by usage, by faculty perception, and by global citation analysis. Almost all of the projects described include some aspect of usage, many focusing on format such as e-books, journals, or print monographs. It is clear that usage has become the prominent, if not the most important, measure for collection assessment.

The commercial collection analysis tool used by the most respondents (currently, previously, or interested in using) is the YBP Gobi Peer Groups, followed closely by the OCLC Collection Evaluation/Analysis System and the ProQuest Intota Assessment. The Bowker Book Analysis had the most “never used” responses. GreenGlass (aka Sustainable Collections Service from OCLC) was the most commonly mentioned other tool that respondents are *currently* using. Other systems include data management & visualization tools (e.g., Cognos and Tableau), usage data management, overlap analysis tools, Ulrich’s Serials Analysis, and UStat.

Interestingly, only eight respondents (13%) have used freely available data, most notably ARL and IPEDS statistics. Other data sets mentioned include CUFTS (for database overlap), the Scopus Journal Metrics (Source Normalized Impact per Page (SNIP), Impact per Publication (IPP), and SCImago Journal Rank (SJR)), and the WorldCat Expert Search feature to compare holdings.

## **Collection Assessment Results Dissemination**

### *Audience for and Format of Reports*

We were interested in learning how libraries disseminate their collection assessment results, both the formats and the audiences, essentially, “who gets what.” Not surprisingly, those internal to the library are the most common recipients of information (over 90%), with library administration, collection managers, and subject specialists receiving slightly more responses than other library staff. There is a notable drop in the number of responses for the next cluster, institutional administration or oversight (roughly 70–80%), while about half make their information available to the general public. Only a few respondents reported other audiences, and these tended to be funders and alumni.

Print or PDF reports and in-person presentations are the most commonly used formats for sharing data (60 respondents each or 92%) across all constituent categories. Many respondents (51 or 79%) disseminate these files through the library intranet (primarily to library staff) and 32 (49%) use the public website (for a broader audience). By far, the institutional repository is the least used mode for disseminating collection assessment results; only five respondents selected this option. While almost all of the respondents share assessment data through written reports and presentations/slide-shows that include charts and graphs, only 29 respondents reported using interactive visualizations/dashboards to represent their findings.

Another purpose of this survey was to determine the accessibility of the summary or raw data gathered for collection assessment purposes. The goal was to determine the data sharing environment of the ARL respondents; 63 responded to questions pertaining to summary data and 58 responded to questions pertaining to unprepared/raw data. Most of the respondents (41 or 65%) indicated that stakeholders have either direct access or access upon request to summary collections evaluation and assessment data. Another 18 (29%) provide more limited access to the summary data, and only three indicated that most summary data is not accessible at all. Twenty-two respondents (38%) reported that most raw data is accessible upon request and an equal number reported that some data is accessible. Eleven (19%) indicated that raw data is not accessible at all.

## **Collection Assessment Outcomes**

We were very interested in learning the outcomes of collection assessments, as well as what collection assessment challenges libraries face. The top two results of collection assessment have been an



increased understanding of the scope and breadth of collections by librarians and changes to collection development policies or priorities.

In terms of more objective forms of outcomes, nearly two-thirds experienced an increase in funding targeted to building or enhancing a collection, and more than a third indicated that funding for overall collection development had increased as a result of collection assessment reports. A smaller set of respondents (18 or 28%) indicated that they had changed their funding algorithms or formulas as a result of collection assessments.

As expected, collection assessment outcomes serve a variety of purposes specific to collection management, including supporting shared collecting initiatives with partner libraries, informing funding and collection development decisions, de-selection and weeding practices, and changing approaches to approval plan initiatives.

### Challenges

Respondents were asked to describe the top three challenges encountered at their library when assessing collections. This question was purposefully open-ended to generate the most comprehensive list and 54 respondents described challenges that fell into seventeen broad thematic categories:

Challenge	Responses	%
Consistency and quality of data	31	23%
Staffing, time, or cost constraints	27	20%
Expertise issues	20	15%
Data integration	15	11%
Data acquisition	13	9%
Communication	8	6%
System and/or hardware deficiencies	7	5%
Organizational culture	7	5%
Volume of content to be assessed/overwhelmed	5	4%
Application	4	3%
Grand Total	137	100%

Issues with data acquisition, integration, consistency, volume, and quality were the most commonly cited challenges, accounting for close to half of those reported. Data were also mentioned in other categories, including being overwhelmed, system deficiencies, and expertise issues. It is clear that librarians are frustrated by the lack of consistent data and standards, as well as the inability to integrate the myriad of systems easily. Typical comments included:

“Messy data. Oftentimes, the data that is used to inform assessment decisions is messy, inconsistent, problematic, and full of caveats.”

“Data over time is difficult, since we have changed the ILS a number of times, and not all data was migrated, and querying the underlying database must be done in another fashion.”

“Not having good benchmarking data for meaningful comparisons.”

The other major sets of issues are with resources, or lack thereof. These may be lack of staff, time (which could also be considered lack of staff), financial resources, and expertise. These represent at least 35% of the challenges, given that they could also apply to the issue of being overwhelmed and some of the data issues. Typical comments included:

“Resources to encourage an expectation of assessment, this includes personnel and collaborating across teams.”

“There are an overwhelming number of resources to evaluate and a lack of staff coordination, time, and interest.”

Expertise issues, communication, and organizational culture are also major concerns, representing 20% of the challenges reported. Some of the challenges of expertise are technical, focusing particularly on data (analysis, manipulation, etc.), but most are conceptual. Librarians are not able to make sense of the data, with several mentioning the sheer complexity of assessment. This extends into the communication challenges, specifically communicating the results and translating data and analysis for non-experts. The respondents also expressed frustration with their attempts to change the library culture to one of assessment, or even to have their work result in any changes. Typical comments included:

“Assessment not tied to strategic goals, so recommendations not necessarily followed.”

“Administrators at the university level largely deaf to evidence of need as presented by the library.”

“We do additional work to collect data to tell the story, but it doesn’t translate to additional funding; so it is worth all the work?”

Several of the challenges described were actually applications of the assessments, specifically for evaluation of the use of space and funding.

## **Collection Assessment Skills**

### *Training*

Staff training appears to be mostly informal and on-the-job. Fewer than half of the respondents indicated that staff have received formal training in collection assessment or evaluation. Of these respondents, two mentioned the ALCTS Fundamentals of Collection Assessment online course, but most mentioned more informal or technical training. The technical training focuses on data management and analysis. Two respondents mentioned that they are developing training programs.

### *Skills Ranking by Importance*

Another goal of this survey was to determine the gap between the most important assessment skills and the skills that library staff are lacking. The rankings in the responses to the questions about which skills are most *important* and which skills library staff still *need* are so similar that they suggest that the respondents misunderstood the intended distinction between the questions.

Overall, analytical/critical thinking, collection assessment, and collection development principles were ranked the three most important skills. Knowledge of spreadsheet software was fourth, but database skills ranked least important. The next group of skills includes subject expertise, data management, and statistical analysis. Knowledge of the publishing industry and data visualization/chart-making skills are less important.

The open-ended responses to a question about the desired continuing education opportunities supports the idea that staff are, indeed, lacking the necessary assessment skills. Data management, critical thinking, and statistical analysis figure prominently in the educational opportunities desired. The last is paradoxical to the relatively modest rank of *importance* given to statistical analysis (average was 7<sup>th</sup> and mode was 8<sup>th</sup>). General collection assessment skills were listed next, followed by technical skills. Interestingly, two responses were focused on communication.

## **Collection Assessment Climate**

The survey next asked respondents to indicate how well a set of statements reflected the assessment climate at their library. The three statements that received the highest ratings indicate that library

administration supports collection assessment, internal stakeholders are interested in the results of collection evaluation, and collection assessment has increased at the responding libraries over the last five years. The next grouping indicates that qualitative data is the primary means of assessing collections and the results of evaluations are used to make collection development decisions, but the data is still difficult to gather. Few respondents believe that their *external* stakeholders are interested in the results of collection evaluations.

The responses to a follow-up question about general library attitudes toward assessment group more around the middle of the scale than those about the assessment climate. For example, the three most common responses to “Collection evaluations are difficult to interpret...” (2, 3 and 4) were within four percentage points (26%, 29%, and 30%, respectively). For the statement comparing the importance of quantitative versus qualitative data the middle response (3) received over half the responses (37 or 56%).

Generally, the respondents most strongly believe that libraries should share collection analyses and data (65% positive). There was also general agreement that collection evaluations should be used to adjust allocation of funding for collections (53%), and that collection assessment is supported by the theoretical foundations of collection development (51%). There was a weak consensus that collection evaluation should be centralized (46% positive and 37% neutral), and no real consensus on the difficulty of interpreting collection evaluations (fairly equal distribution across positive, neutral, and negative ratings).

### **Successful Collection Assessment Processes**

Forty-eight respondents provided examples of successful collection assessment processes at their libraries. The most common thread reported (13 respondents) was the collection and analysis of usage statistics. This was useful for both selection (and de-selection) purposes, as well as observing longitudinal trends. The next most-common thread (11) was the use of evidence-based decision making regarding differing aspects of collection development and management, including selection and de-selection of electronic resources, the selection of resources to move to storage, and the allocation of funds to collections. Another common thread was collaboration, reported in one form or another by nine respondents. This collaboration was usually among other library staff, although two mentioned collaboration with external partners. The other successes varied from disciplinary collection assessment and data sharing to improvements to processes, negotiations with vendors, communication, and data collection. A couple of the more intriguing responses included the ability to assess interdisciplinary collections and greater support from library administrations.

### **Desired Change in Collection Assessment Processes**

Thirty-nine respondents described aspects of their collection assessment process that they would change. The most common thread (17 respondents) related to data: quality, collection, integration, and the sharing thereof. This was often associated with the second most common thread, that of process improvement (14 respondents). Other aspects of the process needing improvement include increased staffing, staff development, planning of assessment, and improved efficiency. Interestingly, while five respondents suggested greater centralization of data collection and analysis, one respondent indicated that the subject bibliographers at that institution were invested in more responsibilities for assessment of their subject areas. Also interesting were two respondents who indicated a desire for improvements in collaboration, particularly with library staff.

### **Additional Comments**

Most of these comments related to the unique environments of each institution. Most notably among these were comments related to staffing, or lack thereof. Several mentioned having positions for

which assessment was only part of the responsibilities. The respondents believe that these “part-time” assessment librarian positions were not enough to conduct activities necessary for proper collection assessment. Several respondents mentioned efforts to encourage the adoption of collection assessment methods by the subject librarians themselves, thus decentralizing the process. Finally, there were comments related to the complexities of collection assessment which this survey may not be able to discern. Indeed, the survey itself was quite complex, yet still did enable us to refine the analysis enough to tease out the wide array of combinations of processes, data, responsibilities, inputs, and outputs. We do hope that this will provide some context from which future research may be initiated to better address these complexities.

## References

- Adams, Brian, and Bob Noel. “Circulation Statistics in the Evaluation of Collection Development.” *Collection Building* 27 no. 2 (2008): 71–3.
- Bullis, Daryl R., and Lorre Smith. “Looking Back, Moving Forward in the Digital Age: A Review of the Collection Management and Development Literature, 2004–8.” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 55 no. 4 (2011): 205–20.
- Hoffmann, Kristin, and Lise Doucette. “A Review of Citation Analysis Methodologies for Collection Management.” *College & Research Libraries* 73 no. 4 (July 2012): 321–35.
- Hughes, Michael. “Assessing the Collection through Use Data: An Automated Collection Assessment Tool.” *Collection Management* 37 no. 2 (2012): 110–26.
- Johnson, Peggy. *Fundamentals of Collection Development and Management*. 2nd ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 2009.
- Kohn, Karen C., and Larissa Gordon. “Citation Analysis as a Tool for Collection Development and Instruction.” *Collection Management* 39 no. 4 (2014): 275–96.
- Lehman, Kathleen A. “Collection Development and Management.” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 58 no. 3 (2014): 169–77.
- Mosher, Paul H. “Quality and Library Collections: New Directions in Research and Practice in Collection Evaluation.” *Advances in Librarianship* 13 no. 1 (1984): 211–38.
- Taiga Forum. *About Taiga*. 2014. <http://taiga-forum.org/taiga-meeting-summaries/>
- White, Howard D. “Better Than Brief Tests: Coverage Power Tests of Collection Strength.” *College & Research Libraries* 69 no. 2 (2008): 155–74. <http://crl.acrl.org/content/69/2/155.abstract>
- Wical, Stephanie H., and R. T. Vandebark. “Combining Citation Studies and Usage Statistics to Build a Stronger Collection.” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 59 no. 1 (2015): 33–42.

# Survey Questions and Responses

The SPEC Survey on Collection Assessment was designed by **Karen R. Harker**, Collection Assessment Librarian, and **Janette Klein**, Interdisciplinary Information Science PhD student, at the University of North Texas. These results are based on responses from 71 of the 124 ARL member libraries (57%) by the deadline of June 7, 2016. The survey's introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

The center of any current library (physical, virtual, or hybrid) is its collection. There have been notable changes in collection development, management, format, distribution, organization, and accessibility of research collections, but the collection remains at the center of librarianship. The distinct trend lines are towards digital, open, and collaborative (print and digital) collections. Because of these trends and the predictions of radical transformation of library collections (e.g., reduced physical collections, on-demand purchasing, just-in-time collection building, etc.), collection evaluation, analysis, and assessment will be needed to manage these activities that are much more complex than traditional selection.

The purpose of this survey is to determine whether the available methods, data, and tools are aligned with the purposes for assessing collections. It looks at which collection assessment methods, measures, and practices are currently employed, how the results are used, and how well assessment questions are answered. The results of this survey could help librarians who are involved in collection development and management, overall library assessment, and administration at research libraries to develop plans to evaluate their collections using established methods.

## COLLECTION ASSESSMENT PROCESS

### 1. Does your library gather any collections-related data beyond what is required by the annual ARL and IPEDS statistics surveys? N=71

Yes, regularly	41	58%
Yes, on a project basis	28	39%
No	2	3%

**If yes, which data categories are gathered for collection assessment purposes? Check all that apply.** N=69

ACRL survey library collections data	50	73%
User satisfaction with the collections (e.g., LibQUAL+®)	47	68%
Open URL server statistics	27	39%
Use of materials that are not included in the library catalog (e.g., open access resources)	18	26%
Purpose of using digital resources (e.g., MINES for Libraries®)	11	16%
Other data	44	64%

**Please specify the other data.** N=44

**Regularly** N=28

- Adequacy of collections to support new academic programs
- Annual data calls by the institution on the collections, digitization, etc., which is used by the institution for planning, reporting to Congress, etc.
- Annual report, internal reporting
- CEAL statistics, subject-area assessments
- Collections information is required for university program and course reviews.
- COUNTER reports, usage statistics for e-books and non-journal content
- E-resource usage (primarily via Intota); print circulation data, including anonymized demographics (school/department; patron status); holdings/acquisitions data for partner libraries (on a project basis)
- E-book and e-resource usage data, print circulation
- E-journal and e-book usage data, transactional usage data for print collections
- EZproxy, demand-driven acquisitions, ILS, budgets, circulation rates, weeding data (duplicates, physical space). We also collect robust data (than reported on ARL or IPEDS) for reference and instruction, collections, finance, digital library, and interlibrary loan.
- Google Analytics, COUNTER compliant usage reports
- ILL data on what our users borrow at the title level
- ILL data, COUNTER compliant statistics on the use of e-resources (primarily JR1, BR2, and DB1)
- ILL data, qualitative data (input from users), EZproxy logs, search logs on our discovery layer, COUNTER stats, peer institution holdings, Scopus report on where researchers are editing and publishing, e-resource turnaway stats.
- ILL, overlap holdings with regional partners, COUNTER from e-providers
- ILLIAD data, GWLA data, circulation patterns, collection data, collections spaces (physical and virtual), IR, cost per use of e-resources
- OCLC comparison analytics
- On both a regular and project basis, monitor/assess changing nature of collections budget expenditures; gather data on cost, usage, and cost-per-use for e-journals and databases by specific resource and/or publisher/vendor; print book circulation statistics; and subject-specific collections metrics (including trend data); and university system mandated faculty and student satisfactions surveys

Other COUNTER reports not included in ARL, IPEDS; search query phrases in Google Analytics; resource clicks through LibGuides

Other membership-related surveys such as for the Canadian Association of Research Libraries

Project-based statistics that are dependent on the particular project, for example: the percent of users requesting material vs. those checking it out in person. We've done both LibQUAL+ and MINES, but not regularly.

Reports from Sustainable Collection Services

Turnaways, circulation, Google Analytics for web resources, linear measurements, reference/collection usage. In the latter case, this informs special collections processing, digitization, preservation.

Usage data for e-journals and databases

Usage of e-resources; circulation statistics of print resources; ILL statistics

Use of e-book DDA by user status and campus for EBL only

Vendor-supplied usage data; interlibrary loan usage data; circulation data

We regularly collect usage data to understand user demand, and combine it with cost data to help us understand the best methods for purchasing what users need.

### **On a project basis** N=16

Analytics for Big Deal expenditures

Case-by-case data gathered for budgeting and collection development and management needs.

COUNTER usage statistics, ILS (Voyager) data on collections use

Expenditure data illustrates support for specific academic programs under review for re-accreditation.

Use of materials in the catalog is included in annual reports as is use of electronic resources.

I don't remember what data is included in the ACRL survey, but we also collect use data for print and electronic materials.

Item circulation; circulation of collections; circulation by user groups; acquisition by fund; acquisition by subject area; counts of digitized items; use of digital items; etc.

JRI, usage statistics for the print book collection, expenditure data

Local user satisfaction survey; local author-published articles and books citation data

More granular circulation data (for specific collections), cost per use data, e-book use/behavior (more than just COUNTER), in-house use statistics (monographs, serials, media bookings, microforms).

Currently looking into leveraging EZproxy logs.

Project-based data

Usage data: circulation statistics for non-digital materials; usage data for e-resources. ILL data.

Collection comparisons through a one-time assessment using GreenGlass software; other collection assessments associated with accreditation programs and new degree programs

Usage data, citation analysis

Use data

Vendor-supplied usage data for online books, journals, databases, and media

We look at usage and cost data for collections on an as-needed basis to make purchasing decisions.

Web analytics, circulation statistics

**2. Is a process for regularly assessing library collections in place at your library? If so, is that process formal, including an established procedure with dedicated staff and other resources? Or is it informal, conducted ad hoc and with no set procedure? N=71**

Yes, a process that contains both formal and informal elements is in place	35	49%
Yes, a formal process is in place	6	9%
Yes, an informal process is in place	6	9%
Not yet, but we are working on a process	21	30%
No, process is not in place, and we have no plans to implement one at this time	3	4%

**Comments N=10**

**Both formal and informal N=4**

Collecting data for the ARL and AAHSL statistics is a formal process each year, then additional data is collected in a more informal way.

The Collection Assessment position is one year and three months old. We are formalizing more processes and procedures, but some may remain informal (i.e., weeding).

The Libraries have an internal wiki page that has some information about strategies and local procedures for accomplishing assessments.

We look at electronic usage stats before some renewals. We collect electronic usage statistics twice a year. We are working toward using the data more for collections decisions. We conduct several weeding/retention projects per year.

**Formal process N=2**

Monthly database renewal review in Collection Management Committee; annual serials review

We have had a formal process for reporting on collections. We now have a new Director, A.D. for Collections, and department head for Collections Strategy. We are in the process of developing new assessment practices for the new leadership.

**Informal process N=2**

Our intention is to develop a formal and ongoing process for collection assessment.

We receive assessment requests from individual departments on campus, typically for accreditation reports or new program proposals. Each request differs in what kind of statistics and other data are needed, so it's not possible to have a set procedure for that. Individual bibliographers sometimes conduct collection assessments in their subject areas, but this is at their discretion and not a required activity. Beyond that, I collect and ponder use statistics on an ongoing basis, and sometimes report on or take action based on findings. Thus we have common activities, but no set procedures.

**Working on a process N=2**

Until his retirement last year, we had a professional librarian in the position of Collections Analyst. We are currently planning a distributed model that will involve coordinated efforts of staff from various library departments (more on this below).

We have been moving toward an evidence-based model for the past two years.



If you answered “Yes” above, please continue to the next screen and complete the survey.

If you answered “Not yet” above, please complete as much of the survey as possible at this time.

If you answered “No” above, you will be directed to the section on No Collection Assessment Process.

## COLLECTION ASSESSMENT FREQUENCY AND SCOPE

### 3. How frequently are the evaluations conducted? N=66

Annual review of serials subscriptions; all other evaluation is ad hoc.

Annual, and as needed

Annual, some parts ongoing, some ad hoc

Annually (8 responses)

Annually we develop collection snapshots by discipline and assess e-resource usage; otherwise as needed.

Annually and on a project basis to answer questions

Annually and on an ad hoc basis

Annually for some data surveys and reports. Others are done on an as-needed basis.

Around renewal time is the most frequent time.

As needed (4 responses)

As needed or requested

As needed to assess specific parts of the collection; annually when re-evaluating approval plans

As needed, but working toward annually

As warranted by needs for space or funding

At least once a year (2 responses)

At the moment, on an ad hoc basis. However, we recently formed a new unit and are in the process of determining an overall approach to collection assessment and evaluation that will make more regular use of data and qualitative information.

Collection of statistics is ongoing, but evaluation of them is irregular.

Continuously

Currently, have several projects in place to re-evaluate the strategic use of space needs.

Currently, evaluations are largely project-based and driven by needs around space saving and budget restrictions.

CY and FY reports

Depending on the project, yearly, quarterly, and as needed

Depends on the evaluation; some are annual or monthly, some are project-based and some are by request.

Evaluations are conducted in conjunction with program reviews carried out by the university.

Evaluations are conducted on an ongoing basis.

Evaluations are conducted on an ongoing basis. For example, a monthly content gains and losses report is disseminated, weeding evaluation is conducted as needed, and budget evaluations of collections are conducted quite often.

Evaluations are done currently on an as-needed basis. A large part of our print collection evaluation has been driven by our participation in the CIC SPR and relocating to a new offsite storage facility.

Every three years

For e-resources, at renewal time. For print collections, ad hoc.

FY basis + as needed

Irregularly and as needed

Irregularly and at different intervals for different collections

Irregularly on an as-needed basis

Irregularly

Monthly or as needed

Monthly/annually

On an ad hoc basis as subject liaisons see the need for evaluation. Examples would include reviewing e-journals subscriptions for budgetary reasons or weeding the print collection for space concerns.

Ongoing

Ongoing, annually for reports, and as needed for projects

Quarterly

Quarterly for usage data; ad hoc projects as required

Quarterly, annually, or project-specific timeline

Semi-annually or annually

Specific projects are completed about three times a year to evaluate parts of the collection.

Sporadically, based on departmental accreditation and library needs.

The evaluations are not conducted at regular intervals. We do monitor the annual statistics, but typically, we will conduct an evaluation before a renewal.

The Libraries does an annual assessment of the collection. We also conduct a periodic “gap analysis” and revise the “content strategy” based on the gap analysis. And, we conduct an annual serials review to more pointedly focus our resources to the needs of the institution.

They are conducted on an ad hoc basis, as needed.

This is a difficult question, since evaluation takes place at various levels. Some is part of ongoing selection, acquisition, and budgeting workflow. We monitor e-resource usage, track collection growth and expenditures regularly and all of this entails a level of evaluation of the content. Deeper analysis of holdings (e.g., with historical dimension) tends to be more project-based, i.e., less frequent/regular and also more subject-specific.

Varies depending on the project and data needed

Varies, some are conducted annually and some are as needed.

Various parts every year and others on ad hoc basis

Very infrequent, couple of times in the last 8 years

We annually review for preservation initiatives, including WEST and University of California Shared Print, and our contributions to University of California's Southern Regional Library Facility, and for local space planning. On an as-needed basis, usually 5-7 times per year, we evaluate our collections for proposed new graduate and undergraduate programs. As needed, usually 1-2 times per year, we provide data for the re-accreditation of individual academic programs.

We have conducted different evaluations annually for at least the past four years.

**4. Please describe the scope of the collection evaluations. N=67**

All formats, all disciplines or subjects, including digital collections	34	51%
Selected formats in selected disciplines	13	19%
Selected formats in all disciplines	9	13%
All formats in all disciplines, excluding digital collections	3	5%
All formats in selected disciplines	3	5%
Other scope	5	8%

**Please briefly describe the other scope. N=5**

All formats, all disciplines or subjects, including digital collections are being conducted but not yet formalized.

All subscribed resources, all formats, disciplines

Format-based without regard to disciplines at this time.

We have evaluated our collections on most of these levels at one time or another.

We plan to work with a vendor to better understand our physical collections in general so that we can develop an assessment plan. At the same time we intend to create a process whereby we push data for electronic resources out to our subject librarians for ongoing assessment.

**5. What formats are usually included in collection reviews or evaluations at your library? Check all that apply. N=67**

Electronic or Online	67	100%
Print	65	97%
Physical audiovisual (LP's, CD's, VHS/DVD's, etc.)	45	67%
Streaming audiovisual resources	45	67%
Other online resources for which the library has paid access	42	63%
Microform	38	57%
Other physical resources/materials (maps, archives, ephemera, slide sets, etc.)	31	46%
Other format	7	10%

**Please specify the other format. N=7**

All formats are included as needed in collection reviews and evaluations.

Film

Government documents (as per Federal Depository standards); special collections manuscripts and artifacts; musical scores

Online resources freely accessible, such as Hathi Trust

Special collections materials all formats

We most commonly include books and journals in both print and electronic format, but we have surveyed the other formats occasionally.

We will start adding other formats such as streaming AV.

**6. What collections are usually included in collection reviews or evaluations at your library? Check all that apply. N=67**

Monographs/monographic series	63	94%
Journals/Serials	66	99%
Demand-driven acquisitions, including "Discovery"	47	70%
Government documents	31	46%
Open Access resources (including OA journals, freely-available Web resources that are included in library catalog or subject guides)	23	34%
Archives	23	34%
Digital repositories	21	31%
Other collection	13	19%

**Please specify the other collection. N=13**

Databases (2 responses)

Demand-driven acquisitions collections, e-books, databases

Emphasis is put on evaluating our own OA resources, and our physical and subscribed resources against external OA collections.

E-resources

Maps

Microforms

Most evaluations are being conducted to address strategic space needs.

Special collections

Special collections, AV, micro collections

Use of archives and manuscripts is usually collected by our Archives and Special Collections. Use of our digital repository is usually collected by the Scholarly Communications Office.

We try to evaluate everything, but it can also be project driven—what to go into storage, what to stop subscribing to, trend lines of collection use, etc.

Within the above categories: non-English language materials, specific call number ranges, comparisons with member libraries in consortium, off-site shelving—items fall in above categories but by virtue of location have become a separate, functional collection.

## LOCUS OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

7. Please indicate at which level library collection data is collected and at which level it is analyzed. Check all that apply. N=67

Level	Data Collected	Data Analyzed	N
Local library	57	56	58
Library system	40	33	40
Library consortium	36	29	38
Shared collection partners other than consortium	11	11	12
Total Respondents	67	65	67

8. Is library collection data collected and analyzed by the same individual or group? N=67

Yes, same individual or group	26	39%
No, different individuals or groups	41	61%

9. Please enter any additional comments you may have about the locus of data collection and analysis. N=22

Central collections staff usually analyzes the data, but sometimes subject liaisons are also involved.

CMC, Acquisitions, Special Collections, ad hoc groups of subject librarians, others

Collection data by the Collection Management Librarian, other data by the assessment team.

Data collection is done chiefly but not exclusively by senior staff in the Acquisitions Department. Specific subject liaison librarians are also involved, more often in analysis.

Data is collected and analyzed in the Libraries for program and course reviews. The Libraries is also taking part in a consortial-level project to look for overlap in collections with the idea that some monograph collections can possibly be shared.

Data is largely centrally collected. Analysis is more dispersed among units.

Data on different areas of the collection may be collected and analyzed by different groups.

Evaluation will vary by discipline, cost, format, or the way that the resource is acquired (e.g., is it cost shared with other libraries in the system, a consortial purchase).

Generally the same, but may depend on the project.

I believe that collection data is collected at our state consortial level, but our library is not involved in that, so I have no specifics.

Library assessment officer and e-resource librarian are normally primary leads but review can happen among different persons in the library.

Library communications & planning: Assessment Librarian collects data for communications and reporting to internal and external stakeholders; ACRL, IPEDs, survey collection, peer comparisons, etc. Collects some library-wide data for internal assessment and evaluation. Collections Management Team in collaboration with acquisitions collects and analyzes data for collections assessment & evaluation.

Locally, our Collection Development Department evaluates our local subscriptions and programs such as our Demand Driven Acquisitions program. California Digital Library provides data for our system-wide consortial subscriptions and purchases.

More of a yes, no, and sometimes. It is dependent on the data and the level of analysis needed.

Sometimes different group/individuals are involved, sometimes it is the same groups/individuals. It really depends on the situation.

Statistics for resources purchased through our state consortium are collected by the consortium. Consortium staff analyze these as needed for purchasing decisions and planning purposes, but we also retrieve and analyze our individual institutional statistics as needed for our own purposes.

The locus of collection assessment data collection and analysis is the Collection Management department. However, that department works closely with other departments and consortial partners depending on the nature of the assessment needed.

The staff involved in data collection and analysis varies from project to project but for the most part are drawn from a list of “usual suspects.”

There are both consortial and institutional efforts underway to assess the collections. Those efforts dovetail but are not necessarily coordinated.

This question is difficult. For parts of our collection, one group or individual collects the data and another group or many individuals analyze the data. For other parts of the collection, data and analysis are collected by one group or individual. For consortially purchased packages, data is collected and analyzed by the consortium.

Use of archives and manuscripts is usually collected by our Archives and Special Collections. Use of our digital repository is usually collected by the Scholarly Communications Office. At this time, such data collection for all collections is performed primarily at the divisional level, or “branch” level and is reported separately and maintained separately. Some data collection is a joint effort between two divisions (e.g., vendor usage data).

With the addition of a Collection Assessment Librarian, collection and analysis is becoming more centralized. Historically, each librarian was responsible for analysis which led to minimal cross-referencing and a less comprehensive view of the collection. The Director of Collection Development maintained a steady hand with regard to the acquisitions of collections. Data analysis is also conducted by the Collection Strategist and the Associate Dean of Collections.

## **SAME INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP**

**10. Please indicate which of the following best describes the organizational structure for the personnel who currently have responsibility for collecting and analyzing library collection data as all or part of their job duties. N=26**

A committee/group from two or more departments within the library	11	42%
A single position within the library	4	15%
A single department within the library	3	12%
A committee/group from the library and other departments in the institution	0	0%
A committee/group from the library system	0	0%
A committee/group from the library consortium	0	0%
A committee/group from the shared collection partners	0	0%
Other organizational structure	8	31%

## COLLECTION ASSESSMENT STAFF: SINGLE POSITION

11. Please list the position title of the person who is responsible for collection assessment and estimate the percentage of their time spent on these activities in a typical year. N=4

Position title	Percentage of time
Collection and Organizational Data Analysis Librarian	90%
Collection Assessment and Analysis Librarian	100%
Collection Management Librarian	20%
Collections Strategist	50%

### Comment N=1

This position [Collections Strategist] was recently vacated so we're assessing our current library needs to identify changes that need to occur to ensure data can be analyzed to support new directives. This position was also part of existing collection teams.

## COLLECTION ASSESSMENT STAFF: SINGLE DEPARTMENT

12. Please enter the name of the department that is responsible for collection assessment, the number of staff in the department who do collection assessment, and an estimate of the percentage of their time spent on these activities in a typical year. N=3

Department name	Number of staff	Percentage of time
Collection Development	8	25%
Collection Management	2	3–5%
Collection Strategies Unit	4	~20%

### Comments N=2

Depending on the project, Collection Management may ask for some help from another person in a different department.

Collection Strategies is a new unit just formed in April, without all staff in place, yet. It will take us some time to form and be fully functioning. A goal is to integrate assessment alongside all other collections work that the team of four librarians will perform. It is a centralized group, responsible for collection management, development, and assessment.

## COLLECTION ASSESSMENT STAFF: COMMITTEE/GROUP

13. Please enter the name of the committee/group that is responsible for collection assessment and the number of members. N=11

Committee/group name	Number of members
Ad hoc group	7
Assessment team	6
Collection development steering committee	6–7
Collection Management	12
Collection Management Committee	10

<b>Committee/group name</b>	<b>Number of members</b>
Collection Services Staff and Assessment Librarian	3
Collections Assessment Task Force	7
Content Strategies for Teaching & Research	8
Standing Committee on Collections	7

**Comments** N=2

Not yet formalized

Two departments collect and analyze the data in coordination but separately with no joint meetings.

**14. How often does the committee/group meet each year?** N=9

12-20 times

4x/year

Almost weekly

Collection Services Associate Dean and the Director of Collection Development collect and review the data working with our Assessment Librarian who works in our dean's office to review and complete surveys related to the data. The Collection Development Committee reviews the data for targeted projects, for example this year to determine a renewal of a large e-resources package.

Depends on the project. Many projects are conducted via email and don't require meetings.

Monthly (4 responses)

**15. About how many hours do the committee/group members spend on collection assessment each year?** N=9

100

1326

40 hours

At least 10 per week

For the regular work maybe a total of 100 hours per year, plus any committee or special projects would be another 100 hours.

Not many, doing non-collection assessment at this time

Unknown, committee has just been formed.

Varies (2 responses)

**16. Please indicate which staff positions are members of the committee/group. Check all that apply.** N=11

Coordinator/manager/department head for collection development	7	64%
Administrator with collection assessment duties	7	64%
Collection development librarian	6	55%
Subject/reference librarian	5	45%
Support staff	5	45%



Coordinator/manager/department head for acquisitions	4	36%
Acquisitions librarian	3	27%
Collection assessment librarian	2	18%
Serials librarian	2	18%
Cataloging/technical services librarian	1	9%
Special collections librarian	1	9%
Other staff category	4	36%

**Please specify the other category.** N=4

Assessment Librarian (2 responses)

Assessment librarian, reference, ILL, special collections, music, systems

Head of Liaison, Head of Access Services, Head of Conservation, Collection Analyst, Digital Collections Specialist

## **COLLECTION ASSESSMENT STAFF: OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

### **17. Please briefly describe the other organizational structure for collection assessment.** N=8

A single individual is responsible for collecting most of the data and facilitating analysis (takes about 25% of his time on average) and a group/committee is responsible for the final aspects of analysis. For collections specific to a particular library, the librarian at that location is primarily responsible for analysis. For cross-disciplinary resources a central committee assists with the analysis and makes recommendations for cancellation. The committee has seven members and meets every two weeks. The committee consists of collections/subject librarians, a department head, technical services librarian, and support staff.

Aside from the Collections Assessment Librarian (0.5 FTE), staff at various departments and libraries collect and analyze a variety of collections data as part of their job duties and as needed.

Assessment activities are primarily located in the Technical Services Division.

Assessment is done by one person with half-time assessment responsibilities, as well as by subject librarians, most of whom are in the Collections Division but some of whom have primary job responsibilities in other divisions.

In the main library, liaisons work with the Head of Technical Services on collection assessments. In the professional school libraries, it is typically a single position who conducts these assessments.

Most routine collection assessment has been done by the Head of Collection Development. But other projects, such as MINES, was done by the Libraries' Assessment Committee, which includes representatives from each of the administratively separate libraries on campus (main, law, medical, theology).

The Collections Coordinator coordinates the collection of use data for the regular collections and prepares some overview reports, but each liaison/selector collects and analyzes some data relevant to their subject area also. Special collections does their own collections assessment.

There is an overarching assessment group (known as the Assessment Integration Group) that consists of representatives (sometimes multiple) from individual divisions within the library. The Services Division (of which collections is a part) is represented by an assessment coordinator within the division (not a full-time position, about 25% of said staff's time). Said coordinator/representative is in charge

of coordinating data collection for major data efforts within his/her division. Until very recently (due to a retirement), the library had an assessment coordinator; currently, there is a part-time temporary staff person in charge of coordination, who depends on AIG representatives for gathering needed data. At this time, such data collection for all collections is performed primarily at the divisional level, or “branch” level and is reported separately and maintained separately. In particular, I am referring to local digital collections, repository use, and archives and manuscript usage. Some data collection is a joint effort between two divisions (e.g., vendor usage data).

## DIFFERENT INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP: DATA COLLECTION

18. Please indicate which of the following best describes the organizational structure for the personnel who currently have responsibility for collecting library collection data as all or part of their job duties. N=41

A committee/group from two or more departments within the library	16	39%
A single department within the library	6	15%
A single position within the library	2	5%
A committee/group from the library system	2	5%
A committee/group from the library and other departments in the institution	0	0%
A committee/group from the library consortium	0	0%
A committee/group from the shared collection partners	0	0%
Other organizational structure	15	37%

## DATA COLLECTION STAFF: SINGLE POSITION

19. Please list the position title of the person who is responsible for data collection and estimate the percentage of their time spent on these activities in a typical year. N=2

Position title	Percentage of time
eResources Access Coordinator	30%
Library Assistant 4, Collection Development	20%

**Comment** N=1

Collections Analyst also collects statistics on demand for specific projects.

## DATA COLLECTION STAFF: SINGLE DEPARTMENT

20. Please enter the name of the department that is responsible for data collection, the number of staff in the department who do data collection, and an estimate of the percentage of their time spent on these activities in a typical year. N=6.

Department name	Number of staff	Percentage of time
Acquisitions	5	5%
Collection Strategies and Services		40%
Collections and Content Strategy	3	10%
Collections Assessment Librarian	4	100%

Department name	Number of staff	Percentage of time
Direction des acquisitions, du traitement et de la conservation des collections	4	8%
Distributed Technical Services	2	60%

**Comments** N=2

There is not one person whose job responsibilities focus on collection assessment. However, at least four unit personnel are active in this area at various times, as well as subject specialists. Percentage represents an aggregate of time for these individuals.

One of the three staff members is always a student employee.

**DATA COLLECTION STAFF: COMMITTEE/GROUP**

**21. Please enter the name of the committee/group that is responsible for data collection and the number of members. N=17**

Committee/group name	Number of members
CDRS Steering Committee	7
Collection development and e-resources	5–8
Collection Strategies Committee	8
Collections Services Advisory Group	12–15
Collections Steering Committee	10
Collections Team	18
Cross-Area Assessment Team, Collections Management unit	11
Data collection is conducted throughout the organization; a core of the membership serves on the Assessment Committee of the library.	
Different people in different positions in the library depending on the task. We will be forming an Assessment Committee next year.	6
Group has not been formalized. Includes library staff in Acquisitions/ E-Resources, Access Services, Library IT, Communications & Assessment	5–7
Informal group, no name	6
No formal name - different departments	12
Not a formal committee for data collection but rather staff from several library departments as part of their job responsibilities	2 staff that regularly collect data, others as needed or requested
Not an official group at this point in time, though we are moving in that direction.	3
Not truly a committee, but rather staff members and librarians from a variety of units including Acquisitions, Resource Management, Discovery, Resource Sharing, Collection Development, and Administration.	6–10
Our collection assessment is not done by a formal committee, rather is done through the workflow of multiple positions in different departments.	n/a
Program Management Center	4

**Comment N=1**

The Collections Management team is responsible for collecting and assessing data specific to developing & managing the collections. There is a small time commitment for assessment and we are working on developing a more comprehensive approach.

**22. How often does the committee/group meet each year? N=17**

24

12 times

About 12 times

About 20 times

Ad hoc

Bi-weekly

Cross-Area Assessment Team meets monthly. Collections Management unit meets as needed.

Group is not yet formalized.

Monthly/as needed

No formal meeting times

Ongoing. Respond to individual requests, complete reporting to internal and external organization and others.

Our collection assessment is not done by a formal committee, rather is done through the workflow of multiple positions in different departments.

Project-dependent. There is currently a Data Dashboard group that meets weekly.

Various subgroups meet on different bases, CMC (which includes members of Collection Development, Resource Management, Acquisitions, and Discovery) meets monthly. Other groups may meet more or less infrequently and formally.

We do have a Collections Committee (7 staff members) that meet on a monthly basis. This group is responsible for reviewing policies/procedures for the library system. If a large-scale assessment project for the library system were to be undertaken, this committee would be the first staff involved and likely oversee the project. Membership on the committee rotates each year. Members serve two-year terms.

We don't necessarily meet since we have a process in place. Each person contributes to the overall project.

We meet weekly.

**23. About how many hours do the committee/group members spend on data collection each year? N=14**

N=14

2

600

100 hours

16 to 20 hours per quarter

2 FTE

About 1,000

Depends on the amount of collection assessment project work to be done.

Hard to estimate, since activity might be extracting cataloging information (annual statistics) to daily extraction of circulation statistics for analysis of use.

Hard to evaluate

Hours spent for regular reporting: about 35 hours per year. Hours spent for project-based data collection and analysis: over 1000 hours per year.

Not tracked

TBD

The committee relies on data gathered elsewhere in the library.

We are beginning a new process. At this point we are unable to give definite numbers.

**24. Please indicate which staff positions are members of the committee/group. Check all that apply.**

N=18

Coordinator/manager/department head for collection development	10	56%
Support staff	10	56%
Acquisitions librarian	9	50%
Coordinator/manager/department head for acquisitions	9	50%
Collection assessment librarian	8	44%
Collection development librarian	8	44%
Administrator with collection assessment duties	7	39%
Cataloging/technical services librarian	6	33%
Special collections librarian	6	33%
Subject/reference librarian	6	33%
Serials librarian	4	22%
Other staff category	10	56%

**Please specify the other staff category. N=10**

Administrative officer, digital projects librarian, preservation department head

Assessment & Organizational Performance; Technical Services (IT)

Assessment officer

AUL for special collections, representatives from the system's law and health libraries

Collection assessment staff

Data analysts

Digital Services Librarian

E-resources librarian; ILL staff

Library Systems Manager, Scholarly Repository Services, Digital Operations Coordinator

Systems Analyst from Library IT; Research and Assessment Analyst/Librarian from Library Communications & Assessment unit

## DATA COLLECTION STAFF: OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

### 25. Please briefly describe the other organizational structure for data collection. N=15

Ad hoc basis driven by needs of the Libraries (e.g., strategic use of space) involves subject specialists, collections, and technical services and institutional overviews.

Assessment, Collections, Access Services, Acquisitions, subject librarians, Budget and Cost Management for main campus plus health sciences plus law plus branch campuses

Collections-related data is collected in coordination with several departments including Collection Management, Planning and Research, Acquisitions and Discovery, Information Technology, Research and Information Services, Digital Library Initiatives, and Special Collections. Data is collected in both an ongoing/formal manner as well as in an ad hoc manner.

Data collection is spread among several individuals, a committee/group, and department heads.

Data is collected by the Head of Collection Development working with a library Data Analytics Specialist, the ILS Coordinator, Head of Acquisitions, and Stacks Supervisor. Additional data may be collected by other teams that include librarians with collections responsibilities and other staff on a project basis.

Data is collected by the liaison librarians for disciplines where program reviews take place and do not necessarily report to one department, although they are all public services librarians. There is usually support staff who work with the liaison librarians on collecting the data.

Distributed among Assessment Librarian, Collection Development, Access Services, Technical Services (Acquisitions and E-Resources) and Library Business Office.

ILS, Collections, and Library IT all play a role in data collection. ILS collects data through our ILS (SirsiDynix). Library IT collects data through EZproxy and other routes. Collections collects, curates, analyzes, and disseminates data in a variety of ways. Collections uses Intota Assessment for COUNTER and SUSHI reports. To a lesser extent (in terms of volume), other data collection systems include: Aeon in Special Collections; CONTENTdm in Digital Library; LibAnalytics in Reference, Instruction, and Public Services. The Programs and Planning department collects data unrelated to collections.

Multiple individuals in multiple departments gather data. This includes staff from acquisitions, cataloging, technology services, and members of certain committees.

Multiple staff from multiple departments, not necessarily as a group

Staff in various departments collect data on the resources that they manage, and our assessment librarian also collects some collection data.

The Libraries' Assessment office gathers data from individuals and systems in different library departments including Cataloging, Systems, Research Collections, and Interlibrary Services in response to requests from external agencies and internal users. Individual departments may collect and analyze data for their own administrative purposes.

Various individuals in various libraries and departments collect data about collections. This include Collection Development, Assessment, Access Services, E-resources, IT, and Collection Management.

We have 1 FTE staff position dedicated to data collection and one librarian position in systems that creates query forms and reports for data collecting as needed (this is only a small part of this position's responsibilities). Most of the requests for data collection come from the collection development or reference departments. Librarians in these departments also sometimes gather data for themselves in addition to requesting it from dedicated staff.

We have an Assessment Librarian, who is often the lead the data collection and analysis. We also have a Collections Management & Planning unit (1 librarian + 1 support staff member) who do a lot of collections assessment work and who work closely with the Assessment Librarian. Our eResources & Acquisitions team (1 librarian + 6 support staff) collect data for our electronic resources. Assessment of our digital (locally created) resources is done on an ad hoc basis by librarians in our Digital Programs & Services unit (4 librarians).

## DIFFERENT INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP: DATA ANALYSIS

26. Please indicate which of the following best describes the organizational structure for the personnel who currently have responsibility for analyzing library collection data as all or part of their job duties. N=40

A committee/group from two or more departments within the library	12	30%
A single position within the library	5	13%
A single department within the library	5	13%
A committee/group from the library and other departments in the institution	1	3%
A committee/group from the library system	1	3%
A committee/group from the library consortium	0	0%
A committee/group from the shared collection partners	0	0%
Other organizational structure	16	40%

## DATA ANALYSIS STAFF: SINGLE POSITION

27. Please list the position title of the person who is responsible for data analysis and estimate the percentage of their time spent on these activities in a typical year. N=4

Position title	Percentage of time
Acquisition's Library Associate	100%
Assistant Director for Collection Development and Analysis	15%
Head of Collection Development and Assessment	30%
Library Collections Analyst	90%

**Comment** N=1

The Library Collections Analyst position also collects statistics on demand for specific projects.

## DATA ANALYSIS STAFF: SINGLE DEPARTMENT

28. Please enter the name of the department that is responsible for data analysis, the number of staff in the department who do data analysis, and an estimate of the percentage of their time spent on these activities in a typical year. N=5

Department name	Number of staff	Percentage of time
Acquisitions and Collection Development	2	90% for one, 50% of another
Assessment & Communications	3	
Collections	1	40%

Department name	Number of staff	Percentage of time
Collections and Content Strategy	3	10%
Collections and Technical Services	6	60%

**Comments** N=3

We are still evaluating options for distributing collection metrics and assessment tasks, but the more complex data analysis projects will likely fall to the library's Assessment & Communications unit, whose staff includes two Research and Assessment Analysts and one Research and Assessment Librarian. This unit already supports some aspects of collection assessment. It is unclear what the additional time commitment will need to be to meet emerging needs (which have become particularly palpable with the recent retirement of the library's dedicated Collections Analyst).

This position [Collections] spends a full 80% on collection assessment of which about half is related to various levels of analysis.

One staff member is always a student employee.

**DATA ANALYSIS STAFF: COMMITTEE/GROUP**

**29. Please enter the name of the committee/group that is responsible for data analysis and the number of members.** N=14

Committee/group name	Number of members
Collection Analysis Group	11
Collection Development, Circulation, and Information Services and Resources	Upwards of 30, depending on the scope of the project.
Collections Advisory Committee; Subject clusters; Access services; Assessment; Collections Space Task Force	40
Collections Services Advisory Group	12–15
Collections Team	18
Comité de gestion des collections	10
Cross-Area Assessment team, Collection Management unit	11
Librarian Subject Groups	
National Collections Program Office (NCP)	4
No formal name	15
No formal name	4
Not an organized committee; analysis happens as staff indicate need to review data for projects	
Please refer to previous answer. Committees share responsibilities for collection and analysis.	
The ARL Workgroup and Selection Workgroup	6

**30. How often does the committee/group meet each year?** N=12

24

About 10 times per year

Ad hoc



As needed

Cross-Area Assessment team meets monthly. Collection Management unit meets as needed.

Currently we meet weekly.

Monthly (3 responses)

No formal schedule or time

Varies, most monthly

Weekly

**31. About how many hours do the committee/group members spend on data analysis each year? N=12**

20

2-3

16-20 hours per quarter

200 hours

30 hours: formal meetings. 60 hours: informal meetings, 60 hours: follow-up and office work

Approximately 140 hours

Associate Dean for Collections reviews budget information weekly. Subject liaisons review data as needed for projects.

It depends on the nature and scope of the project[s].

Not tracked

Over 100 hours if combining all the members' time

Unknown

We are beginning a new process. At this point we are unable to give definite numbers.

**32. Please indicate which staff positions are members of the committee/group. Check all that apply.**

N=13

Subject/reference librarian	11	85%
Coordinator/manager/department head for collection development	10	77%
Collection development librarian	6	46%
Administrator with collection assessment duties	6	46%
Support staff	6	46%
Acquisitions librarian	5	39%
Collection assessment librarian	5	39%
Cataloging/technical services librarian	4	31%
Coordinator/manager/department head for acquisitions	4	31%
Special collections librarian	4	31%
Serials librarian	2	15%
Other staff category	6	46%

**Please specify the other staff category. N=6**

Access services, Facilities, IT, IR, Scholarly communication

Assessment officer

Digital services librarian

NCP office staff run the numbers, create reports. SIL staff then review.

Program Management Center

Specialiste en gestion des contenus numeriques

## **DATA ANALYSIS STAFF: OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

### **33. Please briefly describe the other organizational structure for data analysis. N=16**

Ad hoc basis driven by needs of the Libraries (e.g. strategic use of space) involves subject specialists, collections, and technical services and institutional overviews.

Analysis happens at multiple layers within the organization. Individual role: Collections Analyst and Strategist Group within one department; Collections Strategists Leadership: department head for Collections Strategy and Associate Director for Collections

Analysis is carried on by individual librarians in collection development, reference, and sometimes acquisitions/serials. Collection analysis is not a formal requirement for any of these positions, but they are sometimes called upon to assist with reports or answer questions for which collection data is needed.

As with data collection, data analysis staff are distributed across multiple library departments.

Data analysis projects are collaborative efforts in coordination with several departments including Collection Management, Planning and Research, Acquisitions and Discovery, Information Technology, Research and Information Services, Digital Library Initiatives, and Special Collections.

Data analysis is performed by a large number of librarians throughout our library: subject specialists, Assessment Librarian, Collections Management & Planning Librarian, eResources & Acquisitions librarian. Selected support staff (maybe 3) also do data analysis because they perform high-level work.

Data analysis is performed by the Collections Analyst and Strategist and/or by ad hoc groups depending on the project at the request of the Collection Strategies Committee.

Data is analyzed by librarians and staff who collect the data as well as by subject librarians and library administrators. The Collection Evaluation & Assessment Coordinator analyzes data in collaboration with subject liaisons to provide support for print and electronic collections assessment initiatives such as transfer/weeding projects. Usage and cost data is analyzed by faculty and subject liaisons for collection development purposes. Our Collections Strategy Group focuses on assessment with a broader-based collaborative approach. The Library Assessment office provides analytical support to the coordinator and to library administration for collection assessment as well as for assessment of other library activities.

Distributed among Assessment Librarian, Collection Development, Access Services, Technical Services (Acquisitions and E-Resources), and Library Business Office.

Head of Collection Development, Head of Acquisitions, librarians with collections responsibilities, and other staff as participants in project-based groups or teams.

Liaison librarians analyze the data they collect and prepare a report. This report is reviewed by the Collections Management Coordinator who will also analyse the data and sometimes collect more or will sometimes ask for more data from the liaison librarian. There is also support staff available in Collections Management for this task.

Multiple people conduct analyses from throughout the organization.

Staff from different departments analyze data for collections that they manage, our selectors review and analyze data in their collection areas, and our assessment librarian analyzes some collection data. We also have a recently formed Collection Analysis Task Force that is working on collection analysis.

The Associate Dean for Collection Strategies has overall responsibility for data analysis, but many other individuals contribute to analyses needed for specific projects. These may include senior members of the Acquisitions Department as well as liaison librarians. The Acquisition Department reports to the AD for Collections and the liaison librarians are dotted line reports.

The library's Licensing & Acquisitions unit does most types of analysis for most types of resources. The systems librarian does analysis of circulation data. Personnel in the library's ILL unit does analysis for ILL transactions.

The organizational structure for data analysis is handled by several individuals, a committee, department heads, and administrators.

Various individuals in various libraries and departments analyze data about collections. These include Collection Development, Assessment, Access Services, E-resources, Collection Management, and Subject Librarians.

## PURPOSE OF COLLECTION ASSESSMENT

### 34. For what purpose(s) are the collection assessments or evaluations initiated at your library? Check all that apply. N=65

Collection development	62	95%
Library administration/other library-specific	57	88%
Accreditation review (program, department, or school level)	46	71%
New program reviews	39	60%
Accreditation review (college/university level)	37	57%
Internal academic reviews of programs	31	48%
Initiate development of a shared collection	30	46%
Establish criteria for collection selection digitization	24	37%
Evaluate shared collection strategy effectiveness	24	37%
Other purpose	23	35%

### Please briefly describe the other purpose. N=23

Ad hoc basis driven by needs of the Libraries (e.g., strategic use of space) involves subject specialists, collections, and technical services and institutional overviews.

Annual reporting to institution leadership and Congress

Budget savings

Efficiency (de-duplication process), faculty support and promotion, budgeting, organizational promotion, strategic plan initiatives

Fiscal constraints, space constraints

Good stewardship

I've selected the purposes that our assessment activities primarily serve today (the accreditation function is specific to the Law School). Most of the other listed purposes are potentially relevant too, however, particularly evaluation of the effectiveness of shared collecting—collection assessment projects have informed our coordinated collection programs with partner institutions, but for the most part, these initiatives are relatively new and haven't been thoroughly evaluated yet.

Identify materials for offside storage or for deselection.

Initiate/evaluate media and technology resources that are cataloged and circulated for patrons.

Management of legacy print collections; budget proposals

Maximize our utility to our patrons under the constraints of inflation and a flat budget.

Move of collection to new building and ASRS; deselection

Moving collections off campus

Renewal decisions

Renewal of materials, budgeting

Space, conservation/preservation needs, cataloging prioritization of backlogs

Space; ILL, inventory, student fee review board; provost reports

Title VI Center program reviews

To answer questions from departments about library funding and acquisitions

To complete surveys for consortia and organizations

Understanding user behavior of certain formats (e.g., e-books)

We also perform collection assessments to aid in periodic, budget-driven serials reviews. In addition, we continually assess our collections in an effort to maximize their value and relevance to faculty and students of the university.

When cost reductions are required.

**35. How are the collection evaluation results used in your library? Check all that apply. N=65**

Select physical materials for weeding or remote storage	63	97%
Evaluate serials or database for selection or de-selection	62	95%
Identify database overlap	52	80%
Adjust allocations of expenditures or funds	48	74%
Demonstrate value to the institution	46	71%
Demonstrate level of activity	46	71%
Justify funding increases to stakeholders	46	71%
Evaluate collection strengths and weaknesses	45	69%
Demonstrate the adequacy or inadequacy of collections for accreditation	43	66%
Estimate costs of new or upgraded collections	39	60%
Demonstrate comparisons with peer institutions	35	54%
Identify core works or journals	34	52%
Identify core collections of the library or consortial libraries	29	45%
Demonstrate value to the patron	28	43%
Target parts of the collection for promotion and/or instruction	26	40%

Modify or adjust shared collection strategy	24	37%
Decision to initiate a shared collection strategy	24	37%
Evaluate selector effectiveness	12	19%
Identify opportunities for digitization	2	35%
Collection evaluation data is not used for collections work	2	3%
Other use	9	14%

**Please briefly describe the other use.** N=9

Demonstrate use/value to academic departments.

Demonstrate value to the patron and to the institution: we are planning to.

Determine expenditure trends by format.

Fund raising

Identify fragile materials for preservation.

Preservation

Promote faculty output

Strategic use of space

To identify patron interests at a departmental level. To ensure an adequate number of copies are made available.

## DATA COLLECTION TOOLS, METHODS, AND FREQUENCY

36. Please indicate what software or online services your library has used for storing and analyzing data for collection evaluation purposes and any that you would be interested in using in the future. Check all that apply. N=66

Software or Service	Has Used	Interested in Using	N
Excel or other spreadsheet program	66	2	66
Data visualization (e.g., Tableau)	28	30	54
Access database	41	6	46
SQL Server or other relational database server	29	7	34
Springshare's LibAnalytics	19	14	32
EBSCO's Usage Consolidation	23	7	30
ProQuest's 360 Counter	24	4	28
Statistical software (e.g., SPSS)	16	11	27
Institutional Repository	21	6	27
Institution's data storage service	18	7	24
System developed locally/in-house	20	7	24
Counting Opinion's LibPAS	7	5	12
Other software or service	21	8	27
Total Respondents	66	43	66

**If you selected “Other software or service/Has Used” above, please briefly describe the software or service. N=21**

Alma Analytics (2 responses)

Alma Analytics—but usually the data extracted is converted into a spreadsheet for further analysis.

OCLC Collection Analysis Tool (pre-SCS). JSTOR’s What to Withdraw Tool

Briquiry and Cognos to query the data warehouse. R, SQLite Manager, Open Refine

CONTENTdm

Ex Libris UStat usage statistics service

Gold Rush, AWStats

Gold Rush collection comparison tool

Google Analytics and customization, other web analytics tools. We are in the process of implementing Altmetrics.

ILS (SirsiDynix)

Innovative’s Decision Center

Intota, incites, consortia systems and tools

Ithaka Faculty Survey

MPS’s Scholarly Statistics, SCS’ GreenGlass collection analysis

OCLC Analytics

OCLC Worldshare Analytics

Pajek, UCINET, and HistCite

PeopleSoft to link with university finance system, Intota Assessment

Piwik

Sustainable Collection Services outputs

We have used OCLC/Sustainable Collections Services’ GreenGlass and also GreenGlass for Groups as part of our participation in EAST.

**If you selected “Other software or service/Interested in Using” above, please briefly describe the software or service. N=8**

EZproxy log file analysis for e-resource usage. We are interested in looking at MISO as an open source SUSHI.

GreenGlass collection assessment service provided by OCLC

Intota

SCS, Gold Rush

We are exploring the use of Ex Libris UStat for collecting & reporting e-resources usage statistics.

We would like to better leverage our EZproxy logs, but this would require development time (in-house). SUSHI

Would like to learn more about visualization tools beyond Tableau.

**If your library has used a “System developed locally/in-house,” please briefly describe the system.**  
N=17

A relational database with SQL

A SharePoint-based site called New Serial Title System. A local system, the Serials Extract File, PubMed, PMC

Customization of Google Analytics of events to track use of resources.

Data files stored on library Intranet and/or collaborative cloud storage system. Faculty interest survey for journals developed based upon instance here and conducted in 2014.

Database for analysis of journal big deal titles

DataMart: a self-service report application that uses batch-collected data from various systems, primarily our ILS (Aleph).

It is a locally developed ERM.

Library Online Course Reserves (LOCR)

Metridoc: <https://metridoc.library.upenn.edu>

Our library has developed an integrated serials review system in collaboration with several departments. The system uses a combination of a MySQL database and web services to display serials information to the university community and to record title-level feedback regarding possible cancellations.

Reporting system querying data from institutional data warehouse.

SORA, RMOA

The Cornell University Library Web Logs Statistics Tool (CUL Logs) is based in part on the conceptual framework of “bibliomining” (<http://www.bibliomining.com/>). One of the key features is a method to protect patron privacy by replacing information in data logs that can identify an individual (such as an IP address) with location or patron type surrogates.

There are multiple systems we have developed in-house to help us evaluate acquisitions and collections. Some are simple systems that report expenditures in all categories for individual selectors and some are complicated systems that show journal usage and overlap for all journal titles in our collection.

Tool for locally storing and delivering usage statistics on the web

Using Excel spreadsheets for indexing and displaying data and our local file servers for storage.

We have been using Python for data cleanup and d3.js for data visualization. We also make heavy use of Google Sheets.

**37. How frequently is the data collected? Check all that apply. N=66**

Annually	43	65%
Quarterly	20	30%
Monthly	22	33%
Other interval	45	68%

**Please briefly describe the other interval. N=45**

1x project based (GreenGlass)

Ad hoc

Ad hoc/as needed

All of the above, as well as ad hoc

Also upon request

Annually and as needed to answer questions

Annually for external reporting, for internal assessment--as needed

As needed (5 responses)

As needed for an individual program review

As needed for projects

As needed for projects and subscription decisions

As needed for sporadic reporting

As needed or required

Aside from our normal data collection for ARL, we do have assessments throughout the year for weeding.

Biannually

Budget data collected weekly

Continuously

Currently as needed, hoping to develop regular schedule

Currently, as needed. Planning to be more systematic about data collection in the future.

Daily

Data collected as needed, e.g., to meet university deadlines

Data is mostly transactional (so is collected continuously) and is analyzed as required.

Depends highly on the nature of the data request/need; most data annually, some an ad hoc basis.

Different data is collected at different intervals.

E-resources usage statistics: semi-annually

Frequency varies for different data types. Some (COUNTER usage data) is gathered regularly while other data is gathered when needed for a project.

From daily to on demand, depending on assessment purpose

Interval depends on the data. Acquisitions and expenditure data is captured in an ongoing way and is available to collection development librarians on demand, via a suite of MS Access report macros that pull data from our instance of Voyager. We now get most of our COUNTER stats on e-resource usage via ProQuest's Intota; these are delivered twice a year.

Irregularly, as needed

Live for some data and on a routine basis for other.

On demand (2 responses)

Presently collected on a rolling basis as we try to establish a regular data gathering and analysis workflow.

Project specific (2 responses)

Semiannually, January & July



Varies from annually to as requested, often in connection with collection management projects.

Varies: monthly or as needed

Varies. E-resource data is gathered twice a year. Other data is gathered annually or as needed.

We also collect anonymized transactional data on a daily basis.

Weekly, daily

**38. How accessible is the data that is collected to those who are directly responsible for collection evaluation? N=66**

Most, if not all data is easily accessible directly to those responsible	23	35%
Some data is accessible directly, other data upon request	23	35%
Most, if not all data is made accessible upon request	11	17%
Some data is accessible upon request, other data not accessible at all	4	6%
Most data is not accessible at all	0	0%
Other level	5	8%

**Please briefly describe the other level of accessibility. N=5**

Data for physical collections at level wanted is not currently available; electronic use data is available on request but we hope to push it out regularly.

Most data is directly available, but not necessarily organized in a way that makes it easy for those who might want to use it to find or manipulate it, so it's accessible, but not easily accessible.

Most of the data is accessible directly to those responsible, but it is not necessary "easily" accessible. E-collection data is easily accessible through Intota Assessment. Print collection data is available through the use of Briology or Cognos to query the data warehouse. We make various "canned" reports available to make access to the data easier.

Some data is accessible directly, other data upon request. A system for the data of interlibrary loan services was instituted for ease of accessibility.

We collect our data and share it on common drives and our Intranet, so that our staff can view the data we collect.

**39. Are there tools for data collection that you would like to have at your institution that do not currently exist? N=60**

Yes	42	70%
No	18	30%

**If yes, please briefly describe what this tool would do. N=41**

A cloud-based service to aggregate—and validate—data on serials expenditure and usage, allowing us to arrive at a cost per use per full-text title and per database in a reliable and transparent way. Serials Solutions Intota system seems inadequate to this task. Additionally, integration of collections data into the university's data warehouse could allow us to identify types of users (based on school/department affiliation, status, etc.), which we currently lack the ability to do.

A decent and affordable deselection tool for batch comparison of holdings (i.e., like GreenGlass or WC Analysis, but with better price point. Also, a tool that integrates alt-metrics, ILL, turnaways, etc. data would be ideal. Something that assesses need based on available aggregating data.

A fully integrated ILS

A functional Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI) implementation

An integrated tool that would automatically collect data and send it to our analysis system.

A simple method for running circulation reports for monographs by type of acquisition. SUSHI currently does not work for many platforms and reports are not truly COUNTER-compliant. An automated tool that would easily retrieve usage statistics in standard formats and would integrate with cost information would be very helpful.

A tool that integrates use data from print and electronic collections. A tool that easily pulls data from acquisition records, circulation records and COUNTER reports to accurately calculate cost per use.

A tool that scrapes bibliographic information from grant proposals, faculty annual reports, materials in the institutional repository, course management sites, etc. but that allows for anonymity.

Allow data aggregation and analysis from disparate data collection systems.

Anything that helps collect data automatically, with reliability.

Automated tools for retrieving and presenting e-resource usage information at appropriate time-points are needed.

Collection analysis and visualization tools that combines journal and monographic information.

Compare library holdings to other lists (e.g., new e-book/journal package, list of faculty publications) to identify overlap and gaps in the collection.

Dashboards of collection analytics for individual selectors, as well as an SQL-builder for targeted SQL queries of the ILS.

Easier to use and more robust reporting functionality, mostly within ILMS, for analysis like cost per use and breakout of use by LC Class.

Easily combine electronic and print usage and combine all usage across multiple platforms.

ERM for tracking COUNTER usage statistics over time (does not exist at my institution).

ERM system integrated to our library system (does not currently exist at our library).

I didn't want to reply no and suggest that I'm not interested in new tools, but I don't know what already exists. It seems to me that the way we collect and organize collection data is somewhat cumbersome and time-consuming, but it hasn't been a high enough priority overall for anyone to devote the time or effort it would require to improve it significantly, so mostly we just muddle along with what we have.

I wish it were easier to review the data for e-resource usage. Right now various platforms have their own outputs and it takes manual intervention to put it together.

I would like see a tool that integrates cost, usage, and holdings data for all collection formats and makes it available to various library stakeholders in an easy-to-use way. It would make it easy to move up and down between levels of information granularity and would provide historical as well as current data analysis.

I'd like our ILS to be able to do better reports and combine things in the way I would like them, but alas it is not happening anytime soon. Have to do a lot of manipulation to get what I want sometimes.

In-house SUSHI retrieval service. Overlap tool that is connected to a usage retrieval and analysis tool. For example, Serials Solutions has an overlap tool and it would be great to have it connected to the 360 Counter product.

Internal database to allow all collected data to be in one place and have the ability to run reports and combo reports to have a better “big picture” of what data is collected, allow efficiency, and help expedite the annual reporting.

Intota assessment. Holistic aggregation and analysis of print and electronic collections, including content and usage.

It would blend financial and usage data in an accurate, useful, actionable way and would be open source and scalable to consortial/shared activities.

It would concatenate all of our various data into a single system that generates meaningful reports that show the sometimes complicated relationships between all of the collected data.

More consortial stats from Alma/Primo

More information about e-resource usage by patron group

Not a tool, but a position: an assessment position that would be responsible for assessment in a variety of areas, including collections.

OCLC Collection Evaluation Analysis System for collection management and analysis

On-demand data for selectors

Plum Analytics (primarily for repository use data), altmetrics tools

Replacement of current library management system with one that makes data collection easier. Currently, it is necessary to pull data from a variety of sources.

SCS, Gold Rush

SCS GreenGlass

Tableau

We are interested in systems that link to vendor-supplied or maintained data, and other data readily available in standard format. We are interested in a robust and customization system for reporting.

We are looking for a tool to more easily run reports on our catalog to analyze our print collections. It may exist, we have not looked very hard as of yet.

Would be great if our automated monitoring systems (gate counters, environmental monitors) would auto-report to a server. ILLIAD data does not have good auto-capture now.

Yes, if a full usage consolidation tool that incorporated all COUNTER reports were available, we would be quite interested. Encouraging EBSCO to include more reports.

## DATA ANALYSIS TOOLS, METHODS, AND FREQUENCY

40. For each collection assessment or evaluation method listed below, please either select how frequently your library has used it over the last ten years, or indicate that your library plans to use it, or has never used it. Please make one selection per row. N=66

### Quantitative, collections-based N=66

Method	Once	Annually	Another interval	Plan to use	Never used	N
Collections budget analysis	1	40	21	2	1	65
Collection size by subject and/or format	6	24	24	7	3	64
Collection growth	1	38	17	4	4	64
Collection currency and age	7	11	23	7	15	63
Total Respondents	10	53	39	14	18	66

If you selected “Another interval” above, please specify the method and the interval. N=41

Again, the interval depends on the level of evaluation. Our annual reports track size and growth of the collection; our annual budgeting process scrutinizes expenditures. But there are aspects of each of these that are ongoing processes.

Analysis for weeding

Another interval: 5 years; Budget: constantly

As dictated by space needs

As needed (6 responses)

As needed to answer questions. We did a broad-based review of collection size and allocation by subject once in the past ten years.

As needed, some not usually as frequent as annually, some more than annually

At least quarterly if not monthly

Budget analysis is conducted throughout the year, plus additionally as needed.

Collection assessments and evaluations are an integrated part of the Libraries’ collection management process. As such, assessments and evaluations are performed on a continuous basis using various methods.

Collection currency and age: criteria used by reference/subject librarians according to their own weeding schedule. Collection growth: we used this method in 2006, 2011, and 2012.

Collection growth reports were introduced when I started in 2014. Prior to this no collection growth reports were developed or generated.

Collection size and growth studies have been conducted twice in the last 10 years.

Collection size by subject and/or format: semi-annually; Collection budget analysis: monthly and quarterly; the others are ad hoc.

Collections budget analysis: weekly, Excel spreadsheets

Collections budget analysis: monthly; collection growth: as needed

Collections budget analysis: every three years

Depends on the project

Each of these are done at least annually, but may be done more frequently in support of specific projects or to answer specific questions.

Every few years we measure the collection currency and age.

In all cases this varies from annually to as requested, often in connection with collection management projects.

Irregularly, as needed, and as time permits. We do these activities on a somewhat ongoing, somewhat sporadic basis, sometimes more frequently than annually, sometimes less often.

Many of these processes occur on an ad hoc/as needed basis.

Methods vary, interval of 2–3 years

Monthly tracking of expenditures

More ad hoc: dependent on requests from individual departments, reaccreditation of said departments, annual departmental reviews (some departments more actively engage the library than others).

Mostly monthly

On-demand intervals, for use in new library building planning

Ongoing, as needed

Periodic evaluation of portions of the collection for currency has been undertaken on a project basis.

Size: as needed; Currency: as needed

Sporadically

We are currently creating the process.

We have analyzed collection growth once when doing a long-term space plan.

We have started using Ex Libris Alma and the interval is as needed.

Where selected, “another interval” should be read as “as and when required.”

#### **Qualitative, collections-based** N=65

Method	Once	Annually	Another interval	Plan to use	Never used	N
Peer library comparisons of overall library measures	8	18	17	4	17	64
Peer library comparisons of title holdings	8	6	30	8	12	64
Direct or visual evaluation	4	5	34	5	16	64
Conspectus	12	0	6	2	43	63
Global citation analysis (e.g., impact factor)	6	4	22	10	21	63
List checking	2	6	27	4	24	63
Accreditation guidelines	3	7	45	0	8	63
Brief Tests of Collection Strength	2	1	11	5	42	61
Total Respondents	26	32	53	23	58	65

**If you selected “Another interval” above, please specify the method and the interval. N=48**

Accreditation guidelines have been used for/as demanded by accreditation reviews of individual schools or departments.

Ad hoc based on the project

Ad hoc, as needed for other projects

Again, methods such as global citation analysis, have been performed a number of times, but not on a regular basis.

All methods for which “Another interval” is selected = the interval depends on the discipline and on the subject/reference librarian.

As needed (9 responses)

As needed by selector

As needed, some not usually as frequent as annually, some more than annually

As needed; LibQUAL+, WorldCat, Mono vendor platform

Citation analysis used in journal survey conducted in 2014. List checking via spreadsheets as needed. Peer library comparisons of title holdings as needed. Accreditation guidelines as needed. Direct or visual evaluation as needed.

Collection assessments and evaluations are an integrated part of the Libraries’ collection management process. As such, assessments and evaluations are performed on a continuous basis using various methods.

Conspectus was used in the past regularly. Global citation analysis is used in some disciplines regularly but not in others. Peer library comparisons of overall library measures and holdings are done when a project arises within one of our consortial partners. Accreditation guidelines are done as required by the university.

Conspectus: we used this multiple times in the past, but not in the last ten years. Global citation analysis: occasionally, project based. List checking: occasionally, project based. Peer library comparisons of title holdings: rarely, but not quite never. Accreditation guidelines: when requested by individual departments at our university. Direct evaluation: occasionally, project based.

Depends on the project

Every 5 years; when schools need accreditation assistance

Every few years

For accreditation it depends on what is being accredited.

From a top-down view, qualitative assessment has been virtually absent in our library. Individual subject librarians perform these kinds of assessments fairly regularly.

Generally based on aspirational peers & looking at data related to specific product or discipline: ad hoc project based

Global citation analysis; list checking: upon request. Brief tests of collection strength; accreditation guidelines: as required for unit reviews (university-based). Direct or visual evaluation: as needed, e.g., for major moves of collections

Global citation and list checking are ad hoc. All methods are used by a small groups or individual subject librarians.

Global citations: Academic Analytics and Web of Science (when needed). Peer comparisons: every 3–6 years using OCLC data. Accreditation: only when needed. Direct evaluation: project specific and when needed.

In all cases this varies from annually to as requested, often in connection with collection management projects.

In most cases another interval is done upon request/ad hoc. Accreditation is done per accreditation cycles.

Individual collection managers conduct these evaluations on an as-needed basis. The Libraries does not currently conduct these evaluations at an institution-wide level.

Irregularly, as needed

Many of these processes occur on an ad hoc/as-needed basis.

Mostly as needed. Some of the above, such as accreditation guidelines are conducted on regular intervals, but others are conducted on an ad hoc basis.

On occasion

Ongoing, as needed

Other intervals refer to portions of the collection, on a project basis.

Peer library: as needed. Direct evaluation: multiple annually

RLG Conspectus was completed several times years ago. Accreditation guidelines have been used for individual school accreditations.

Used on ad hoc basis for specific projects.

Varies, as needed

Various selectors have used global citations analysis, list checking, and visual evaluation in various projects at time of need. We do accreditation evaluations as the colleges/units need them.

We use impact factor to make selection and renewal decisions, but have not done a global review based on impact factor. We've done small-scale analysis with peer comparison and department level accreditation reviews.

We were an active participant in the RLG Conspectus in the 1980s and 90s. We have used LibQUAL+ surveys in the past, which include comparisons to peer libraries. Collection analysis in connection with our 2CUL partnership with Columbia and other collaborative collection development initiatives have included comparisons of holdings, but these have been undertaken on a project basis. Visual evaluation has played a role in decision-making around remote storage—this has also been mainly project-based. I am not aware of systematic recent use of list checking or brief tests, although individual selectors may use variations on these methods from time to time. Impact factor and similar measures are used, in some cases, in cancellation decisions, but we do not systematically track citations for collection development purposes.

When relevant

Where selected, “another interval” should be read as “as and when required.”

**Quantitative, user-based N=66**

Method	Once	Annually	Another interval	Plan to use	Never used	N
Circulation by subject or format	2	23	34	4	3	66
Interlibrary loan requests by user groups	2	28	24	9	3	66
Usage of electronic resources statistics	0	41	24	1	0	66
Circulations by user groups, subject, and format	2	21	27	5	10	65
Local citation analysis studies	8	6	21	12	17	64
MINES for Libraries© responses	6	0	4	2	51	63
Gap analysis	3	7	12	10	30	62
Total Respondents	20	50	50	29	60	66

**If you selected “Another interval” above, please specify the method and the interval. N=44**

3–5 years or as needed for specific projects

Ad hoc: all methods are used by a small groups or individual subject librarians.

As needed (8 responses)

As needed basis, particularly when deciding on the retention or cancellation of a resource. Gap analyses are provided to us by a vendor or publisher on request.

As needed by selector or group

As needed to answer questions

As needed, some not usually as frequent as annually, some more than annually

As needed; through our provincial consortium, World of Science/Scopus, Decision Center, publisher platforms, RACER (ILL software)

As needed. Reports from ILS are used to look at circulation data; Illiad reports used for ILL data.

As needed/requested

Circulation by subject or format: as needed for projects or to answer specific questions. ILL requests: 2x/year. Usage of e-resources: statistics are harvested monthly and analyzed annually or as needed for projects or to answer specific questions.

Circulation by subject done in branch libraries via collection print outs; Circulation by users conducted.

Circulation by subject or format is being done as part of a project with our consortium.

Circulation by subject or format: frequently but sporadically. Circulations by user groups: occasionally, project based. Local citation analysis: occasionally, project based. Interlibrary loan requests: occasionally, project-based. Gap analysis: we participate in LibQUAL+ every 3–4 years. Usage of electronic resources: occasionally, project based.

Circulation by subject or format: the interval depends on the discipline and on the subject/reference librarian. Usage of electronic resources statistics: before every renewal.

Circulation data used as needed for determining items to go to storage. Interlibrary loan data used in serials review process which will become an annual exercise in FY17.

Circulation reports we have done every 2–3 years, and local citation analysis has been done in conjunction with published research projects. We do analyze ILL requests but not by user group at this time, though that is a goal in the future.



Circulation: by using Sierra and only as needed

Circulations by user groups, subject, and format: periodically to measure trends

Collection assessments and evaluations are an integrated part of the Libraries' collection management process. As such, assessments and evaluations are performed on a continuous basis using various methods.

Constantly

In all cases this varies from annually to as requested, often in connection with collection management projects.

Interlibrary loan requests are evaluated quarterly.

Irregularly

Local citation analysis studies as needed, at the individual selector/subject level; some discussion about doing this more broadly and frequently. Usage stats collected monthly.

Local citation analysis studies are ad hoc; all the rest would be monthly.

Look at those stats quarterly.

Many of these processes occur on an ad hoc/as needed basis.

MINES for Libraries conducted as part of overhead/cost analysis study. Circulation data analyzed on demand via ILMS reporting system.

More granular circulation data is available, but usually only aggregate circulation numbers are reported. However, we have been engaged in gathering annual statistics on the use of approval titles. More granular data on e-resource use may be facilitated by further development of a querying/reporting method to accompany our EZproxy implementation. Local citation analyses studies are selectively used, again department/subject librarian initiated. If by "usage of electronic resources statistics," one means data such as COUNTER and COUNTER-like statistics from vendors, then this is collected annually (that is the assumption).

Ongoing, as needed

Project based

These are driven by projects during the year. Some are driven by renewals, etc.

Used occasionally

Used on ad hoc basis for specific projects.

We track circulation of print materials and keep stats, including anonymized demographics (school/department, patron status). This data is collected on an ongoing basis, but only analyzed on a project basis. We now get most of our COUNTER stats on e-resource usage via ProQuest's Intota; these are delivered twice a year.

Where selected, "another interval" should be read as "as and when required."

**Qualitative, user-based N=65**

Method	Once	Annually	Another interval	Plan to use	Never used	N
Comparison of holdings with readings in course syllabi	5	2	23	10	25	65
Mapping the collection to courses and research centers	2	3	11	18	31	65
Input from faculty/staff/researchers	2	11	45	4	3	65
Input from librarian	1	16	45	1	2	65
Input from students	3	8	43	3	7	64
Total Respondents	9	22	54	20	38	65

**If you selected “Another interval” above, please specify the method and the interval. N=46**

Ad hoc

All categories marked “Another interval” are done on a continuous basis.

As needed (6 responses)

As needed, some not usually as frequent as annually, some more than annually

As needed. Input from librarians received regularly, but not in a scheduled manner.

Collection assessments and evaluations are an integrated part of the Libraries’ collection management process. As such, assessments and evaluations are performed on a continuous basis using various methods.

Collection managers use input from constituents on an ongoing/as needed basis.

Comparison of holdings with readings in course syllabi and mapping the collection to courses and research centers is done as needed by the liaison librarians.

Comparison of holdings with readings in course syllabi: initiated a couple of times at irregular intervals. Input (three methods): faculty/staff/researchers, librarians, students are not officially invited to give their input during an assessment activity, but some of them contact us to offer it.

Comparison of holdings with readings: occasionally, project based. Input from faculty, librarian, students: in addition to LibQUAL+, we conduct both formal and informal surveys of these groups on an occasional basis.

Comparison with syllabi: as needed/desired, at the individual selector/subject level. Input from librarian: occasional, reasons vary.

Comparison with syllabi and mapping to courses is done at the selector/discipline level. Input from faculty, staff, students, and librarians (other than selectors) is done through a suggest-a-purchase form that acquisitions automatically fulfills based on pre-defined criteria.

Comparison: use sampling of the courses and only when needed

Every three years for LibQUAL+; as needed by survey or direct communication

Faculty and students are surveyed every three years (the second survey was conducted this year). I’m unclear on the ‘input from librarian’ category, as our librarians are constantly analyzing the collections from various perspectives.

For the first two: on occasion; for the 3rd and 4th: in real time we take feedback, requests for purchase or if someone gives us feedback.-

In all cases this varies from annually to as requested, often in connection with collection management projects.

In-house survey similar to LibQUAL+ has been expanded to include questions about collections and is conducted every three years.

Input from faculty/staff and librarians is solicited in serials review process, which will become an annual exercise in FY17. Faculty, staff, and students are constantly providing suggestions for the collection via an online form on the library website.

Input from faculty/staff/researchers/students used to be collected annually by way of a survey (and supplemented by focus groups and/or interviews), but this survey is on hold at the moment.

Input is gathered approximately every three years in our LibQUAL+ survey.

Input whenever needed or received from library patrons

Involved faculty in weeding and purchasing decisions. Recommend-A-Book and LEAP requests both used.

Irregularly and not systematically

LibQUAL+ every three years

Many of these processes occur on an ad hoc/as needed basis.

Mapping the collection to courses and research centers: to align with the university's strategic research directions. Input from faculty/staff/researchers; Input from librarian: upon request

Occasionally by reference staff

On demand; feedback received via e-mail or request forms

Ongoing

Ongoing, as needed

Qualitative input about collections is formally solicited from faculty/staff/researchers and students via LibQUAL+, but we also receive and consider informal input from these groups throughout the year. We receive qualitative input about the collections from librarians frequently.

Subject liaison librarians are directly involved in collection development. Input from faculty, staff, and students is encouraged and aids in decision-making throughout the Libraries. The Libraries have formal faculty/staff and student advisory groups for this purpose.

These are continuous.

This is primarily carried out by our selectors.

Varies

Varies, as needed

We actively listen to faculty and students.

We gather input from patrons on an ongoing basis.

We survey students every 2–3 years to get their input. We gather input from faculty in a variety of ways, from liaison contact to a survey every 2–3 years. Liaisons/selectors review syllabi every semester, and continuously offer input.

Where selected, "another interval" should be read as "as and when required."

**Please briefly describe any other collection assessment method your library has or plans to use.**

N=13

Altmetrics data collection, in-house use data

Collections analysis by call number

Comparison with course lists from the university bookstore

Have just started several evidence-based pilots. Will look at use.

Participating in a CRKN initiative to look at journals, based on usage statistics, citation analysis for the institution, and faculty indication of required journals.

Ratio of circulation to ILL borrowing statistics for books

Several years ago, we evaluated multi-year acquisitions on our central approval plan for English-language print books, analyzing average cost per book circulation by publisher. We also carried out a broader study of print monograph usage across the library system. The study looked at 20 years of circulation data and, among other things, tracked cohorts of books acquired in a single year over multiple years, which revealed a rather long (12-year) interval during which books in a cohort are actively charged out for the first time. The print usage study also included analysis of circulation by various patron demographics, which were captured (and anonymized) in a single-day circulation “snapshot.”

Sustainable Collection Services GreenGlass, Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries Gold Rush

We are actively developing an organizational structure, functional set of responsibilities, and procedures to support a more formal program for collection assessment.

We are developing a tool that should help us consolidate the various data sets we have about our collections and generate reports from the relationships between all of the data.

We are going to do a survey started at the University of Montreal, where you look at the top cited journals in various disciplines, you ask the faculty their top 10 journals in their field, and then you compare both to the usage statistics. This can help you identify what journal you need and which you might discontinue subscribing to. We plan to do this next fall.

We did an in-depth study of our big deal journal packages and also studied the correlations between COUNTER use data and click-through data from our A-Z lists and faculty citation data.

We plan to increase assessment of e-book use.

**41. For each of the commercial collection analysis tools listed below, please indicate whether your library currently uses it, previously (but not currently) used it, has never used it, and/or would be interested in using it in the future. Check all that apply. N=65**

Tool	Currently use	Previously (but not currently) used	Never used	Would be interested in using	N
YBP Gobi Peer Groups	30	11	14	11	63
OCLC Collection Evaluation/Analysis System	9	33	15	6	62
ProQuest’s Intota Assessment	12	1	36	11	60
Bowker Book Analysis System	0	9	47	3	59
Other tool	16	5	8	7	32
Total Respondents	43	42	54	25	65

**If you selected “Other tool/Currently use” above, please specify the tool(s). N=19**

360 COUNTER; custom reports from approval plan vendors

Brioquery and Cognos to query the data warehouse, Tableau for visualization, GreenGlass from OCLC Sustainable Collections

CRL's PAPR analysis tool is being used consortially. OCLC has created a custom analysis for us on request.

Ex Libris, Alma and Altmetrics

Gold Rush (2 responses)

GreenGlass

GreenGlass, EBSCO Usage Consolidation

ProQuest Ebook Central

SCS GreenGlass

Serial Solutions for overlap analysis

Sustainable Collections' GreenGlass collection analysis tool

Tableau

The Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries has developed an online holdings comparison tool so that we can identify overlap and unique holdings within our consortium.

Ulrich's GreenGlass (Sustainable Collection Services)

We have purchased SCS (GreenGlass) system, specifically for use in planning for potential deselection and planning for new library collection management.

GreenGlass provided by OCLC

OCLC Sustainable Collection Services

We recently investigated Worldshare Collection Evaluation. It appears OCLC is not investing resources to expand the tools capabilities. We have of course initiated conversations with Sustainable Collection Services, which is now owned by OCLC.

**If you selected “Other tool/Previously used” above, please specify the tool(s). N=5**

Ulrich's Serials Analysis

Ulrich's Serials Analysis System

UStat

We previously used Ulrich's Serials Analysis system.

WorldCat Collection Analysis

**If you selected “Other tool/Would be interested in using” above, please specify the tool(s). N=6**

Counting Opinions LibPas

GreenGlass, OCLC's GIST

libAnalytics

OCLC GreenGlass

OCLC Sustainable Collection Services GreenGlass  
Sustainable Collections tool

**42. Is your library using any freely available data to make collection comparisons? N=62**

Yes	8	13%
No	54	87%

**If yes, please briefly describe the data set. N=8**

ARL and IPEDS statistics

CUFTS, lists from vendors, DOAJ holdings

Locally developed tool by a peer university to compare databases' coverage (similar to Gold Rush). Two members of our committee have a privileged access for now.

Portfolio holdings

Several sources, as an example, IPEDS data

SNIP, IPP and SJR metrics, Bergstrom-McAfee Data

Usage data available from publishers/vendors

We use OCLC Expert Search to compare our holdings to those of other institutions.

**43. Are there tools for data analysis that you would like to have at your institution that do not currently exist? N=57**

Yes	19	33%
No	38	67%

**If yes, please briefly describe what this tool would do. N=16**

A comprehensive tool to compare print and electronic holdings for purposes of overlap analysis with an impact on budgeting, physical space, and user needs. A real-time cost/usage report with reliable data. A tool that connects research, teaching, and learning outcomes to collection usage and management.

A fully integrated ILS

A tool that would assist in comparing freely available collection datasets from other institutions with our own would have some value.

A tool that would provide comprehensive analysis of the entire collection.

A tool to bring various assessments together.

As before, I'm not familiar with all tools, so I can't say what doesn't currently exist. Much of our analysis is based on home-grown methods rather than commercial analysis tools.

As I mentioned earlier, we are interested in a tool that would help us analyze our catalog better for our print collection—easy reports on circulation by subject, etc.

Compare use statistics, impact factor, LJUR data and other journal metrics and information across publisher, by call #, by research subject area. Same type of tool to compare ebook statistics from different publishers or platforms like EBL and compare stats across the board by publisher, platform, call #, subject areas, etc.

I would love a tool that would scrape the citations from our faculty's and researcher's publications (including monographic publications) and compare these against our holdings.

It would be useful to be able to more easily compare holdings, usage, new acquisitions, and collections expenditures among library consortium partners, with ability to look at facets such as language of publication.

Open source data visualization tools

Probably, I just don't know what it might be at this time. But I'm always looking for new tools to make some of this analysis easier.

Take proxy data & parse by user group, evaluate collections through administrative partners—sponsored programs, student support services, spin-off research companies, patents, allow direct correlations to student/researcher success

Tool that could help analyze e-resource content by subject.

Upload and compare two lists to identify overlap with library holdings.

We would like to build a web-based dashboard to give collection development staff and others real-time interactive access to data about our collections and their use.

## COLLECTION ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISSEMINATION

44. To whom and how are the results of collection assessments disseminated? Check all that apply.  
N=65

Constituent	Library website	Library intranet	Institutional repository	Print or PDF report	In-person presentation	N
Library administration	13	44	3	55	46	63
Manager of collections/ department head collection development	10	43	2	53	43	63
Subject specialist librarian	7	42	3	49	37	62
Library staff	12	45	2	37	35	59
College dean, vice-president, or president of the college/university	9	2	1	37	43	51
Department or faculty that initially requested the assessment	7	10	2	39	27	50
Faculty governance committee for the library	4	5	0	33	42	45
General public	30	1	2	9	5	34
Other constituent	1	0	0	4	4	5
Total Respondents	32	51	5	60	60	65

If you answered "Other constituent" above, please specify the constituent category and the method of dissemination. N=5

**Library website** N=1

Alumni: library news updates

**Report/Presentation** N=4

Colleagues at other institutions

Grant & Foundation reports, for example, Title VI or Korea Foundation

Includes grant seeking entities and Board of Councilors

Presentations to National Council, which includes many donors

**Additional comment** N=1

Can't answer much of this at the present time but we plan to openly and widely disseminate data/ findings.

**45. Please indicate the formats of dissemination used. Check all that apply.** N=65

Presentations/slide-shows	61	94%
Graphs, charts	61	94%
Formal written, text-based reports	60	92%
Written summary	57	88%
Interactive visualization/dashboard	29	45%
Other format	4	6%

**Please briefly describe the other format.** N=4

Excel spreadsheets

Raw data (e.g., usage reports for e-resources)

Spreadsheets

Spreadsheets and verbal dissemination

**46. How accessible are the resulting raw and summary data for use by other related stakeholders?**

**Please make one selection for raw data and one selection for summary data.** N=64

Level	Unprepared/Raw Data	Summary Data	N
Most, if not all data is made accessible upon request.	22	21	34
Most, if not all data is easily accessible directly to stakeholders.	1	20	21
Some data is accessible upon request, other data not accessible at all.	13	8	17
Some data is accessible directly, other data upon request.	9	10	12
Most data is not accessible at all.	11	3	11
Other situation	2	1	2
Total Respondents	58	63	64



**If you selected “other situation” above, please briefly describe the situation.** N=2

[Unprepared/raw data is] available to a limited few.

The data is made available in both forms for library staff. For faculties and such it would more likely be the summary data, unless a researcher or special request was made to obtain the data.

**Additional comments** N=2

Data is accessible directly to library staff, but is not “easily” accessible. You have to know how to use the software to query the data warehouse. Data related to formal presentations and reports have the source data documented and it is available on request.

We want to make all data open and available for whoever wants to see it.

## **COLLECTION ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES AND CHALLENGES**

**47. Please indicate the types of changes that have been a result of assessment of the library’s collections. Check all that apply.** N=64

Increased understanding of the scope and breadth of collections by subject and/or collection management librarians	55	86%
Modifications to collection development priorities or policies	50	78%
Additional funding targeted to enhance or build a collection	40	63%
Collaboration with subject librarians and academic faculty for enhancing collections	38	59%
Increased understanding of the scope and breadth of collections by faculty and/or campus administration	37	58%
Increased funding for the overall library’s collection	25	39%
Development, modification, or elimination of subject-based funding algorithms or formulas	18	28%
Other change	8	13%

**Please briefly describe the other change.** N=8

Assist decision-making around the transfer of library materials to off-site storage.

Better partnership with consortia; better package deals purchased

Cancellation decisions due to reduced purchasing power as a result of an unfavourable currency exchange rate.

Deselection and cancellation decisions

Deselection, relocation of materials; changes in choice of format to purchase (print or electronic); adjustments to approval plans

Shift in format from print to electronic

Unable to say at the present time.

Weeding or other transfer of physical holdings to remote storage.

**48. Please briefly describe any other ways assessment has been used to sustain and grow your library’s collections.** N=14

Assessment has primarily been used to facilitate the cancellation of resources.

Collection assessment projects have been essential in supporting shared collecting initiatives with partner libraries, particularly our “2CUL” partnership with Columbia University Libraries and the member libraries of the Borrow Direct/Ivy Plus consortium.

Consortial collection comparisons, collaborative retention/long-term storage agreements. Shift from approval plans/just-in-case to DDA/just-in-time purchasing.

Continuing to build a culture of assessment with librarians asking questions of the data, and what it means for collection development decision making.

Currently reverse applying weeding criteria to identify high needs areas of the collection for management.

Deciding the location of print collections (on-site, off-site, branch libraries).

Ensuring we’re meeting the needs of our students and faculty.

Fund raising compact shelving and other collection management equipment

It is central to our academic program reviews and to strategic budget requests.

Most assessment actions have been related to evaluation of resources for cancellation or retention. Also a bit of energy for weeding and relocation to high-density storage.

Ongoing assessment of continuing resources is used to reallocate funds toward interdisciplinary resources.

Successfully advocated for preservation environment offsite storage facility.

To make decisions about deselection and shared storage.

Used to justify increased support for collections budget.

**49. Please briefly describe up to three challenges your library has encountered when assessing collections. Include any methods that were successful in overcoming that challenge. N=54**

Ability to integrate collections data with institutional data

Ability to quickly create detailed and varied reports—need more technical statistical analysis skills

Assessment is not tied to strategic goals, so recommendations are not necessarily followed.

Assessments are very time-consuming.

It is difficult to gather some necessary data.

There can be disagreement on what is relevant data.

Collecting COUNTER data from publishers.

Lack of “extra” data variable, e.g., subject codes/BISAC codes and LC call numbers

Collection space: ongoing analysis based on space reports and collection review

Collection funding: some success with shared funding of some journal packages

Complexity

Lack of tools

Lack of dedicated staff

Consistency and acceptance of data sources and collection methods  
Resistance to evidence based/data driven collection development and management  
Lack of dedicated resources and staff

Consistency and efficiency of collection data: hiring of assessment officer  
Sharing of results: hiring of marketing person

Consistent data

Time

Too many locations of data

Consistent means of collecting and reporting data/findings  
Strategic use of data to support institutional goals and objectives  
Coordination of multiple parties' time and effort

Cost of comprehensive assessments

Data for consortial acquisitions can be challenging to parse.

Even with data, there can be many other factors that can influence good decisions when it comes to collection development.

Cross-departmental communication. Created position to help communicate between public and technical services.

Lack of system interoperability

Lack of consistent usage data, changing usage standards, vendors who do not adopt usage standards.

Current integrated library system was designed for handling print materials; compile data for assessment using a variety of library and university systems.

Concerns with the reliability of vendor-supplied data; double check data and disregard as necessary.

Different systems provide a different numbers, which restricts our ability to pull comparable data.

Current workflows don't produce data that is consistently reliable or legible in the abstract.

Current systems don't allow robust aggregation/analysis/reporting of our collections data. Solution: extract and manipulate the raw data using other tools.

Administrators at the university level largely deaf to evidence of need as presented by the library.

Data volume and size of collections

Lack of compliance with standards (e.g., COUNTER)

Data quality and integrity

Determining who/when is using certain e-collections more heavily (might be mediated by the use of EZproxy logs, although there are limitations as to how deep one can go into a particular resource).

Data over time is difficult, since we have changed the ILS a number of times, and not all data was migrated, and querying the underlying database must be done in another fashion.

Difficult to combine data/statistics from different sources without a lot of manual labor

Difficult to describe/present the outcomes of data analysis without spreadsheets

Not having good benchmarking data for meaningful comparisons

Difficulty parsing data from MARC bibliographic records

Each assessment project differs in the type of data it requires. Therefore, although we collect a lot of data, we don't typically have precisely what is needed for a particular project. This means that we often have to gather or reorganize data in a different way for each project, which is time-consuming and labor-intensive, and cuts down on the amount of assessment we can undertake.

Although our assessment projects nearly always contribute in a general way to an enhanced understanding of how our collection is perceived and used by our faculty and students, it can be difficult to turn that understanding into specific actions.

Electronic resource usage data that is not COUNTER compliant

Insufficient staff to manage collections data

Insufficient time for analysis and also for training liaisons in analysis

Funding

Space

Gathering use data can be difficult if vendor does not supply COUNTER reports. Their analysis is sometimes complicated by messy data and incomplete title lists.

In the context of a very large research collection, overlap analysis is a key aspect of collections assessment projects, and this is a resource intensive undertaking.

Since our institution is so large, even the smallest collections receive high use.

Getting selectors actively engaged. Have not overcome that challenge.

Data: there's both a lot and not enough. Bad records make it impossible to do good comparisons. Have not overcome that challenge.

Staff using the data that is gathered to make decisions. Have not overcome that challenge.

Having the time to analyse the data

Being able to have meaning reports about e-resources usage

Moving to a culture of evidence-based decisions with the data to assist/drive collection development when we know past decisions resulted in collections where 80% weren't used.

Historical lack of assessment

Historical difficulty acquiring raw data from vendors, ILS department

Inconsistent data

Lack of time and dedicated staff

Large quantity of data

Inconsistent data or bad match points. We have used OCLC and other APIs to attempt to make data more consistent.

Getting data in the first place. Persistence on a case-by-case basis was our only solution.

Integrating data from different sources: overcome with analytical programming skills

Presenting data from multiple sources in a manner that allows faculty input in collections review: overcome by combining skill sets across departments.

Forecasting physical collection growth: overcome with analytic programming skills

It is difficult to collect and analyze data produced from many different sources.

Lack of reliable unique identifiers across data sources makes it difficult to bring data together for analysis.

Difficult to extract and interpret data from our largest systems.

Information in our systems (e.g., ILLIAD and ILS and OCLC) is a mess, inconsistent. Springer's breach this spring calls into question the veracity of COUNTER stats from vendors.

Lack of time and people is a challenge, so we will shortly be recruiting for an assessment librarian who will work on collections and other types of assessment.

We have cut collections and lost purchasing power over the last decade, so we are focusing on defining what core resources are needed and how much money is needed for the core.

Lack of skill on using Access and other programs is a personal challenge.

Lack of time to do a proper assessment

Difficulty in obtaining data/reports needed

Staff don't always have sufficient expertise with Excel to analyze data

Limited access to data: circulation and in-house use

Migration to a new ILS impacted comparable data reporting

Comparability between print and electronic measures

Not always having a standard identifier in the record, for example ISBN or ISSN numbers

Negotiating the political dimension of assessment; for example, some users believing assessment decisions reflect the extent to which the library values and supports particular fields of research. We try to address this through clear and abundant communications and through transparency.

Communicating the complexities of purchasing models and restrictions to decision-makers and other stakeholders. We've tried to address this through the creation of glossaries of terms and very careful and thoughtful contextual details related to resources under evaluation.

Messy data. Oftentimes, the data that is used to inform assessment decisions is messy, inconsistent, problematic, and full of caveats.

Non-standard data, data integrity issues in general

Access to complete financial data

Incomplete vendor data or non-standard compliant data

Non-COUNTER usage statistics

Reliable vendor statistics

Cost/per use analysis within consortia

Not enough staff/librarian time

Not enough technology support, need software we don't have

We do additional work to collect data to tell the story, but it doesn't translate to additional funding; so it is worth all the work?

Overcome selector biases to data. Methods to overcome this challenge include exposing subject librarians to data, transparency in how data is being use, and training.

RDA. Problems with the standard in analyzing collections by publisher and subject. Problems have not yet been overcome.

Scale. Collection assessment tools are not up for the job. The size of our collections make them difficult to analyze.

Overwhelming number of subject areas to assess

Limited staff time to perform assessment activities

No systematic, individual tool—requires multiple tools and approaches

Staff shortage

Lack of data analysis expertise

Staff shortages

Time constraints

Staffing. We were among the first research libraries to create a Collections Analyst position, but we lost the position when the incumbent retired. As described above, we are exploring options for distributing collection assessment tasks among staff in various library units. These units have been involved in aspects of collection assessment all along, so this is partly a matter of more closely defining as well as enhancing existing work and also improving coordination. We expect a successful outcome, but it will still be a challenge to match the focused attention of a dedicated, collections-specific position.

Tools. We need automated tools that allow different library stakeholders to quickly and easily generate various tailored, real-time reports that provide integrated views of holdings, acquisitions, usage, expenditure, and budget data.

Purpose and implementation. It is a challenge to understand the conclusions to draw from collections assessment, how to act on the data wisely and with appropriate attention to specificities of academic discipline.

Support from the vendor (e.g., Intota Assessment): Vendor level of customer support was poor. A formal complaint was filed and the issue was resolved.

Outdated credentials on provider admin portals: Credentials expire or platforms change resulting in lost access to provider platform admin sites and usage statistics. Synchronizing between publisher and the provider they use is poor.

Responsibility for assessing collections is assigned to collection librarians with varying levels of skill and engagement in assessing the collections. Cross training or assigning an individual or individuals to this task would ensure ownership and quality of the results.

Systems that do not transfer data, for example e-collection cost data from Aleph to Intota Assessment

Gaps in data that are not obvious

Difficulty reporting electronic and print collections together

The raw data is only accessible to a limited number of people.

Insufficient or lacking underlying data hinders comprehensive analysis.

There are an overwhelming number of resources to evaluate and a lack of staff coordination, time, and interest.

Not all data are COUNTER compliant, in the same format, or are measuring the same things. Some platforms offer no use data.

There is a lack of transparency and pricing models on the part of collection providers/vendors.

Time

Personnel to manage assessment

Expertise to manage assessment

Time (to identify, collect, analyze, disseminate, and put into action results of analysis)

Technical skills distributed by enough staff to maximize use of data and analysis for assessment

Lack of centralization for vendor-provided data resulting in silos, making analysis more difficult

Time limitations have been reduced by increasing staff and faculty hours in assessment.

Understanding historical practices for collection assessment.

Resources to encourage an expectation of assessment, this includes personnel and collaborating across teams.

Documentation

Unreliable statistics from vendors

Vendor inconsistency in providing/presenting data

System migration causing loss of data

What do, or can, e-resource usage statistics tell us about user satisfaction?

It is difficult to accurately connect cost data with usage data, especially with journals available on multiple platforms (or where the publisher has changed platforms over time) and connecting this with overlap analysis.

How can we derive meaningful comparisons from disparate usage data: COUNTER vs. non-standard, e-book vs. print circulation.

## COLLECTION ASSESSMENT SKILLS

50. Have library staff received formal training in collection assessment or evaluation? N=65

Yes	28	43%
No	37	57%

**Yes** N=12

ALCTS Fundamentals of Collection Assessment online course

ALCTS professional development online course and several webinars

All librarians with collections responsibilities have received training in using GreenGlass.

Library staff have participated in technology trainings as well as a data science short course.

Mentoring, webinars and seminars, workshops—locally and at conferences

More training would be useful.

One staff member has received formal training in assessment, although not specifically for collection assessment.

Really: Yes and No. Our selector training and continuing education covers aspects of collection assessment, but we do not offer systematic or stand-alone training in collection assessment.

Some

Training for specific tools and/or project based

Two librarians on the assessment committee have completed the ALCTS Fundamentals of Collections Assessment course.

Yes some people have received training, nothing very recent.

**No** N=8

Certain individuals have expertise but there has been no over-arching effort to train personnel.

Informal training has included vendor-provided training, webinars, and conference sessions,

Library staff generally have not received formal training. The Collection Assessment Librarian has received some formal training.

Most learned on the job.

Planning for this is underway.

Some individuals have received specialized training, as required for their work.

Some staff have been trained or have sought out training, others have learned in-house.

We are planning for this.



51. Using a scale of 1 to 11, where 1 = Most Important and 11 = Least Important, please rank the skills or knowledge needed by library staff for collection assessment or evaluation. Click on the arrow to select a number or drag each choice into the desired order of importance. N=65

Skills/Knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	N
Collection development principles	10	15	15	6	6	5	2	3	1	1	1	65
Excel/spreadsheet	2	3	12	14	13	10	8	2	0	1	0	65
Access/database	0	1	0	2	5	5	9	11	8	20	4	65
Statistical analysis	0	2	2	9	5	8	7	17	10	3	2	65
Analytical/critical thinking	26	15	10	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	64
Data visualization/chart-making	0	0	0	3	8	9	10	11	13	9	1	64
Subject expertise	5	7	5	4	4	8	4	6	14	7	0	64
Knowledge of publishing industry	0	2	4	4	8	7	10	5	8	14	2	64
Collection assessment/evaluation principles	19	15	10	12	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	63
Data management	1	3	6	4	8	6	13	8	9	5	0	63
Other skill or knowledge	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	44	54
Total Respondents	64	64	64	64	64	63	64	65	65	65	54	65

Skills/Knowledge	Rating Average	N
Analytical/critical thinking	2.33	64
Collection assessment/evaluation principles	2.71	63
Collection development principles	3.65	65
Excel/spreadsheet	4.72	65
Subject expertise	6.09	64
Data management	6.40	63
Statistical analysis	6.86	65
Knowledge of publishing industry	7.16	64
Data visualization/chart-making	7.53	64
Access/database	8.18	65
Other skill or knowledge	10.37	54

52. Using a scale of 1 to 11, where 1 = Most Needed and 11 = Least Needed, please rank the skills or knowledge needed by library staff for collection assessment or evaluation. Click on the arrow to select a number or drag each choice into the desired order of importance. N=46

Skill/Knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	N
Collection development principles	8	12	8	6	1	5	0	4	1	1	0	46
Collection assessment/evaluation principles	17	12	4	4	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	46
Data management	0	3	5	1	6	6	11	9	3	2	0	46
Analytical/critical thinking	15	7	12	3	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	46
Excel/spreadsheet	0	5	7	13	8	4	8	1	0	0	0	46
Access/database	0	0	1	3	3	3	7	9	5	13	2	46
Statistical analysis	1	2	3	6	4	5	5	10	7	2	1	46
Data visualization/chart-making	0	2	0	5	5	6	7	5	9	6	0	45
Subject expertise	5	1	3	3	2	7	5	3	11	5	1	46
Knowledge of publishing industry	0	1	3	2	4	7	2	3	8	15	0	45
Other skill or knowledge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	37	41
Total Respondents	46	45	46	46	46	46	46	46	45	46	41	46

Skill/Knowledge	Rating Average	N
Collection assessment/evaluation principles	2.54	46
Analytical/critical thinking	2.76	46
Collection development principles	3.61	46
Excel/spreadsheet	4.59	46
Data management	6.24	46
Statistical analysis	6.46	46
Subject expertise	6.50	46
Data visualization/chart-making	7.00	45
Knowledge of publishing industry	7.58	45
Access/database	7.96	46
Other skill or knowledge	10.83	41

53. What continuing education opportunities (if any) would be helpful or beneficial for establishing or improving the collection assessment process at your library? N=29

A class on basic collection assessment methods

Access/database: we consider these to be systems internal to the institution; e.g., Datamarts, finance systems. Excel: increase knowledge from beginner to intermediate and advanced. Data visualization: training in tools such as Tableau.

Advanced statistical analysis

Analytical thinking, data visualization

Business analytics

Data visualization and how to ask the right questions

How to tell an accurate, data-rich, meaningful story with data

I think looking at what other institutions are doing, through webinars or other means, could help move us toward best practices. This SPEC survey request has revealed a need for a greater emphasis on documentation.

Learning of and using new technologies and software programs to demonstrate impact

More training in Excel and data management

MS Excel

Now that we have an office of library assessment we plan to establish a program in support of collection assessment.

Online tutorials for new tools

Opportunities to collaborate with peers at similar libraries for sharing strategies, benchmarking, tool development, etc. Support for methodological applications, understanding accreditation process from a reviewer's perspective, creating connections to student/researcher success.

Possibly basic orientation

Programming, data manipulation, and visualization continuing education

Properly communicating evaluation results to multiple separate audiences

Rather than continuing education, we might benefit more from a consultant reviewing our entire data collection and analysis landscape and making recommendations for how we could make it more efficient and useful.

Statistical analysis training (SPSS or R)

Tableau and other visualization tools, basics of statistical analysis

Tailored/individualized assessment training for subject liaisons, coupled with discipline group feedback, is the path we are currently organizing to grow assessment skills within our library faculty.

Teamwork, Excel knowledge relevant to statistical analysis, statistical analysis in general

Technical application training; opportunities to broaden understanding of collection assessment in general

Training, new software to support assessment, workshops on best practices hosted by ARL

We have conducted a series, "Dates with Data" to improve basic skills with Excel, Pivot tables, and analyzing data sets.

Webinars on planning assessment projects for different types of materials.

Workshops that offer various perspectives—publisher, provider, library. Also hands-on for Excel, visualization, and analysis tasks.

Workshops that speak to the topics rated above.

Workshops/conferences/presentations on how to organize and integrate the collection assessment process to make it more formal.

## COLLECTION ASSESSMENT CLIMATE

54. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Not at All and 5 = Very Well, please indicate how well each of the following statements reflects the collection evaluation and assessment climate at your library. Please make one selection per row. N=66

Climate	1 Not at All	2	3	4	5 Very Well	N
Quantitative collections data is the primary means of collection assessment.	0	6	19	29	12	66
Results of collection evaluations are used to make collection development decisions.	1	6	20	21	18	66
Use of collection evaluations has increased in the last 5 years.	4	2	6	21	33	66
The data needed for effective collection assessment is difficult to access or gather.	0	2	29	19	16	66
Stakeholders outside of the library (e.g., faculty, department administration, campus administration) are interested in the results of collection evaluations.	5	16	27	14	4	66
Internal stakeholders (library administration, subject librarians, etc.) are interested in the results of the collection evaluation.	0	1	10	27	28	66
Library administration supports collection assessment.	1	0	5	11	49	66
Total Respondents	10	24	60	57	59	66

55. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Not at All and 5 = Very Well, please indicate how well each of the following statements reflects the attitude toward collection evaluation and assessment in general at your library. Please make one selection per row. N=66

Attitude	1 Not at All	2	3	4	5 Very Well	N
Collection evaluations should be used to adjust allocations of funding for collections.	2	12	17	22	13	66
Collection evaluations are difficult to interpret, understand, or apply.	7	17	19	20	3	66
Quantitative data is more important than qualitative data for effective collection evaluations.	8	9	37	12	0	66
Libraries should share collection analyses and data with others in the field.	2	4	17	23	20	66
Collection evaluation should be a centralized function.	2	9	24	19	11	65
Collection assessment is supported by the theoretical foundations of collection development.	3	6	23	18	15	65
Total Respondents	18	41	62	53	35	66

56. What is the most successful part of the collection assessment process (regardless of how formal or informal) that is used at your library? N=48

A few core staff are interested in doing it and do it well.

Academic program reviews

Analyses of the data: local citation analyses, database overlap analyses, cost/benefit analyses

Analyses of use and cost/use are very helpful and used all the time in funding and purchasing decisions; also frequently used to determine which materials stay in campus libraries, which go to remote storage, which get replaced by digital versions.

Analyzing use statistics and helping with accreditation reports

Calculate cost per use for e-resources

Collaboration among colleagues to collect, analyze, and share information

Collaboration and co-operation across departments to retrieve, share, and analyze data

Collaboration and continuous improvement of the process of collection assessment

Collaboration between subject specialists and functional specialists

Collaboration between units (Collection Development, Acquisitions, Information Technology, etc.

Consistent review and demand for data for decision-making

Decentralization of tasks and processes across the department

Electronic resource usage

Faculty and student feedback and requests (needs)

Increased attention placed on continuing resources

Increased awareness of the usefulness of collection assessment within our library over the past two years

Increased standardization

It allowed us to use data to start an EBA e-book program with two publishers. These publishers were identified using ILL transaction logs.

It informs our selection and collection development decision-making process.

One of the most successful parts of our collection assessment process is the ability to combine and concisely present multiple data sources to the university community in order to gather feedback during collections reviews. This feedback can then be integrated into our data-informed collection management strategies. More generally, the fact that assessment is ongoing and integrated into our collecting has also been very successful.

Our collection assessment process is centrally coordinated, but everyone with collections responsibilities is conversant and engaged in the process.

Our focus has been on quantitative assessment of electronic resource and journal use, tempered by the knowledge that different fields have different levels of use. This has been successful and summary reports are used annually by selectors/liaisons in making individual collection decisions.

Our informal communication and workflows are successful at accomplishing needs-based objectives.

Price negotiations with vendors; increasing transparency in use of data for decision-making about collections

Process for assessment for new program reviews gathers good data, although there is no support at the university level for more funding to support areas of need (new journals and databases).

Providing the “net” that captures interdisciplinary materials that might otherwise fall through disciplinary cracks.

Setting and documenting policies for what is selected for the collection

Support of community decision-making

Teamwork, disciplinary analysis and duplicate analysis

The ability to execute change based on the analytics and having the resources and personnel to engage consistently with the data.

The ability to quickly capture electronic usage statistics for quick analysis

The application of learned knowledge to administrative decision-making

The day-to-day work of selectors and technical services colleagues monitoring usage of electronic resources may be the most consistently successful aspect. But the more elaborate projects comparing holdings and collection activity with partner institutions have also been very important and successful in supporting collaborative initiatives. Since this work takes place on so many different levels, it is difficult to isolate parts.

The determinations to add to our collections or not, the determinations to de-accession or store off site, and the prioritization of funding are all informed by our practices.

The efforts made by the Collections Development department to compile and present quantitative data used to inform decision-making.

The high-level assessments can be helpful for large trends. Using Sustainable Collection Services has been helpful for us to look at issues related to storage, which is different than what other libraries use it for (which has more often been for deselection).

The library administration encourages ongoing collection assessment and has made it a priority.

The most successful parts of the collection assessment process are both formal and informal. Informally, listening skills, dispelling myths of assessment, and showing actionable results no matter how small have contributed to the success of collection assessment. Formally, clear support from stakeholders (dean, associate deans, division heads) and productive collaborations have contributed to the success of collection assessment.

The opportunity to examine collections in particular subject or discipline areas is the most successful part of the collection assessment process.

The routine collection of usage statistics for collection evaluation, and the triennial survey of our users.

Understanding the usage patterns of our various constituencies.

Usage analysis

Usage data on e-journals is made available on a regular basis. All subject liaisons have the option to have a personal login to the EBSCONET database to review usage data as needed. Reports from ILS are run and delivered to subject liaisons as requested and in formats easy to use.

Using data to make decisions on which continuing resources should be renewed.

We annually report collections trends showing changes in collections and use over time. We use assessment measures to select items for storage.

We can see the use evolve over time.

We have developed some good tools for presenting and contextualizing data.

**57. If you could, what aspects or parts of the collection assessment process would you change? N=39**

Better communication

Collection development librarians and acquisitions staff need to develop the skills and, in some cases, the intellectual curiosity requisite for sustained collection analysis.

Communicating value to library staff

Create a more centralized role with a focus on collection assessment. Make collection assessment a systematic, regular, and mandatory process.

Create a more holistic approach.

Develop a proactive rather than largely reactive system of assessment.

Ease in getting data

Ease of extracting and combining data from multiples sources, and at multiple scales

Easier, more uniform data collection, with more consistency from publishers.

Formalize it more and co-locate the data

Fully integrate and capitalize on usage, finance, ROI data into our e-resources renewal, decision-making processes.

Going forward we want to focus more assessment on print collections. We are also going to hire an assessment librarian so that we have a person to help with many kinds of assessments, as currently time to spend on assessment is a challenge.

I would increase personnel support for collection assessment.

I would like to have dedicated staff to run tabulations and to format the data for public and library sharing.

I would make usage data and assessment available as an ongoing service to our liaison librarians.

I would successfully integrate our bibliographers more fully into the assessment process.

Ideally there would be more staff time available for the collection assessment process so that it could be done more systematically.

Improve consistency of data (both internal and external)

It would be easier to gather and combine electronic resource usage data.

More automation and easier access

More funding would be useful.

More people dedicated to collection assessment, better technical infrastructure to manage the process, and improved data quality connected to acquisitions and cataloging processes.

More reliable data

More resources devoted specifically to collection assessment.

More staff/librarian resources, more software, more recognition of the extreme amount of work that goes in to the process of collection assessment

More systematic and centralized

Reporting data

Since the Collection Assessment Librarian is relatively new and first of its kind, processes that existed before the position have changed on their own (i.e., collecting and analyzing usage and pricing data has become centralized; curation and dissemination of what's new and changed has been regularized and centralized). Other processes have not changed much (i.e., heads of libraries spearhead weeding projects with support from the collections team). What is changing is capacity. The more work the

Collection Assessment Librarian accomplishes to educate and train colleagues, the greater capacity everyone in the library will have to do some level of assessment in the subject-area collections of which they are expert.

Statistics collection and assessment/analysis should be handled in the same department.

System improvements and the ability to anticipate what data will be needed.

The difficulty of getting all of the data in one place and making sure that it is shared out to all stakeholders

The time it takes to perform gathering and analysis.

This SPEC survey has revealed the need for much greater documentation of our processes.

We are developing a collections assessment plan that integrates our general collections (print and electronic), special collections, archives, and digital collections. We would like to put in place a regular, systemic review of all continuing resources and standing orders informed by cost and use data.

We need (and are working on) better coordination of a rather distributed set of processes. We also need to understand better, as a library, what the goals of our collection assessment activities are and what outcomes we would like to see.

We need more efficiently organized data (or more staff to work with it) so that we don't seem to be starting from scratch with each project.

We would like a process that is more formal than the one we use. In addition, an ERM would be greatly beneficial.

We'd like to be able to make the data more accessible.

Working with reporting entities such as ARL, ACRL, IPEDS to clarify and simplify.

## **NO COLLECTION ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

**58. If an evaluation has not been conducted or there is currently no process for regularly assessing the library collections, please indicate the reason. Check all that apply. N=3**

Insufficient staff	2	67%
Lack of time	2	67%
Insufficient technical infrastructure	2	67%
Inadequate funds	1	33%
Inadequate staff skills	1	33%
Lack of perceived value	1	33%
Lack of interest	0	0%
Lack of administrative support	0	0%
Other reason	2	67%

**Please briefly describe the other reason. N=2**

Need tools and data that support decision-making.

Options often are not cost effective in terms of time and effort, while output/results are often problematic and therefore not useful.



**59. What question(s) are you trying to answer about your collection that you have not yet been able to resolve with the tools currently available? N=1**

Key challenges are: how well do the collections support the academic enterprise generally and specifically (especially when a unit is undergoing review); what metrics would be useful in achieving equity and establishing spending priorities; how to effectively evaluate alternative strategies and possible actions; devising approaches and standards for monitoring how well the collections deliver value; and crafting the assessment results into compelling and understandable narratives. Moreover, the appropriate methodologies and corresponding metrics vary greatly depending upon the nature and goal(s) of the assessment.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**60. Please enter any additional information regarding collection assessment activities at your library that may assist the authors in accurately analyzing the results of this survey. N=12**

Collection assessment is a very complex, evolving, multifaceted process involving people with many different and changing roles. It's not always easy to capture that complexity in survey responses.

Collection assessment staff and organization have increased and changed within the past academic year, and new plans and approaches are still being worked out.

Survey responses should have allowed for more than 1 box to be checked, e.g., regular AND project or formal AND informal, to reflect the realities in libraries. Also, as structured the survey does not capture the complexities of collection assessment.

The association dean for collection strategies position has been staffed on a part-time basis for most of the last three years. This arrangement has recently been changed with the incumbent taking on the position full-time, enabling increased resources (greater time and attention) for collection assessment projects and ongoing assessment training and service development.

The survey questions seem to assume an established program for assessment. We do assessment on a very ad hoc basis, which made many of the questions difficult to answer accurately.

This is more a comment on the survey than on assessment activities at our library: It would have been useful to provide a clearer definition of the range of activities that constitute "collection assessment." Every library gathers data on holdings, usage, collection expenditures and analyzes this data in various ways, though not always in an integrated fashion. To what extent—separately and/or in combination—do these activities amount to collection assessment? For example, the question about "changes made as a result of assessment"—our faculty and university administration responded to statistics showing a drop in library for annual collection expenditures. Concern about this development eventually led to greater support for collections funding, but it was unclear to me whether this should be seen (in terms of the present survey) as an impact of collections assessment per se.

We are in the second year of a sustained effort to make collection development more evidence-based. This effort includes programs already in place—such as DDA—and is complementary to a library-wide reorganization of staff that emphasizes the formation of flexible, project-based teams. Our fiscal climate also demands that we be able to present (better) data about our collections and their use both to administrators and to faculty and students. Currently, collection development librarians are considering ways to make assessment part of their regular practices, and we are also examining workflows in acquisitions that could better support the kinds of data we need for reliable assessments.

We do not have a staff position that has sole responsibility for overseeing collection assessment. The Coordinator for Library Assessment is a new position and only 50% of that staff member's job.

Collection assessment happens as subject liaisons see a need and initiate request for data for specific projects. Currently, collection assessment is decentralized in the university library system.

We have had leadership changes at multiple levels within the organization that have disrupted our regular processes and provide an opportunity to put new processes in place.

We hired an Assessment Librarian a couple of years ago, but currently that position is vacant and we haven't replaced them yet, so in this transition period others are taking parts of those duties. I think that having a full-time person dedicated to assessment is a great idea to assist with collection analysis, because along with human resources, this is our largest area of spending and our focus is to meet the needs of our students and faculty. Understanding the usage is key to ensuring we are doing the right things with our budget.

We use both formal and informal collection assessment processes. Basically, the formal processes are led by a committee that focuses on multidisciplinary resources. Informal processes are led by subject librarians for their own assigned collections, but there is collaboration between the committee and the subject librarians.

We've been working hard to modify staff position descriptions to reflect anticipated increases in focus, attention, and skill development to support assessment generally. Collections is one focus at the forefront.

# Responding Institutions

University of Alberta  
Arizona State University  
Boston University  
Brigham Young University  
University of British Columbia  
Brown University  
University of Calgary  
University of California, Irvine  
Case Western Reserve University  
University of Colorado at Boulder  
Colorado State University  
University of Connecticut  
Cornell University  
Duke University  
Emory University  
George Washington University  
Georgetown University  
University of Georgia  
University of Houston  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
Indiana University Bloomington  
University of Iowa  
Iowa State University  
Johns Hopkins University  
University of Kansas  
Université Laval  
Louisiana State University  
University of Louisville  
McGill University  
University of Manitoba  
University of Maryland  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
University of Miami  
University of Michigan  
National Library of Medicine  
University of Nebraska—Lincoln  
University of New Mexico  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
North Carolina State University  
Northwestern University  
University of Notre Dame  
Ohio University  
Ohio State University  
University of Oklahoma  
Oklahoma State University  
University of Oregon  
University of Pennsylvania  
Pennsylvania State University  
University of Rochester  
Rutgers University  
Smithsonian Institution  
University of South Carolina  
University of Southern California  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
University at Albany, SUNY  
Syracuse University  
Temple University  
University of Tennessee  
Texas A&M University  
Texas Tech University  
University of Toronto  
Vanderbilt University  
University of Virginia  
Virginia Tech  
University of Washington  
Washington University in St. Louis  
University of Waterloo  
Western University  
University of Wisconsin—Madison  
Yale University