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DUKE UNIVERSITY ACCREDITATION PROCESS

Duke University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to award baccalaureate, masters, doctorate, and professional degrees. Contact the Commission on Colleges at 1866 Southern Lane, Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097 or call 404-679-4500 for questions about the accreditation of Duke University.

Reaffirmation of accreditation occurs every ten years. The process has two components: a Compliance Certification (demonstration of compliance with 88 core requirements, comprehensive standards, and federal regulations) and a Quality Enhancement Plan (self-study on a topic pertaining to the enhancement of student learning). General information on these components and the overall process may be found in the SACS Handbook for Reaffirmation of Accreditation. Duke-specific details on committees and process are available in this presentation from January 2007, when the process was rolled out to various Duke constituencies.

A leadership team headed by President Richard Brodhead has overall responsibility for oversight of the reaffirmation process and products.

COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION

For more than 1.5 years, from February 2007 through early September 2008, two teams from around the University worked collaboratively to develop Duke's University's compliance certification report: primary responsibility rested with the Compliance Certification Team; an Assessment Working Group assisted with the assessment components of the report. On September 8, 2008, Duke submitted its report to the ten external reviewers from around the region, as well as to SACS: a Web site with 3,000 links; a DVD; and a print version. The external reviewers asked for more information in several areas and Duke provided it in a "focused report" in early February 2009.

A second team of reviewers is coming to campus from March 22-25, 2009, to discuss the Quality Enhancement Plan as well as the focused report.

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN (QEP)

Duke’s QEP is entitled "Global Duke: Enhancing Students’ Capacity for World Citizenship." The three components of the QEP are:

1) Winter Forum: a 2.5-day symposium before the start of spring semester, examining a global challenge in interdisciplinary and international perspective;
2) Global Semester Abroad: a study abroad program examining a global issue in comparative perspective in two different locations;
3) Global Advising Program: a cadre of specially trained advisors to assist students in making more intentional use of the many opportunities available for addressing global challenges and building intercultural competencies.

The QEP submitted in February 2009 may be found here; it includes the history of Duke's development of the QEP, a literature review, supporting documents, and other features required by SACS. Some QEP documents
are presented only online: case statement June 2007; summary of “blue sky” conversation May 2007; case statement Sept. 2008; Global Semester Abroad budget; and report on fall 2008 focus groups.

For further information on the accreditation process or products, please call Vice Provost Keith Whitfield, Duke University’s liaison to SACS, at 660-0330, or email him at keith.whitfield@duke.edu.
Introduction

Georgetown has begun its self-study in preparation for its review in the spring of 2012 for reaccreditation through the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. This process takes place every 10 years, and applies to the entire University. The whole University community is encouraged to participate. On this website you will find key documents and links pertinent to the review process.

Our self-study is led by a Steering Committee that is co-chaired by Professor of English and Assistant Provost for Teaching and Learning Randy Bass and Associate Provost, Academic Marjory Blumenthal. I am grateful to them and to the many other faculty members and administrators who are serving in this important process, including members of working groups and participants in ad hoc activities that will provide specific inputs.

This is an important opportunity to assess the life and culture of our University and consider how we can become even stronger as an academic institution. In the latter stages of the process, we will seek feedback from senior administrators and faculty members from peer institutions who will serve on a visiting evaluation team. Throughout the coming months, we will use this process to explore opportunities for using our resources more effectively to renew Georgetown as a prominent research university.

On this website you will learn more about our 2010-2012 self-study and review. I hope you find our approach interesting and productive. You will also find places to contribute your own ideas – and as I said above, I hope you do.

John J. DeGioia
President, Georgetown University
Accreditation

Accreditation in higher education is a process of external review (through peer evaluation), that allows for quality assurance of colleges, universities and educational programs. Through the process of accreditation, schools and programs are better able to develop standards and channels for self-examination.

Georgetown University is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. The Middle States Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. The Middle States region includes the District of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Accreditation is essential, as it instills confidence in the University’s mission, goals, performance and resources through the enforcement of its rigorous standards. Accreditation is a requirement for the University's access to federal financial aid dollars and is a marker of prestige of the University. Additionally, the self-study process involved in accreditation is an opportunity for in-depth analysis of the University's strengths and areas for improvement. Student, faculty and staff input is vital to this process.

Specialized and Professional Accreditation

In addition to the University’s overall accreditation, each of Georgetown’s schools and certain programs are accredited by specialized accreditors.

Law Center

The Georgetown University Law Center is accredited by the American Bar Association and is a member of the Association of American Law Schools.

McDonough School of Business

The McDonough School of Business is fully accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Founded in 1916, AACSB International is the longest serving global accrediting body for business schools that offer undergraduate, master's, and doctoral degrees in business. Only 620 schools of business, or less than 5% worldwide, have earned this distinguished hallmark of excellence in management education. To maintain accreditation, a business program must undergo a rigorous internal review every five years, at which must demonstrate its commitment to the 21 quality standards relating to faculty qualification, strategic management of resources, interactions with faculty and students, as well as a commitment to continuous improvement and achievement of learning goals in degree programs.

School of Medicine

The Georgetown University School of Medicine is accredited by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME). LCME is the nationally recognized accrediting authority for medical education programs leading to the M.D. degree in U.S. and Canadian medical schools.

School of Nursing & Health Studies

The Georgetown University School of Nursing & Health Studies is accredited by the following agencies:
The Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education (ACME) for the basic certificate and graduate nurse-midwifery education programs for registered nurses. The ACME has been recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as a programmatic accrediting agency for nurse-midwifery education programs since 1982.
The Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education (CAHME) for the graduate programs in health services administration. CAHME serves the public good through promoting, evaluating, and improving the
quality of graduate healthcare management education in the United States and Canada. CAHME is proud to be officially recognized by both the Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. CAHME is also a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASAPA) and adheres to the ASPA Code of Good Practice.

The Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) for the nursing education programs at the baccalaureate and graduate degree levels. Officially recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education as a national accreditation agency, CCNE is an autonomous accrediting agency, contributing to the improvement of the public's health. CCNE ensures the quality and integrity of baccalaureate, graduate, and residency programs in nursing.

The Council on Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs for nurse anesthesia programs at the certificate and master's degree programs. Founded in 1931, the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists (AANA) is the professional association representing more than 46,000 Certified Nurse Anesthetists (CRNAs) and student nurse anesthetists nationwide.

Athletics

Georgetown University is certified by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) as a Division I school. The NCAA is a membership organization of colleges and universities that participate in intercollegiate athletics. Its primary purpose is to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body. Activities of the NCAA membership include formulating rules of play for NCAA sports, conducting national championships, adopting and enforcing standards of eligibility and studying all phases of intercollegiate athletics.
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GOAL 1: ACCESS TO INFORMATION -- Patrons informational needs for education, research and service are fully met

OBJECTIVE 1a: Patrons have access to resources that adequately support their information needs, regardless of format, time, or location

- **Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success** — When seeking information resources, patrons will experience the following:
  - Students will locate all required readings in campus libraries or through the library
  - Students will be able to do required reading through the e-reserve collection
  - Undergraduate students will locate the monographs and journals they need
  - Students will use evaluative webliographies, annotated guides and other finding aids compiled or identified by library staff to locate appropriate resources
  - Graduate or professional students, researchers and faculty will locate the resources they need in or through the library

- **Performance Activities**
  - Bibliographers will review course syllabi on the University website and ensure that required and recommended readings are available or accessible
  - Bibliographers will acquire every monograph authored, edited, or contributed to by an HU author
  - Bibliographers will maintain regular contact with liaisons and departmental faculty to keep abreast of new courses, programs or changing emphases.
  - Bibliographers will be alert to important, free electronic resources and generate orders for pertinent, authoritative titles
  - Bibliographers will submit faculty requests expeditiously and will provide periodic updates about the status of the orders. If the requested items are needed immediately, bibliographer will advise user to request material through Interlibrary Loan while awaiting the processing and fulfillment of the orders or borrow needed items directly from reciprocating libraries
  - Bibliographers will notify interested users of new acquisitions pertinent to their specialization
  - Bibliographers will prepare, upload and maintain pertinent, up-to-date help guides and webliographies

- **Methods of Assessment**
  - Survey Questionnaire (to measure satisfaction/adequacy)
  - Analysis of selected theses and faculty publications

- **Use of Findings**
  - Order or provide access to publications needed for teaching and research
  - Review consortial agreements
  - Revise collection policies

- **Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline**
  - Bibliographers - each semester or academic year
  - Library administrators - before end of budget cycle
  - Department chairs and faculty liaisons
  - University Assessment Committee
  - University administrators
Goal 1 Objective 1b

**Objective 1b:** Patrons use high performance technologies to locate the information they need, regardless of format, time, or location

- **Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success**
  - OPAC usability; information accuracy and currency
  - Website usability; information accuracy and currency
  - Public-domain workstation availability, accessibility, age, maintenance
  - Print service readiness
  - Network availability (sub-networks)
  - Network server availability
  - Technology user problem-tracking effectiveness

- **Performance Activities--Criteria (CR) and Achievement Targets (AT)**
  - OPAC usability
    - CR= Easy, intuitive navigation; information is accurate and current; iii Millennium is current version
    - AT= Common interface; pleasant design; optimal page load; 98% links effectiveness
  - Website usability:
    - CR= Easy, intuitive navigation; information is accurate and current; authenticated full access to restricted resources
    - AT= Common interface; pleasant design; optimal page load; specialized easy-link subject lists; 98% link effectiveness
  - Published information currency:
    - CR= Continuing scrutiny, excluding archives
    - AT= 90% of documents to have last-reviewed date no earlier than 1 year
  - Public-access workstation availability of use:
    - CR= Throughout core working hours
    - AT= 98% availability, in workstation-hours, over a rolling quarter
  - Public-access workstation accessibility
    - CR=
    - AT= At least 1 workstation fitted with adaptive technologies
  - Public-access workstation maintenance:
    - CR= Repair/replacement w/in 2 working days of diagnosis
    - AT= 95% of jobs completed within specified time
  - Public-access workstation age profile:
    - CR= Retire machine from service by 4th anniversary
    - AT= 75% of public-access machines have a commissioning date no earlier than 4 years
• Print service readiness:
  - CR= Throughout core working hours
  - AT= 96% accessibility, measured over a rolling quarter
• Network availability (sub-networks):
  - CR= Anytime
  - AT= 98% availability for each sub-network, measured over a rolling quarter
• Network server availability:
  - CR= Anytime
  - AT= 98% availability for each server, measured over a rolling quarter
• Communication plant room equipment fault resolution:
  - CR= Complete resolution w/in 12 working hours of receipt of fault report
  - AT= 98% of jobs fall w/in time frame, measured over a rolling quarter
• User problem-tracking effectiveness:
  - CR= Initial response (w/in 2 workdays); problem identification (w/in 3 work days; closure (w/in 5 work days)
  - AT= 95% of jobs fall within the given time
• PC/peripheral problem-tracking effectiveness:
  - CR= Initial response (w/in 5 workdays); problem identification (w/in 2 work days; closure (w/in 3 work days)
  - AT= 95% of jobs fall within the given time, measured over a rolling quarter

• Methods of Assessment
  - Survey Questionnaire (to measure satisfaction/adequacy)
  - Network performance statistics

• Use of Findings
  - Update iii Millennium records
  - Update affected Web pages

• Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline
  - Bibliographers
  - Systems administrator
  - Webmaster
  - Technical Services
  - Department chairs and faculty liaisons
  - University Assessment Committee
  - University administrator
GOAL 1: ACCESS TO INFORMATION -- Patrons informational needs for education, research and service are fully met

OBJECTIVE 1c: Patrons obtain information not available at Howard libraries, promptly and with minimum effort

When seeking information resources, patrons will experience the following:

- **Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success**
  - New acquisitions are promptly listed in OPAC and made available
  - Bibliographers have current information of account balances
  - URLs in Sterling, webbibographies, annotated guides and other finding aids are working, accurate and up-to-date
  - Staff assistance in locating materials/processing requests is prompt, courteous, and confidential
  - Borrowing/return/clearance procedures/services are prompt, consistent and courteous
  - Patrons will obtain materials listed as available in the Channing Pollock Theatre Collection expeditiously or by a specified time on weekdays
  - Processing of course reserves is prompt and accurate
  - E-reserves are ubiquitous and promptly available
  - Processing of ILL requests is prompt and informative
  - Shelving of materials is prompt and orderly
  - Reciprocal libraries' resources collections are accessible through direct borrowing or ILL (AS)
  - Library policies and procedures are up-to-date and clear

- **Performance Activities**
  - Assigned staff will oversee the continuous shelf reading of the collections
  - Bibliographers will prepare new subject guides or update existing ones each semester, as needed
  - Bibliographers will check web pages pertaining to their assigned disciplines monthly and ensure that the links are working and up-to-date
  - Technical services will report monthly to bibliographers on new acquisitions and cataloging information
  - Technical Services will collaborate with bibliographers to create quick-link subject lists of online periodicals accessible through Sterling
  - Technical Services will collaborate with bibliographers to expand Sterling into a “meta-catalog” -- a comprehensive tool providing a national level of bibliographic description and subject analysis for all accessible academic resources, including links to the best available databases and bibliographic services
  - Bibliographers will report irregularities in Sterling or non-working links in Web records as soon as they are discovered and on a weekly log that is emailed to the Head Cataloger, Systems Administrator or other appropriate library administrators
  - Bibliographers will oversee the annual inventory of selected subsets of the collections in order to replace missing items or request adjustment of Sterling entries
- The Special Collections Curator will inventory the Pollock Theatre Collection continually and request catalog adjustments for missing items that cannot be replaced

- **Methods of Assessment**
  - Survey Questionnaire (to measure satisfaction/adequacy)
  - Analysis of requests for stack searches, ILL and direct borrowing requests

- **Use of Findings**
  - Order or provide access to publications needed for teaching and research
  - Update Sterling records
  - Update affected Web pages
  - Customer service training

- **Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline**
  - Bibliographers
  - Library administrators
  - Department chairs and faculty liaisons
  - University Assessment Committee
  - University administrator
Library Assessment Plan—Goal 2

Objectives: 2a | 2b | 2c | 2d

Department/School/Administrative Unit: University Libraries
Submitted by: Academic Year
Program Title and Degree (if applicable)

GOAL 2: INFORMATION EMPOWERMENT -- The student’s information skills as foundations for life-long learning are developed or enhanced

Intended Educational (Student), Research or Service Outcomes, Administrative Objectives or Expected Results (In this section, clearly articulate the expected results related to each goal. Try to make the objectives results-oriented). It is best to specify the objectives for each goal--e.g., Goal 1 may have two objectives labeled as Objective 1a and Objective 1b)

OBJECTIVE 2a: Patrons receive effective ready reference and consultation assistance

- **Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success**—When seeking information/reference/consultation assistance, the patron experiences the following:
  - Enthusiastic, innovative and courteous service
  - Prompt and effective service

- **Performance Activities**
  - Staff the service point adequately and appropriately
  - Provide electronic reference service for remote users
  - Conduct training to ensure each employee possesses
    - thorough professional knowledge and technical skills
    - excellent communication skills--listening, understanding, and speaking
    - excellent personal qualities
  - Conduct regular employee appraisals to assess and evaluate performance
  - Communicate with University constituencies about services and collections (Bibliographers; Webmaster; Systems)
  - Produce print and electronic general and specialized guides to services and resources (Bibliographers; Webmaster; Systems)
  - Conduct user surveys to assess customer expectations and perception

- **Methods of Assessment**
  - Survey Questionnaire

- **Use of Findings**
  - Accelerate training and plan future staff development
  - Revise staffing patterns
  - Test alternative staffing models
  - Adjust recruitment strategy

- **Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline**
  - Data collected/analyzed quarterly by research assistants
  - Results reported to library administrators, managers, public service staff
  - External stakeholders (faculty, students, University administrators)
Library Assessment Plan—Goal 2 Objective 2b

GOAL 2: INFORMATION EMPOWERMENT -- The student's information skills as foundations for life-long learning are developed or enhanced

OBJECTIVE 2b: First-year students can use finding tools effectively to identify useful resources and locate needed information (learning outcome)

- Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success (What will students/customer be able to do, to be, possess or perceive when the goal is accomplished? The National Center for Research, Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (1996) defines criteria as "guidelines, rules, characteristics, or dimensions that are used to judge the quality of student performance. Criteria indicate what we value in student responses, products, or performances." The student will be able to do the following:
  - Identify the campus library as a primary source for class-related information
  - Delineate the elements of information (e.g., author, title, topic, call number, etc.) that are used as access points in the library's basic finding tool
  - Describe how typical citation elements help differentiate publications as books, journals, newspapers, non-print media, or Web sites
  - Identify potential sources of information
  - Create search strategies appropriate to the finding tool (e.g., online catalog, printed index or electronic database), using appropriate keywords or phrases, Boolean operators, or subject headings
  - Interpret search results to access full-text online or to locate physical copy in a campus library or externally through Interlibrary Loan.

- Performance Activities
  - Students enrolled in the Freshman Experience will attend an interactive multimedia presentation highlighting library services, resources, policies and library layout.
  - English 002 students will attend 1-2 hour library instruction sessions to learn how to navigate the library home page, Sterling, and general databases.
  - International Students will attend an interpretive tour and hands-on library session to familiarize themselves with library layout, policies and procedures.
  - Center for Academic Reinforcement enrollees and students in the Graduate Expository Writing Program will complete online library tutorials with embedded quizzes to master basic searching techniques.

- Methods of Assessment
  - Pre- and post-tests to measure participants' learning
  - Focus group comprised of 10-12 students who participated in library sessions or completed the online tutorial.
  - Survey Questionnaire
  - Bibliography prepared by CAR or Expository Writing students

- Use of Findings
  - Advise English 002 Coordinator of any shortcomings detected
  - Revise exercises for CAR and Expository Writing participants
Revise library tour and workshop for international students' orientation

- **Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline**
  - Teaching librarian
  - Class or Program Instructor
  - Student
  - University Assessment Committee
Library Assessment Plan—Goal 2 Objective 2c

OBJECTIVE 2c: Upper-level undergraduates and graduate students completing departmental research methods courses can readily identify appropriate finding tools expeditiously, evaluate information sources and their content critically, and document information content accurately (learning outcome)

- **Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success** — An information competent user will be able to:
  - Articulate his/her information need
  - Select finding tools according to the type of information source needed or specified time frame
  - Construct strategies for basic and advanced searches to obtain information at the desired level of specificity
  - Critically evaluate citations retrieved or material accessed in full-text and determine whether or not the information is credible, authoritative, accurate and appropriate for the intended use
  - Cite the information included in papers, reports, and proposals according to documentation guidelines in particular subject areas or disciplines.

- **Performance Activities**
  - Upper-level undergraduates and graduate students completing departmental research methods courses will complete at least one session of advanced, discipline-specific library instruction
  - Distance learners will complete an online tutorial on advanced search techniques
  - Graduate and professional students will complete online questionnaire on scholarly communications, copyright, intellectual property, plagiarism and documentation

- **Methods of Assessment**
  - Pre- and Post-Tests
  - Course Portfolio
  - Course Diary or Journal
  - Bibliographic Essay

- **Use of Findings**
  - Revise online modules
  - Adjust pedagogy
  - Order publications recommended in student papers

- **Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline**
  - Teaching librarian - at end of session or semester
  - Faculty teaching course or seminar - at end of semester
  - Student
  - Library-faculty assessment committee
  - Library administrators - before end of budget cycle
  - University Assessment Committee
Library Assessment Plan—Goal 2 Objective 2d

Department/School/Administrative Unit: University Libraries

Submitted by: Academic Year

Program Title and Degree (if applicable)

**GOAL 2: INFORMATION EMPOWERMENT -- The student's information skills as foundations for life-long learning are developed or enhanced**

**OBJECTIVE 2d: Students and faculty will acquire advanced skills in searching particular finding tools--Sterling Online Catalog; WWW; specialized databases** (learning outcome)

- **Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success** — Information competent users will be able to:
  - Select an online catalog, Internet search engine, or commercial database according to the type of information source needed or specified time frame
  - Construct strategies for advanced searches utilizing limiting features, truncation, proximity searching, relevance weights and other advanced techniques according to the finding tool used
  - Critically evaluate citations retrieved or material accessed in full-text and determine whether or not the search strategies should be modified further

- **Performance Activities**
  - Students will complete at least one session of advanced, discipline-specific library instruction conducted by a librarian or a database vendor
  - Distance learners will complete an online tutorial on advanced search techniques

- **Methods of Assessment**
  - Pre- and Post-Tests

- **Use of Findings**
  - Revise online modules
  - Adjust onsite pedagogy
  - Prepare additional help guides

- **Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline**
  - Teaching librarian - at end of session or semester
  - Student
  - Library-faculty assessment committee
  - Library administrators
  - University Assessment Committee
  - University administrators
Library Assessment Plan—Goal 3

Department/School/Administrative Unit: University Libraries
Submitted by: Academic Year

GOAL 3: APPROPRIATE ENVIRONMENT -- Presentation and exchange of knowledge and ideas are facilitated by appropriate spaces

Intended Educational (Student), Research or Service Outcomes, Administrative Objectives or Expected Results (In this section, clearly articulate the expected results related to each goal. Try to make the objectives results-oriented). It is best to specify the objectives for each goal—e.g., Goal 1 may have two objectives labeled as Objective 1a and Objective 1b)

OBJECTIVE 3: Patrons will experience an inviting, safe, secure and resourceful environment that nurtures creative thinking, productivity and intellectual fulfillment (Satisfaction)

- Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success
  - Contrasting venues for study and reflection ranging from wide open rooms, smart presentation rooms, and small, intimate spaces.
  - Easy to retrieve books from library shelves that are well maintained and uncrowded
  - Clean, well-maintained, fully functioning ergonomic equipment and furniture
  - Sufficient stack space for existing collections and growth
  - Adequate study space for individuals, groups, and visiting scholars
  - Adequate space for readers and staff
  - Adequate environmental control
  - Conformity to ADA standards
  - Security and safety incidents minimized or eliminated.

- Performance Activities
  - Provide free and equal access to all patrons per American Library Association's guidelines
  - Provide special terminals, materials and aids for the physically challenged
  - Provide expanded access to facilities in off-peak hours
  - Provide a diversity of seating and study options
  - Creating spaces for quiet study and contemplation, and relaxation
  - Provide clear and appropriate signage

- Methods of Assessment
  - Survey to assess satisfaction levels of different categories of users

- Use of Findings
  - Revise policies and procedures
  - Update resources or get new equipment
  - Adjust staffing patterns to ensure adequate coverage to meet specialized needs of users

- Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline
  - Library-faculty assessment committee
  - Library administrators
  - University Assessment Committee
  - University administrators
Library Assessment Plan—Goal 4

Objectives: 4a | 4b

Department/School/Administrative Unit: University Libraries
Submitted by: [Name]
Program Title and Degree (if applicable): [Title]

GOAL 4: EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION -- Enhanced organizational effectiveness and efficiency, and sustained financial growth

Intended Educational (Student), Research or Service Outcomes, Administrative Objectives or Expected Results (In this section, clearly articulate the expected results related to each goal. Try to make the objectives results-oriented). It is best to specify the objectives for each goal—e.g., Goal 1 may have two objectives labeled as Objective 1a and Objective 1b)

OBJECTIVE 4a: Workforce is effective, informed and motivated

- Performance indicators/Indicators for Success
  - A work environment that fosters team cohesiveness, mutual commitment and cooperation
  - Increased job satisfaction and morale
  - Increased cross-training and shared expertise
  - Widespread staff proficiency and awareness of new technologies
  - Continual generation and testing of new ideas
  - Increased staff interest in library programs and presentations
  - Adequate funding and opportunities for training and development
  - Development of training opportunities in supervision and evaluation

- Performance Activities
  - Hold regular staff meetings, special programs, social activities and an annual staff retreat for sharing information and developing community
  - Create library-wide teams and a system for team records management and inter-team communication
  - Encourage active participation, evaluation and leadership opportunities
  - Conduct a needs assessment survey on staff training
  - Develop a program of continuous in-service education
  - Explore job sharing and cross-training
  - Provide workshops in communication, customer service, student supervision and teamwork
  - Create a team to monitor and assess effectiveness of programming

- Methods of Assessment
  - Surveys to assess satisfaction levels of different categories of end-users

- Use of Findings
  - Revise policies and procedures

- Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline
  - Library-faculty assessment committee
  - Library administrators
  - University Assessment Committee
  - University administrators
GOAL 4: EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION -- Enhanced organizational effectiveness and efficiency, and sustained financial growth

Intended Educational (Student), Research or Service Outcomes, Administrative Objectives or Expected Results (In this section, clearly articulate the expected results related to each goal. Try to make the objectives results-oriented). It is best to specify the objectives for each goal--e.g., Goal 1 may have two objectives labeled as Objective 1a and Objective 1b)

OBJECTIVE 4b: Library has a financial management strategy

- Performance indicators/Indicators for Success
  - Identify opportunities for funding from private foundations and public agencies and prepare two proposals each year to solicit funding for Library priorities
- Performance Activities
  - Evaluate Library funding needs and prepare a financial plan for the University Administration
  - Link development activities to Library priorities to optimize resource allocation
  - Create a plan to increase private donations to the Library, working with Alumni Affairs and University Advancement to coordinate with University initiatives.
  - Actively participate in the University Campaign for Howard
  - Encourage staff to become actively and regularly involved in library fundraising
- Methods of Assessment Use of Findings
  - Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline
    - Library administrators
    - University Assessment Committee
    - University administrator
Library Assessment @ Illinois

Assessment at UIUC

Library Assessment Working Group
Membership and minutes of the working group

Current Assessment Projects
A list of ongoing activities at the University of Illinois

Library-Wide Surveys
Information on library-wide surveys, including LibQUAL+

Departmental Library Statistics
Data from departmental libraries, including MPAL's WOREP report

Faculty Publications
Bibliography of assessment publications by UIUC faculty

Assessment Resources

Survey Tools
Websites, such as Survey Monkey, which can generate online surveys

Desk Tracker Information
Documentation on custom fields and Excel tools to aid in data processing

READ Scale
Information on the implementation of the READ Scale at UIUC

Assessment Bibliography
Fundamental publications on assessment in the context of libraries

Assessment at Other Institutions
Links to other assessment programs, including several research universities

Data Sources

UIUC Demographic Data
Sources of demographic data at UIUC

Library Unit Annual Reports
The annual reports of library units [UIUC NetID required]

ARL Resources
Assessment resources at the Association of Research Libraries

ACRL Metrics
ACRL and NCES library statistics from 2000 to present [UIUC NetID Required]

NCES Academic Libraries
The National Center for Education Statistics collects data biennially from over 3,700 postsecondary institutions

For comments on this page contact: Assessment
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Program / Accreditation Review Process

Campus departmental program and accreditation reviews offer an opportunity to assess faculty and student satisfaction with library services, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the library collection in support of instruction and research. Subject librarians and Research Collections staff collaborate to prepare the library portion of departmental reviews.

Research Services and Collections staff will distribute to all subject librarians the calendar for program reviews that is prepared by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Schedule revisions received in RSC will be forwarded to subject librarians and coordinators. A complete file of program reviews prepared by the Libraries is available in the Research Collections office in room 146 of Hodges Library, and subject librarians may request copies as needed. Research Services and Collections uses boilerplate from Libraries publications and Web pages to compile descriptive sections about collections and services.

Sample Program Review

Program Review Library Assessment Form

CALENDAR

July: Subject librarians and other library staff revise library boilerplate used in departmental review documents.

August - Sept.: RSC sends the current Academic Affairs program review calendar to all subject librarians.

September: Subject librarians contact department heads to determine if an accrediting board exists, and if reviews are scheduled for the academic year.

September: RSC prepares for the Web pages a calendar of program reviews and accreditation reports planned for the current academic year. Page is updated as new dates are discovered.

3-4 months before report due: Subject librarian contacts academic department head to determine the kind of library information desired for the review.

3-4 months before report due: Immediately following the meeting with academic department head or designated review coordinator, subject librarian meets with Delight to discuss data needed and overall content of the library portion, and evaluative sections. Librarian and Delight determine production timetable.

2 weeks before report due: Delight sends draft of report to subject librarian for review.

1 week before report due: Subject librarian returns corrected draft to Delight.

Report due date: Delight or subject librarian delivers completed report to academic department.

Ongoing: Research Collections refers questions from academic departments about program reviews to appropriate subject librarian.