

# Advocating for Technical Services through Assessment

Rebecca L. Mugridge  
Potomac Technical Processing Librarians  
October 12, 2018

# Agenda

- \* Why do assessment?
- \* Assessment landscape
- \* My research on assessment
- \* Goals of assessment
- \* Assessment methods
  - \* Workflow assessment
  - \* Customer surveys
  - \* Focus groups
  - \* Benchmarking
- \* Advocating for Technical Services

# Why do assessment?

- \* Gauge productivity
- \* Identify best practices
- \* Demonstrate accountability
- \* Demonstrate value or impact
- \* Generate data or information to support advocacy efforts
- \* Help set direction for division or department

# Advocacy

**Advocacy:** The act of pleading or arguing in favor of something, such as a cause, idea, or policy; active support.  
(*The Free Dictionary*)

- \* Create new positions
- \* Keep or redefine current positions
- \* More funding
- \* Evaluate vendors
- \* Change procedures
- \* Create or modify policy
- \* Propose or eliminate services

# Assessment

- \* Evaluation, estimation, appraisal
- \* “A type of evaluation that gathers evidence perhaps from the application of evaluation research.” (Hernon and Altman, 2010)
- \* “the evaluation or estimation of the nature, quality, or ability of someone or something.” (google.com)
- \* Examples:
  - \* How satisfied are our customers?
  - \* What is our turnaround time for new orders?
  - \* How do our productivity goals compare with other institutions’?
  - \* Can we eliminate steps from this workflow?
  - \* How do we ensure quality cataloging after training/review period?

# Evidence

- \* Data on which to base proof or to establish truth or falsehood (*The Free Dictionary*)
- \* The available body of facts or information indicating whether a belief or proposition is true or valid (google.com)
- \* *Evidence* is anything that can be used to prove something (Vocabulary.com)

# Data

- \* Facts and statistics collected together for reference or analysis. (google.com)
- \* Forms of data:
  - \* Questionnaire responses
  - \* Notes from a focus group
  - \* Audio or video files
  - \* Photos
  - \* Digital files
  - \* Collections of procedures or policies
  - \* Statistics
  - \* Flowcharts
  - \* Reports

# Thesis

Assessment is an evaluation of a process, policy, workflow, standard, etc. that collects data that can be used as evidence to advocate for something. It will help you:

- \* Make management decisions
- \* Advocate for technical services
- \* Tell your story
- \* Demonstrate impact on the library, community, and profession

# Why this topic?

- \* 2011 PaLA CRD Spring Workshop with Megan Oakleaf as keynote speaker
- \* *The Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report* (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010)
- \* There are 22 recommendations for next steps for librarians who wish to demonstrate value

# Recommendation: Mobilize library administrators (1)

- \* Communicating **assessment** needs and results to library stakeholders
- \* Using **evidence-based** decision making
- \* Creating confidence in library **assessment** efforts
- \* Dedicating **assessment** personnel and training

# Recommendation: Mobilize library administrators (2)

- \* Fostering environments that encourage creativity and risk taking
- \* Integrating library **assessment** within library planning, budget, and reward structures
- \* Ensuring that **assessment** efforts have requisite resources

# Why a focus on Technical Services?

- \* Technical services staff equal 20-30% of our total staff
- \* Very little published on technical services assessment
- \* Most articles that do address assessment in technical services have to do with assessing *specific processes*
- \* Interested in a broader approach to technical services assessment

# Assessment landscape

- \* LibQual™
- \* ACRL *Value of Academic Libraries* report
- \* ARL biennial assessment conferences
- \* ARL SPEC Kit on Library Assessment
- \* Evidence-Based Librarianship
- \* Conference and other programming on assessment
- \* Growing body of research on technical services assessment (e.g., CCQ special issue on Assessment of Cataloging and Metadata Services (55:7/8))

# SPEC kit: *Library Assessment*

- \* Spec Kit 303 (Stephanie Wright and Lynda S. White)
- \* Assessment of technical services activities addressed in one question:
- \* “Please indicate which of the following departments/units your library has assessed since 2002 and what methodologies were used for those assessments.”

# SPEC Kit: *Library Assessment* : Cataloging

- \* Cataloging: Number of respondents: 62
  - \* Surveys: 4.8%
  - \* Qualitative methods: 9.7%
  - \* Statistics collection and analysis: 69%
  - \* Usability: 1.6%
  - \* Other (Benchmarking, Unit cost analyses, Balanced Scorecard, Process improvement): 14.5%
  - \* Have not assessed: 24%

# SPEC Kit: *Library Assessment* : Acquisitions

- \* Acquisitions: Number of respondents: 62
  - \* Surveys: 14.5%
  - \* Qualitative methods: 13%
  - \* Statistics collection and analysis: 74%
  - \* Usability: 0%
  - \* Other (Benchmarking, Unit cost analyses, Balanced Scorecard, Process improvement): 13%
  - \* Have not assessed: 21%

# SPEC Kit: *Library Assessment* : Preservation

- \* Preservation: Number of respondents: 61
  - \* Surveys: 13%
  - \* Qualitative methods: 13%
  - \* Statistics collection and analysis: 57%
  - \* Usability: 0%
  - \* Other (Benchmarking, Unit cost analyses, Balanced Scorecard, Process improvement): 8%
  - \* Have not assessed: 33%

# Technical Services Assessment

- \* Rebecca L. Mugridge, “Technical Services Assessment: A Survey of Pennsylvania Academic Libraries” *Library Resources and Technical Services* 58:2 (April 2014): 100-110.
  - \* Survey sent to 120 PA academic libraries
  - \* 63 responses
  - \* 53% response rate

# Survey proposal

- \* Survey the academic libraries in Pennsylvania to determine:
  - \* **Whether** they conducted assessment of technical services
  - \* **How** they conducted assessment
  - \* **How** they shared the results of their assessment activities
  - \* **What** actions they took based on their assessment activities

# Technical Services

For the purposes of the survey, technical services is defined as units responsible for:

- \* Cataloging/Metadata
- \* Acquisitions
- \* Electronic resources management
- \* Preservation/Bindery/Physical processing

# Demographics

- \* 63 responding libraries (53% response rate)
  - \* 16 Public (25%)
  - \* 47 Private (75%)
- \* Average total employees: 13 librarians, 17 staff
- \* Average total technical services employees: 2 librarians, 4 staff

# Results

- \* 90% of libraries reported assessment of technical services
- \* Gathering statistics was the most common form of assessment (84%)
- \* Cataloging and acquisitions were the most assessed departments; preservation the least

# Goals of technical services assessment

- \* Improve or streamline processes (68%)
- \* Improve services (63%)
- \* Make better decisions (62%)
- \* Inform strategic planning activities (55%)
- \* Explore offering new services (40%)
- \* Reallocate staff or other services (30%)
- \* Compare with other institutions (22%)

# How do you report the results of technical services assessment?

- \* Annual report (61%)
- \* Informational report to library administration (52%)
- \* Mass email to library employees (11%)
- \* Library newsletter article (8%)
- \* Presentations (8%)
- \* Web site (5%)
- \* Campus newsletter article (2%)

# Outcomes reported

- \* 35 responses
- \* Themes:
  - \* Streamlining processes
  - \* Staff reallocation
  - \* Changed vendors/Changed vendor services
  - \* Collection decisions
  - \* Training
  - \* Communication
  - \* New services
  - \* Changed ILSs

# Assessment methods

- \* Statistics gathering and analysis
- \* Workflow analysis
- \* Customer surveys
- \* Interviews or focus groups
- \* Benchmarking

# Statistics

- \* Reveal trends over time
- \* Changes in library collections focus
- \* Identify training needs
- \* Identify hiring needs
- \* Benchmark against peers
- \* Identify further assessment needs

# Workflow analysis

- \* Most-commonly reported form of assessment in the library literature
- \* Examples:
  - \* Assessment of technical services workflow
  - \* Assessment of cataloging and database maintenance
  - \* Workflow assessment and redesign
  - \* Streamlining work between acquisitions and cataloging
  - \* Assessment of shelf-ready services

# Resources

Richard M. Dougherty. *Streamlining Library Services: What We do, How Much Time It Takes, What It Costs, and How We Can Do It Better*. Scarecrow Press, 2008. 9780810851986.

Robert B. Freeborn and Ann H. Dodd. “And They Lived Happily Ever After: Findings from the Penn State University Libraries’ AV Workflow Process Improvement Team.” In *Teams in Library Technical Services*, edited by Rosann Bazirjian and Rebecca Mugridge. Scarecrow Press, 2006. 9780810852945.

Leigh Billings, et al. “Many Languages, Many Workflows: Mapping and Analyzing Technical Services Processes for East Asian and International Studies Materials.” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 55:7/8: 606-629.

# Customer service survey

## Surveys can:

- \* Provide new information
- \* Corroborate anecdotal reports
- \* Serve as a public relations or marketing tool
- \* Support change, funding requests, or further assessment
- \* Help you identify service gaps or services that are no longer needed

# Customer service survey

Goals of conducting a customer service survey at UAlbany:

- \* To gauge overall satisfaction with the Division and Department services
- \* Identify areas for process improvement

# Potential concerns

- \* Will the survey be anonymous?
- \* What information will be shared?
  - \* Will details be shared outside the Department/Division?
  - \* What if someone comments on specific people? Will that be shared?
- \* Will the survey be submitted for IRB approval?
- \* What information will be published?

# Survey design

- \* Introduction, including goals for conducting survey
- \* Five pages; one for each department and one general
- \* Department mission, name of department head
- \* Likert scale rating department on 12 factors
- \* Other common questions: communication, comfort in asking questions, suggestions for improvement or other feedback
- \* Questions pertinent to specific departments
- \* You can download the survey questions here:  
[http://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/ulib\\_fac\\_scholar/35/](http://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/ulib_fac_scholar/35/)

# Planning

- \* May 2014: Discussed at Department Heads' meeting
- \* June 2014: Discussed at Division meeting; shared draft
- \* July 2014: Shared draft with library administration
- \* August 2014: Submitted IRB application
- \* September 5, 2014: Received IRB approval
- \* September 12, 2014: Survey deployed
- \* October 6, 2014: Survey closed with 52 completed

# Results

- \* **Advocacy for change (both internal and cross-divisional) and funding was supported by the results of this internal customer service assessment. Examples:**
  - \* Value placed on cataloging hidden collections supports funding for batchloading records for e-resources and microforms
  - \* Survey respondents' request for fewer steps in the ordering process supports cross-divisional efforts to streamline the procedures
  - \* We need to further assess certain workflows, e.g., our use of the Footprints ticketing system for IT problems
  - \* We need better signage in our work areas

# Actions taken and next steps

- \* Reported results at our Division meeting
- \* Discussed at our Department meetings
- \* Reviewed problematic procedures and policies
- \* Identified areas that need further assessment
- \* Created maps of our Division offices
- \* Hosted a Division Open House
- \* Shared results at other library division meetings

# Article:

- \* Mugridge, Rebecca L. and Nancy M. Poehlmann. “Internal Customer Service Assessment of Cataloging, Acquisitions, and Library Systems.” *OCLC Systems & Services* 31(4) (2015): 219-248.

# Interviews or focus groups

- \* Informally as part of a periodic “checking in” with customers
- \* Example: Periodic meetings with subject library staff or other “customers” of technical services
  - \* Include as many staff of all levels as possible
  - \* Ask a set of standard questions
  - \* Document and report responses and discussion
  - \* Results: better communication with our customers and greater comfort level with asking questions

# Research on focus groups in cataloging

- \* K.C. Elhard and Qiang Jin, “Shifting focus: Assessing cataloging service through focus groups,” *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* 28:2 (2004): 196-204.
- \* Suggestions:
  - \* Have a neutral party lead the focus group
  - \* Record and transcribe the comments

# Sample focus group topics (Elhard and Jin)

- \* Do you find it easy to communicate with the three cataloging units?
- \* Do you ever use the Technical Service Division Web page to identify appropriate contacts to resolve problems?
- \* Are maintenance problems you encounter quickly resolved to your satisfaction?
- \* What do you find most confusing about what the cataloging units do?
- \* What do we do in cataloging that is the most helpful to your library?
- \* What one service would you like to see cataloging provide which is not currently provided?
- \* Is there anything else you would like to tell us about cataloging?

# Results (Elhard and Jin)

**Advocacy for change was supported by the use of focus groups to assess cataloging services at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Examples:**

- \* Restructured the cataloging units
- \* Redesigned their contact list
- \* Appointed liaisons from cataloging to subject libraries
- \* Organized cataloging workshops

# Benchmarking

## Definition:

Benchmarking is the process of comparing one's own policies, procedures or other factors, e.g., statistics, to other institutions for evaluative purposes or to determine best practices, goals, or standards

# Statistical benchmarks

- \* Michael D. Charbonneau, “Production Benchmarks for Catalogers in Academic Libraries: Are We There Yet?” *Library Resources & Technical Services* 49:1 (2005), 40-48.
- \* Findings:
  - \* Defining production benchmarks for cataloging doesn’t work very well
  - \* Cataloging is highly specialized and can’t be quantified in the same way as mechanized-based measurements.
- \* J. Buschman and F.W. Chickering, “A Rough Measure of Copy Cataloging Productivity in the Academic Library.” *Library Philosophy and Practice*,  
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/139>
  - \* It is possible to determine benchmarks for copy cataloging

# Benchmarking as an Assessment Tool

- \* Mugridge, Rebecca L. and Nancy M. Poehlmann, “Benchmarking as an Assessment Tool for Cataloging.” *Technical Services Quarterly*, 32(2) (2015): 141-159.
  - \* <http://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/6FRKceiu2MxJe58zEH97/full>
  - \* Survey conducted on AUTOCAT
  - \* 92 completed surveys
  - \* 20 libraries reported using benchmarking (22%)
  - \* 9/10 libraries reported that they planned to use benchmarking again within the next five years

# Goals of benchmarking: research findings

- \* Improve or streamline processes: 72%
- \* Make better decisions: 61%
- \* Improve services: 33%
- \* Reallocate staff or other resources: 33%
- \* Explore offering new services: 22%
- \* Inform strategic planning activities: 22%

# Information collected: research findings

- \* Procedures: 82%
- \* Statistics: 73%
- \* Policies: 55%
- \* Staffing levels: 36%
- \* Best practices: 55%

# Goals and results: research findings

Goal or Result	Libraries that selected this as a goal of benchmarking (n=18)	Libraries that selected this as a result of benchmarking (n=10)
Improve or streamline processes	13 (72.2 percent)	7 (70 %)
Make better decisions	11 (61.1 percent)	5 (50 %)
Improve services	6 (33.3 percent)	3 (30 %)
Reallocate staff or other resources	6 (33.3 percent)	3 (30 %)
Explore offering new services	4 (22.2 percent)	1 (10 %)
Inform strategic planning activities	4 (22.2 percent)	1 (10 %)

# Reporting benchmarking results: research findings

- \* Informational report to library administration: 60%
- \* Annual report: 30%
- \* Assessment report: 20%
- \* Presentations: 10%

# Benchmarking pros and cons: research findings

- \* Advantages

- \* Improve performance
- \* Generate ideas
- \* Encourage a continuous improvement mindset

- \* Disadvantages/Challenges

- \* Apples to oranges comparisons
- \* It's difficult to identify a peer group

# Conclusion

## **Assessment can help you:**

- \* Make management decisions
- \* Advocate for technical services
- \* Tell your story
- \* Demonstrate impact

## **Reminder:**

- \* We don't do assessment just because it's interesting (although it is); we should have a goal in mind

# Conclusion

- \* Advocacy through assessment happens by:
  - \* Identifying a goal or problem that needs attention
  - \* Selecting an assessment method that will give you the information you need to solve the problem
  - \* Sharing that information with all stakeholders, internal or external to your unit
- \* Tell your story, own the conversation!

# Questions?

**Rebecca L. Mugridge**

Dean of University Libraries

University at Albany

LI-123 University Library

1400 Washington Ave.

Albany, NY 12222

email: [rmugridge@albany.edu](mailto:rmugridge@albany.edu)

phone: (518) 442-3570