



Co-curricular Assessment Report

Program/Department Name: Digital Library
Year of CAR Completion: 2018
CAR Cycle: 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18

Co-curricular Assessment Report

Organization of Program Review Materials:

- ◆ Component I: Response to Previous Co-curricular Assessment Report
- ◆ Component II: Review of Assessment Data
- ◆ Component III: Criteria for Co-curricular Assessment Report
- ◆ Component IV: Recommendations and Executive Summary
- ◆ Appendix A: Co-curricular Program/Department Summary Work Plan

NOTE: Please spell out any acronym the first time it is used.

NOTE: Whenever possible, link answers to supplemental documentation that you are providing.

Component I

Response to Previous Co-curricular Assessment Report

Based on your previous CAR review, identify strengths, areas of improvement, opportunities, threats, and progress to date. (Please enter NA in these areas if this is your first CAR.) **If you are referring to supplemental documentation that you are including in this CAR, please identify that documentation clearly in your answers below.****

Program/Department: Digital Library

Strengths:

- Professional Experience
- Technological Savvy
- Strong understanding of Community College student and faculty information needs
- No other library in state is completely digital
- Dedicated teaching space
- Serving Online Students
- Embedded in Courses

Areas of improvement:

- Extremely understaffed for school this size
- Underfunded resource budget
- Misconceptions by students and faculty about what the Library and Librarians do
- Serving Satellites
- Inability to meet faculty requests for classes due to staffing issues

Opportunities:

- OhioLINK
- Accreditations
- Academic Library Association of Ohio (ALAO) presence and reputation
- Kent State-Stark Campus Library

Threats:

- Student Expectations of Instant Gratification
- Weak Information Literacy Skills – Students and Faculty
- Public misconception that all libraries are irrelevant in an Information Age

- Kent State-Stark Campus Library

Progress to Date:

We have directed our strengths to focus areas of improvement and leveraging opportunities.

To date we have...

- Focused our technical skills on building tutorials to reach online and satellite students
- Used Collaborate to teach live library instruction sessions at satellites
- Used video tutorials to cover introductory information eliminating the need for classes like SSC101, ENG011, ENG124 to inundate the library with orientation requests and allowing us to focus face-to-face efforts on point-of-need instruction that addresses specific research assignments
- Secured funding to begin replacing instruction television panels in the Digital Library space
- Student computers replaced in Digital Library space
- Assistant Director of Library Services has become an active member in ALAO and is currently co-chairing Community and 2-Year Colleges Interest Group for the organization
- Assistant Director of Library Services received ALAO 2016 Visionary Librarian award for synchronous online and remote library instruction
- Developed a general library resource statement for program accreditations and proactively contacted faculty involved in accreditations
- Took advantage of professional development opportunities in copyright law and compliance, open educational resources, and textbook affordability initiatives
- Shifted focus to library instruction and strengthening online presence while taking full advantage of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Kent State University and began utilizing the physical presence of the Kent Stark Library by factoring in their hours of operation into our service plan

Component II

Review of Previous Assessment Data

*****If you are referring to supplemental documentation that you are including in this CAR, please identify that documentation clearly in your answers below.***

1. What changes have been recommended that have had a positive effect on your program's outcomes? (Please be specific.)

No recommended changes in the previous assessment report.

2. What changes to your program/department were made based on findings from the previous CAR?

Based on the discovery that students who use the Digital Library space are only using it as a computer lab and rarely request assistance that requires a librarian while completing the previous assessment report, the Digital Library began focusing on online services and began moving away from face-to-face services. We initiated a system of appointments for students requiring the services of a librarian and moved away from waiting for students to "drop in" and ask for help. This freed up librarian time for online resource and tutorial development including synchronous library instruction and virtual office appointments available to all SSC students regardless of where they are taking classes.

Additionally, as per the terms of our MOU with Kent State University, we marketed their library as an option for our students to make up for the limited availability of only two librarians here at Stark State College.

Component III

Criteria for Co-curricular Assessment Report

Criterion 1.0 Mission, Values and Goals

Mission: It is the mission of the Stark State Digital Library to provide to the Stark State College community reliable digital resources and professional library information services in support of research, teaching, and learning.

Vision: The Stark State Digital Library will be a catalyst for academic discovery, an agent for collaboration, and persistent advocate of responsible information use.

Values: The Library is committed to promoting and strengthening information literacy and critical thinking skills as a foundation for college, career and civic engagement

Goals:

Goal 1: To provide digital resources to the College community

Goal 2: To provide high-quality library information services to students, faculty and staff

*Goals should align with current SSC Strategic Plan.

***Note if any changes have been made to the mission, values, and/or goals since the last CAR.**

Criterion 2.0 Baseline Data

1.) What baseline data has your Program/Department collected during this CAR term?

Point of Service Data (Goal 1)

- LibGuide (Librarian-managed online guides and resources) Access Point Data including everything from General Access Information (looking for service hours), OhioLINK resource portals, online reference chat & texting, and library guides and tutorials. (See Appendix A)
- Embedded library module access data (See Appendix B)
- Reference transaction data (See Appendix C)

Noel-Levitz SSI 2017 (Goal 2)

- The Digital Library performed within acceptable parameters based on Midwestern peer comparison in the Noel-Levitz SSI 2017.

- Item 14. Library resources and services are adequate. The Digital Library registered a 6.33 for importance and 5.85 in satisfaction, which kept pace with peer institutions as reflected in the numbers reflected by the Midwestern segment of the National Community Colleges combined results of 6.16 for importance and 5.87 in satisfaction.
- 26. Library staff are helpful and approachable. The Digital Library registered a 6.22 for importance and 5.84 in satisfaction, which kept pace with peer institutions as reflected in the numbers reflected by the Midwestern segment of the National Community Colleges combined results of 6.05 for importance and 5.86 in satisfaction.

2.) How is that data used to evaluate the Program/Department?

Point of service data are used as follows:

- Usage data on LibGuide use is used to determine if the library users actually access resources.
- Embedded module data is used to determine if the students in targeted courses are accessing necessary library foundational material.
- Reference question data is used to determine when live coverage needs to be scheduled to meet peak usage times.

Criterion 2.0 Program/ Departmental Assessment Procedure and Action Plan

Program/Department Name: Digital Library
Individual Completing Report: Marcia Addison
Individual(s) Reviewing Report:
Date:

Program/ Departmental Assessment Procedure and Action Plan

Purpose:

To self-identify the status of Program/Department in the outcomes assessment process as well as the action-steps and timetable for the development of assessment processes.

Assessment Criteria

Goals:

Does the Department have specific student learning or academic/ student service goals which reflect the discipline or service area professional standards?

Yes No

Outcome Measures:

Are direct and indirect outcome measures identified for each goal?

Yes No

Research:

Is research systematically conducted to evaluate success or failure in achieving outcomes?

Yes No

Findings:

Are research results analyzed and interpreted and findings determined?

Yes No

Review Process:

Are findings discussed and reviewed by appropriate groups and individuals and recommendations made for action?

Yes No

Proposed Actions:

Are recommendations acted upon?

Yes No

Improvements:

Have actions resulted in documented improvements in student learning or academic/ student services?

Yes No

Assessment Measures Inventory

***The matrix should contain all goals as they pertain to the CAR.**

Assessment Measures for Goals (Outcome measures from assessment report)	Is trend data available for the measure? (Yes, No, NA)	Has a performance benchmark(s) been identified for the measure? (Yes, No, NA)	Type of performance benchmark - SSC (internal), State-level (OACC, OBR, Etc.), National (Professional Org., accrediting group, etc.) List all that apply
Goal 1, OhioLink Usage statistics	No	No	
Goal 1, Point of Service usage statistics (face-to-face and online)	Yes	No	
Goal 1, 2 Library- research skills rubric for both ENG Composition courses and SSC 101	No	No	National Standards: ACRL (Association of College and Research Libraries)
Goal 1, Noel-Levitz SSI (item 14)	No	Yes	Maintain or exceed standard of previous survey
Goal 1, Satisfaction survey – faculty/staff	Yes	No	
Goal 2, Satisfaction survey – faculty/staff	Yes	No	
Goal 2, Noel-Levitz SSI (item 26)	No	Yes	Maintain or exceed standard of previous survey
Goal 2, Library Advisory Committee Feedback	NA	NA	N/A

Criterion 3.0: Assessment Results Report

Purpose:

The report is a summary compilation of key assessment methods, findings, review processes, actions, and improvements related to the academic/student service or learning goals of the Program/Department on an annual basis. As an historical record of assessment activities, the report provides for and supports the *systematic* assessment of academic support outcomes.

Instructions:

Enter the outcome measure in the space provided. Please note that for each goal it is expected that a mix of quantitative and qualitative as well as direct and indirect measures are employed.

Provide a brief summary of baseline data collected by the Program/Department and how that data has been used during the current CAR cycle.

Provide a brief summary of *key findings*, either as bulleted points or in short paragraph form.

Provide a brief summary on the review committee/review process (for example, Findings are reviewed by the Director and staff on a per term basis and recommendations are forward to the VP for further review).

Provide a brief summary of any proposed actions for the next term/CAR cycle. Please note that not all findings result in actions.

Provide a brief summary of any improvements from the previous CAR cycle (this does not apply to new measures the first year).

Goal 1: To provide digital resources to the College community

Outcome Measure 1: OhioLINK usage statistics

Terms of Assessment: Fall 2015-17 Spring 2015-17 Annual 2015-17

Findings: Indirectly measured through access point data in the form of LibGuide assess numbers. OhioLINK usage statistics remain inaccessible due to issues related to the required co-location agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Kent State University – Stark.

In 2014 OhioLINK reevaluated and as a result rewrote the MOU with participating institutions. This has lead to a closer working relationship with the new OhioLINK leadership. By June 2016, independent access from the previous Kent-Stark connection was finally realized; however, the technical separation of our two institutions remains problematic we are continuing to work with OhioLINK to gain independent statistics.

The numbers, as expected, fell due to a decline in enrollment; however, the usage did not go down as much as enrollment and even showed a rebound in Spring 2018.

Review Committee/Review Process: Although our numbers are co-mingled with Kent and overall state numbers, access points indicate users are finding the resources. At this time, the librarians look at these numbers to see if usage patterns indicate a means of more meaningful data collection. The data are then discussed with the Dean of Student Success to determine additional usefulness of the information and if changes can/should be made to access points.

Improvements: For the next assessment cycle, we will use LibAnalytics to collect usage data for specific resource database access points. For the first year, we will target those we have determined to be the top three databases based on antidotal information (Academic Search Complete; SocINDEX; and Health Source: Nursing/Academic Edition) to determine if the collection process functions as anticipated.

Outcome Measure 2: Point of service usage statistics (F2F and online)

Terms of Assessment: Fall 2015-17 Spring 2015-17 Annual 2015-17

Findings: In Fall 2010 Library Services implemented LibGuides and began creating interactive access points for library instruction and research assistance. In the first year, online usage grew by 21%. Since the 2010-11 academic year online usage has grown by over 321% from 40759 in 2010-11 to 171899 in 2017-18, with an increase of 47% since the end of the last assessment period in 2014-15.

As anticipated, point-of-service usage declined with enrollment; however, the usage numbers began to show a slight rebound Spring 2018.

As online services have grown, face-to-face use has declined. Being a “digital” library, we expected face-to-face numbers to decline as the Stark State community became more familiar with the convenience of online library services accessible from their own computers and tablets. As of Fall 2013, we discontinued keeping physical gate count statistics as they were inaccurate, cost-prohibitive to gather, and did not reflect actual library usage. The students in the library space typically use the space as a computer lab and quiet study space.

Review Committee/Review Process: The librarians look at these numbers to see if usage patterns indicate a means of more meaningful data collection. The data are then discussed with the Dean of Student Success to determine additional usefulness of the information and if changes can/should be made to access points.

Improvements: As in previous cycles, the library staff will continue to expand subject offerings and increase faculty-focused services.

We expect enrollment to continue to impact our numbers in the next assessment cycle. If funding is available, library services will build online reference usage by working with the College marketing department to promote online reference options of chat and texting as well the options make face-to-face and online (virtual) research appointments with a librarian. (See: *Digital Library Access* under Additional Information)

Outcome Measure 3: Library- research skills rubric

Terms of Assessment: PILOT – Fall 2017 Spring 2016, 2018 Annual _____

Findings: Face-to-face library instruction meets the goal of moving students from “Lacks Skills” to “Developing” or higher in the areas of research skills and information literacy.

Review Committee/Review Process: This rubric is based on the ACRL Framework and threshold concepts. My objective is to have the bulk of the students fall in the Developing category with some crossing the threshold into Advanced. As a community college, we often work to move students from Lacks Skill to the Developing range.

A lack of staffing combined with limited faculty buy-in makes it difficult to expand the use of the assessment rubric to more than one or two classes in a semester. Since developing the rubric in 2016, we have attempted to assess at least one class that has received face-to-face library instruction. The results are reviewed by the instructional librarian, participating faculty, and the library director to determine effectiveness of library instruction then reviewed with the Dean of Student Success. (See: *Rubrics-Pilot Classes* under Additional Information)

Improvements:

Outcome Measure 4: Noel Levitz SSI, item 14

Terms of Assessment: Fall 2017 Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings: Meets benchmark.

Review Committee/Review Process: The librarians and the Dean of Student Success review the results and comments to determine if changes can/should be made in library services.

Improvements: N/A

Outcome Measure 5: Satisfaction survey – faculty/staff

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings: Meets benchmark.

Review Committee/Review Process: The librarians and the Dean of Student Success review the results and comments to determine if changes can/should be made in library services.

Improvements: N/A

Goal 2: To provide high-quality library information services to students, faculty and staff

Outcome Measure 1: Satisfaction survey – faculty/staff

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings: Meets benchmark.

Review Committee/Review Process: The librarians and the Dean of Student Success review the results and comments to determine if changes can/should be made in library services.

Improvements: N/A

Outcome Measure 2: Noel Levitz SSI, items 14, 26

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings: Meets benchmark.

Review Committee/Review Process: The librarians and the Dean of Student Success review the results and comments to determine if changes can/should be made in library services.

Improvements: N/A

Outcome Measure 3: Library advisory committee feedback

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings: The revision of the MOU with Kent State University-Stark Campus Library changed the nature of the library advisory committee. The MOU no longer required meetings each semester as long as librarians from both institutions maintain open communication and pursue collaborative endeavors when they benefit both student bodies.

Review Committee/Review Process: N/A

Improvements: With only two librarians on staff organizing regular advisory meetings is difficult. External partners have been nonexistent. Beginning Fall 2018, the SSC Library Services will enter into a collaborative partnership with Akron Summit County Public Library to boost library services for Stark State Akron. An initial meeting will be held summer 2018 and additional meetings will be held each semester to evaluate student impact on ASCPL services as well as how the two libraries can better serve Stark State students.

Criterion 4.0 Program/Department members are qualified by professional background, experience, and continuing professional development and meet the needs of the Program/Department.

Yes	No	DNA		
X			4.1	Employee (full-time and part-time) credentials meet the program, college, state, and national accreditation requirements.
X			4.2	Annual Employee Performance Evaluations are on record in Human Resources.
X			4.3	Employees (full-time and part-time) are involved in professional organizations, presentations, and/or other scholarly works.
X			4.4	Employees are involved in the development of program/department initiatives that support the College Mission.

3. Additional Comments: (Please explain any “No” selections.)

N/A

Reflective Narrative Questions:

1. Describe how Performance Evaluations are being used to enhance the Program/Department.

Due to the fact we have a two person department and communicate daily (almost hourly), the annual Performance Evaluation is just an annual summary and overview of our regular communication process. The one thing we do to keep up with professional activity is to require an updated resume/CV during the annual Performance Review.

2. Describe how professional development benefits the program.

The library profession has been in a state of rapid change since the early 1990s. The pace has not slowed, and Stark State College has a unique library situation – 90% digital (online) library services including resources, reference, and instruction. The librarians keep up with these changes and new trends in online services by attending the American Library Association annual conference, the Academic, College, and Research Libraries conference, and being active in the state professional organization, Academic Library Association of Ohio. The librarians regularly collaborate with the Kent librarians and attend OhioLINK/State Library training opportunities in order to maintain and enhance the existing digital (online) library at the College.

3. Describe how employees are involved in the development of program/department initiatives that support the College Mission.

The nature of Digital Library Services meets Goal 1B, continue integrating cutting-edge equipment, laboratories, and technology into our academic programs, of the Strategic Plan by offering virtual appointments, chat and text reference services, and online research resources available 24/7.

The Digital Librarians meet Goal 1D, emphasize academic rigor and maintain high standards of teaching and student support, by reviewing, revising and expanding embedded library instruction efforts as a foundation in research skills for SSC students. (See: *Embedded Library Modules* under Additional Information)

Fall 2018, Digital Library Services will lead the Common Read Program that will introduce students to reading as a means to create a common point of reference as well as illustrate real world applications of coursework through programming and faculty course adoption. The Common Read Program not only addresses Goal 1D, but also touches on Goal 1E, promote academic excellence of faculty and staff, by leveraging skills and talents among the academic community, but it also meets Goal 6A, continue to enhance the student life experience and student spaces.

Criterion 5.0 Program/Department is responsive to changes in current technology and adequate resources.

Yes	No	DNA		
X			5.1	Program/Department changes are consistent with technological and scientific advances, and Program/Department content incorporates new developments in the field.
X			5.2	Employees work with supervisors to ensure adequate and current resources available for the Program/Department.
	X		5.3	Employees work with information technology staff to ensure availability of appropriate software and hardware components.

Additional Comments: (Please explain any “No” selections.)

IT provides basic hardware and software to all employees. To manage support, IT requires users to submit help requests through a central Help Desk. It can be a challenge to articulate specialized library-related technical issues via this process. The IT support staff are easily able to manage the software offered campus-wide. Finding support for specialized applications is challenging and often must be managed and maintained by the department implementing and using it.

Reflective Narrative Questions:

1. Explain the changing conditions within the field.

The rise of the Information Age and the Google generation has changed libraries. Librarians no longer collect and maintain information resources. They have become facilitators of the new “Wild West” of information. It is no longer enough to house information. Librarians must now become intrusive and guide users to good information while steering them away from bad information. Librarians have a greater responsibility to educate users in Information Literacy and help users develop strong critical thinking skills.

2. How are these changing conditions addressed within the Program/Department?

The Digital Librarians are proactive by seeking out opportunities to embed our lessons in courses and teach assignment-specific research lessons that build on the foundation material embedded in early coursework (SSC101, ENG011, ENG124, ENG 231). (See: Embedded Library Modules under Additional Information)

1. Explain how employees work with information technology staff to ensure availability of appropriate software and hardware components.

The librarians work with information technology staff when they can be contacted directly or when all other avenues have been exhausted.

Component IV

Recommendations and Executive Summary

Based on the results of this current CAR, list your strengths, areas of improvement, opportunities, threats, and recommendations.

Program/Department: Digital Library

Strengths:

- Professional Experience
- Technological Savvy
- Strong understanding of Community College student and faculty information needs
- Shift in status with OhioLINK
- No other library in state is completely digital
- Dedicated teaching space
- Serving Online Students
- Copyright & plagiarism knowledge
- Embedded in Courses
- Research Tutorial Requests
- Upcoming Common Read Program

Areas of improvement:

- Extremely understaffed for school this size
- Underfunded resource budget
- Misconceptions by students and faculty about what the Library and Librarians do
- The Physical Space
- Serving Akron
- Serving Satellites
- Inability to meet faculty requests for classes and tutorials due to staffing issues
- Equipment in teaching space is 10 years old and inadequate for teaching
- The physical library space – computer lab

Opportunities:

- ACRL shift to Frames Standard
- OhioLINK
- Accreditations
- ALAO presence and reputation
- Kent State-Stark Campus Library

Threats:

- Google Mentality
- Information Illiteracy (Fake News, etc)
- Higher Employment
- Public misconception that all libraries are irrelevant in an Information Age
- Kent State-Stark Campus Library

Priority Recommendations: *(For each area listed below, please number all recommendations as they will be prioritized on the [Summary Work Plan - Appendix A](#). Sufficient support for the recommendations must be included, either by reference to responses in the components or specific Criterion or by additional information included with this program review.)*

Additional Information. On occasion, some programs may have additional documents that they feel should be included to complete the self-study. Supporting documents may include such things as program self-study reports, case study reports, survey statistics, focus group data, etc. All supporting documentation must be dated within this CAR period. Please list below the additional documents that you will be adding to this CAR in support of your recommendations.

- [Digital Library Access](#)
- [Embedded Library Modules – Students Reached](#)
- [Rubrics – Pilot Classes](#)