

Texas A&M International University

Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)

Date Submitted February 14, 2006

Assessment Period Covered (2006)

Academic Program/AES Unit Killam Library

Person(s) Preparing Review Rodney Webb

Provide summary of the last cycle's use of results and changes implemented

Assessment of library instruction showed faculty and student satisfaction with the quality of instruction, so reviewers determined the next step was to increase the number of classes and students served. Librarians have planned a Spring 2006 pilot program for that expansion. Assessment of acquisitions service met the criteria for success, but the reviewers decided to focus on improvement of communication on acquisitions matters, which received a satisfactory, albeit weaker rating than the other area assessed. Faculty members are now receiving a more frequent notification of their books received. The third area assessed was the effectiveness of the government documents catalog. The final analysis showed the government documents catalog was greatly improved, yet considered it less effective than the retrieval possible if the government documents catalog were integrated into the main library catalog. The government documents catalog is the only assessment brought forward into the current AIER, which will assess the effectiveness of integrated government documents cataloging. The selection of formal assessments followed the strategic planning for this year.

Section I: Planning and Implementation

Institutional Mission

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

Academic Program or Administrative/Educational Support Unit Mission

The library provides materials and service to meet the information needs of the students, faculty, and staff of Texas A&M International University. Library services and materials support the university's instructional programs at all levels. Through a combination of locally owned collections and access to off-site information resources, the library supports the research and current awareness needs of the university faculty and students at a level appropriate to the university's mission. The library enhances the availability of resources to the local university community and serves the academic community at the local, state, and regional levels through

participation in cooperative library programs. The library supports the public service programs of the university and, as resources permit, serves the needs of the local border community. The library develops its resources in accordance with the international focus of the university. Services to fulfill this mission include: collection development, maintenance and preservation, library assistance and instruction, circulation, library technology infrastructure and interlibrary services.

Identify outcomes and the relationship to Strategic Plan

Outcome 1 **Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**

The library will provide varied, authoritative and up-to-date resources sufficient to support the academic and research goals of the university.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 1

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 1

1.8 Provide support programs, services, and activities that promote student learning and enhance student development.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

1. The library will conduct a study of the number of books, journals and databases available at TAMIU in support of selected academic programs compared to resources available at other comparable institutions.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

TAMIU books, journals and databases will at least meet the average number of resources available in the group of comparable institutions for each academic program studied.

Outcome 2 **Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?**

The library will provide quality library services, information literacy instruction, community outreach and funding development needed to support the academic, research and community service goals of the university and to promote student success at all levels.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 2

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 2

1.8 Provide support programs, services, and activities that promote student learning and enhance student development.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

1. The library will register the number of community outreach activities (lectures, readings, etc.) held each semester or summer. 2. The library will survey persons participating in the outreach activities to evaluate the relevance, quality, location, scheduling and length of the event they attended .

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

1. During the assessment period (Jan. 2006-Dec. 2006) the library will hold at least three community outreach activities (lectures, readings, etc), one of which will be a meeting of a new Friends of the Library group. 2. Evaluations of the participants in the outreach activities will indicate an average satisfaction rate of at least 80% (using a 1-5 Likert Scale for survey response).

Outcome 3

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

The library will provide timely, efficient and effective access to information resources and other available research materials for all Killam Library users, both on-campus and remote.

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 3

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 3

1.8 Provide support programs, services, and activities that promote student learning and enhance student development.

Identify methods of assessment to be used

1. Generate a set of standards (best practices) for physical access and intellectual access (i.e. access to content of collections through guides, catalogs, indexes, or other finding aids) to special collections with a 1-3 grading scale for each area of the standards in order to rate the Killam Library special collections’ performance in each area of the standards and develop a total score to compare with the average, total performance score of a selected group of special collections at other institutions surveyed. 2. Survey users of the special collections as to their satisfaction with the intellectual and physical access to the collections. 3. Following conversion and integration of the cataloging records for government documents into the Voyager Online Public Access Catalog, the library will count the number of circulations (including use of links to electronic full text) of government documents and compare that number with the circulation count for an equal time period prior to the integration.

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

1. The Killam Library Special Collections' score (total number of points) assigned for performance of the standards will meet or exceed the average score of the group of special collections departments at the other institutions studied. 2. The survey of special collections users will show an average rate of 80% satisfaction with the intellectual and physical access to the special collections materials. 3. The number of government documents circulated after the integration of the cataloging records into Voyager will increase by a factor of 10 over the number of circulations during an equal time period prior to the integration of the cataloging records.

Section II: Analysis of Results

When (term/date) was assessment conducted?

Outcome 1

Nov. 2006-Jan. 2007

Outcome 2

No assessment performed, because service to be assessed did not take place.

Outcome 3

(3.1) Nov. 2006-Jan. 2007

(3.2) Oct. 06-Jan 07

(3.3) No assessment performed because initiative to be assessed was not funded.

What were the results attained (raw data)?

Outcome 1

Business Books: TAMIU holds 20,419 book titles relevant to the Business Ph.D. program compared to an average of 34,371 titles held by the 9 institutions surveyed in the SACS region. TAMIU holds 59% of the peer average. TAMIU needs to add 13,952 business book titles to reach the peer average. Business Databases: TAMIU subscribes to 12 of 59 relevant databases available at the Harvard Business School library as compared to the average of 11 of those databases available at the 9 peer institutions surveyed. TAMIU exceeds the peer average and does not need to add databases to meet the benchmark. -----Hispanic Studies Books: TAMIU holds 9,308 relevant titles compared to an average of 22,823 titles held by the 8 peer institutions surveyed in the SACS region. TAMIU holds 41% of the peer average. TAMIU needs to add 13,515 Hispanic Studies book titles to reach the peer average. Hispanic Studies Databases: TAMIU subscribes to 17 of 44 relevant databases available at Princeton University as compared to the average of 26 of those databases available at the 8 peer institutions surveyed. TAMIU database subscriptions represent 65% of the peer average. TAMIU needs to subscribe to 9 additional databases to reach the benchmark, which is the peer average.-----Note: For purposes of this assessment, journal literature was not separately studied as a format, because the databases now provide access to the full text of most of our journals and there were no readily available subject lists of print journal holdings at the peer institutions.

Outcome 2

N/A

Outcome 3

Outcome 3.1

A survey (included in support documentation) was administered to the Special Collections librarians of ten Texas university libraries. Most of the questions were yes/no or always/sometimes/never. As indicated above, a three-point scale was used. For yes/no questions, an answer indicating better practices (depending on the wording of the question) received a three, and a response indicating worse practices received a one. For

always/sometimes/never, the scale was 3/2/1 again depending on whether the practice in question was a good or bad one. Question 7, regarding staff, was recorded as FTE modified as noted on the spreadsheet (included in the support documentation). Question 8, regarding service hours, was recorded as service hours per week. These are the results, grouped by subject matter of question:

Staffing – TAMIU 1.5 FTE, Other institutions average 5.0 FTE

Staffing Utilization – TAMIU score 1.42, Other institutions average score 1.63

Access & Services

Service Hours per Week – TAMIU 60, Other institutions average 48.9

Services Provided – TAMIU score 2.0, Other institutions average score 2.54

User Aids - TAMIU score 2.58, Other institutions average score 2.03

Space Utilization - TAMIU score 2.5, Other institutions average score 2.0

Ongoing Assessment - TAMIU score 2.25, Other institutions average score 2.2

Outcome 3.2

A four-question satisfaction survey (attached) was administered to users of the Killam Library Special Collections Department. All four questions were on a Likert scale of Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. All were worded so that agreement indicated satisfaction. Responses of Strongly Agree or Agree were recorded as positive responses. On the four questions, the responses were 100%, 82.6%, 90.5%, and 85.7% positive, respectively.

Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?

Outcome 1

Rogelio Hinojosa & John Maxstadt

Outcome 2

N/A

Outcome 3

Outcome 3.1

Jeanette Hatcher and John Maxstadt

Outcome 3.2

Jeanette Hatcher and John Maxstadt

When were the results and analysis shared and with whom (department chair, supervisor, staff, external stakeholders)? Submit minutes with data analysis to assessment@tamiu.edu (Please use Minutes Template located on the [Project INTEGRATE web page.](#))

Results and analysis are scheduled to be shared at a February 2007 meeting of the Library Advisory Council and at an April 2007 meeting of the University Library Committee.

NOTE: Submit all assessment documentation (i.e., surveys, rubrics, course exams with embedded questions, etc.) to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.

Use of Results: Indicate whether criteria were met/not met and what changes, if any, have been identified based on the data collected?

Outcome 1

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: Business Ph.D.: Data collected shows a need for 13,952 additional business books and no additional databases to bring TAMIU holdings up to the peer average.-----
Hispanic Studies Collaborative Ph.D.: Data collected shows a need for 13,515 additional Hispanic Studies books and 9 relevant databases to bring TAMIU holdings up to the peer average.

Outcome 2

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: N/A

Outcome 3

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: Outcome 3.1 Not Met

The score in the staffing category indicates the FTE of the Special Collections in the respective institutions, with student workers counting as .33 FTE. TAMIU had the fewest Special Collections FTE staff of all institutions surveyed. TAMIU Special Collections staffing is significantly less than other institutions even when adjusted for differences in size of collection, service hours, etc.

Questions 18-21 on the survey addressed staff utilization practices. All except question 20 described undesirable practices, in which staff would be under-supported or given excessive and contradictory responsibilities – therefore, “yes” and “always” responses were given the lowest scores. The TAMIU score was somewhat below the average, mostly because of question 18 regarding hours during which only one staffer is on duty.

Questions 13-17 addressed services provided by Special Collections (reference service, research service, bibliographic instruction, photocopying). The TAMIU score was again somewhat below the average, mostly because of questions 13 and 14 regarding photocopying.

Responses regarding hours of service, user aids, space utilization, and ongoing assessment indicated that the TAMIU Special Collections practices are well within (if not superior to) peer group norms.

The first five questions on the survey addressed number and variety of materials in Special Collections and the number added per year. These were intended to be contextual questions, to indicate similarities and differences in the size and scope of the Special Collections departments at the respective institutions. The responses were scored as derived percentages, with the highest numerical response to each question being 100%. The results indicated that although TAMIU is smaller in total enrollment than all but one of the other institutions surveyed, our Special Collections Department is well within the range of the others in size and scope (sixth out of nine, with Prairie View and Sul Ross omitted because they failed to answer most of the first five questions).

Outcome 3.2

Met

TAMIU Special Collections users surveyed indicated over 80% satisfaction with staff courtesy and helpfulness, availability of information and materials, physical access to materials, and intellectual access to materials in TAMIU Special Collections.

How have these data-based changes improved your program/unit?

Outcome 1: The library now has a benchmarked study to indicate how its collections compare to other institutions granting Ph.D. degrees in business and Hispanic Studies within the region of our accreditation association. This study provides a tool for collection development showing us the types of materials and even specific databases, which we should add to bring our local support for these degrees within the average level of support at the peer institutions. The magnitude of these collection needs will require more than a single year to address. Achieving the benchmark will require resources that are challenging to obtain even when distributed over a 5-year period. The collection development goals indicated will improve access to research materials required by doctoral students and faculty and place resources in their hands that make them more competitive with their peers in the region.-----Outcome 2: N/A----Outcome 3.1 and 3.2: The assessment results indicate that resources are required to make staffing and equipment changes, as noted below. A photocopier for Special Collections has been selected and is scheduled to be ordered out of the FY2007 budget. Staffing changes can only be made after budgetary approval in the next budget cycle.

Section III: Programmatic Review

Are resources affected by the changes identified in Section II? Yes No

If so, specify the effect(s) using the chart below:

Funding	Physical	Other
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New resources required	<input type="checkbox"/> New or reallocated space	<input type="checkbox"/> Primarily faculty/staff time
<input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation of current funds		<input type="checkbox"/> University rule/procedure change only
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other: Enter text here

Provide a narrative description and justification for requested resources (include linkage to Strategic Plan)

Outcome 1: (Strategic plan linkage to goal 1.8) On the basis of this benchmarked assessment the materials and resources detailed above are needed to bring TAMIU up to the average of peer institutions in supporting the two doctoral programs in the the study. Peer institutions were selected from the region of our accreditation association (SACS). While the size and enrollment of the insititions were criteria for peer selection, choices were limited to public institutions granting doctoral degrees in the field. That is the peer group for the doctoral degrees we are offering independently and collaboratively. This limitation did produce some larger schools in the peer group, because doctoral granting schools are typically larger. Here is an overview of required resources for each degree supported: Business: To add 13,952 book titles at an average cost of \$70.21 (Source: Bowker Annual) will cost \$979,570. We recommend that these purchases be distributed over a period of 5 years at \$195,914 per year. Based on this assessment no additional databases will be required--however budgetary increases of approximately 10% per year are required to cover inflationary costs of maintaining the existing subscriptions.-----
 Hispanic Studies: To add 13,515 book titles at an average cost of \$33.30 (Source: Bowker Annual),will cost \$450,000, which we recommend distributing over a period of 5 years at \$90,000 annually. The cost of adding 9 databases will depend on the databases selected and the enrollment at the time of subscription, which is a factor in the price structure. We recommend that databases be added when the collaborative degree program becomes independent on our compus. The estimated cost of annual database subscriptions is approximately \$25,000 for nine databases.-----
 Outcome 2: N/A.-----
 Outcome 3.1 and 3.2: (Strategic plan linkage to goal 1.8 and goal 2.1) Attainment below the benchmark comparison with 10 peer institutions in the area of staffing, staff utilization and services demonstrates the need for two additional full time classified staff and a photocopy machine in Special Collections. Responses in staffing and staff utilization also indicate the advisability of redefining the responsibilities of the Reference/Special Collections Librarian to allow for more concentration on Special Collections development and management. An additional librarian to cover public services functions in reference and library instruction is needed to compensate for services that would no longer be performed in those areas by the Special Collections Librarian when the position is redefined.

Identify proposed outcomes for the next assessment cycle:

Continuation of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for continuation): Outcomes 1,2,3 (These outcomes represent essential continuing components of the library's mission to 1. provide resources, 2. services and 3. access tools. Each outcome is sufficiently broad so that various subcomponents or aspects of the outcomes require successive assessments.
New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below): Outcome 4: The library facilities will provide adequate, well-organized, secure, comfortable, welcoming and aesthetically pleasing space, conducive to study and research, for library users, with suitable environmental conditions for services, personnel, resources, and collections, and adequate and functional library equipment.
Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification): Enter text here

****** This section to be completed by dean/director/vice-president ******

Are resources requested a priority for the academic program/AES unit?

Yes No

Comments:

Outome 1: TAMIU has selected business and Hispanic Studies as two areas to offer advanced degrees and develop excellence. As an academic support unit the library must also follow this lead to create excellent resources related to research and study in these fields. Outcome 3: In collaboration with the TAMIU administration the library has also chosen to pursue a greater role as a resource center for information about our region, including archival material which requires labor-intensive handling to prepare it for public use. Additional space has been made available for that function. Now staffing is needed as indicated in the benchmark study.

If funding, physical or other resources were requested, what is the impact of the budget decisions on the academic program/AES unit?

The library cannot achieve the benchmarks set forth in these assessments without budgetary support.