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**INSTITUTIONAL MISSION:**Hollins is an independent liberal arts university dedicated to academic excellence and humane values. Hollins University offers undergraduate liberal arts education for women, selected graduate programs for men and women, and community outreach initiatives. The Hollins curriculum and cocurricular programs prepare students for lives of active learning, fulfilling work, personal growth, achievement, and service to society. The Hollins community sustains talented students engaged in challenging study, and productive scholars and artists devoted to teaching and to the advancement of knowledge. Experiential learning, study abroad, and internships enhance the academic program. The hallmarks of a Hollins education are creativity and effective self-expression, problem solving and critical thinking skills, and independent inquiry and the free exchange of ideas. Hollins nurtures civility, integrity, and concern for others, encourages and values diversity and social justice, and affirms the equal worth of women and men. Our university motto, *Levavi Oculos*, calls us to leadership and service in accord with the Hollins values and traditions.

**UNIT MISSION:** “The Wyndham Robertson Library fosters student success at Hollins University by teaching students to critically engage in the discovery and use of information; by connecting faculty and students with resources that advance scholarship and creative work; by strengthening the intellectual community; and by preserving and sharing Hollins' legacy.” *(Revised May 2014)*

**OUTCOMES:**

1. Students will find resources for their courseworkthat are authoritative and appropriate to the scope of the assignment.

2. Students will find physical spaces in the library to engage and explore in their intellectual pursuits.

3. The library will provide print materials in a timely and accurate fashion to facilitate student and faculty work.

**Outcome 1:**

Students will find resources for their courseworkthat are authoritative and appropriate to the scope of the assignment.

**Assessment Measures:**

* Qualitative feedback from students, to be gathered through survey, interview or focus group
* Rubric-based review of one completed research assignment from each student
* Qualitative feedback from each student’s professor, regarding the student’s research abilities and work on the assignment

**Assessment Timeline** (\*\*Note that all items will be coordinated by Luke/Maryke, with James and Rebecca also participating in the gathering of data)**:**

* Instruments (rubric, questions/foci for surveys and interviews) to be developed by Sept. 5
* September-October: Identify participating students and gather initial qualitative feedback from students after first contact (instruction session)
* December-January: Review of research assignments, to be completed by Jan. 31
* December-January: Gather feedback from students’ professors, through survey or interview, to be completed by Jan. 31
* December-January: Second round of qualitative feedback from students, focused on their self-assessment of their performance on research assignment, to be completed by Feb. 15
* April-May: Third and final round of qualitative feedback from students, to self-assess their spring work, to be completed by May 13

**Assessment Results:**

*A brief summary of assessment results, analysis of results, and key findings is provided below:*

We found that a large majority of students use authoritative and appropriate sources after being provided research instruction. Faculty and librarians concurred in their judgment of student abilities in these areas, and students mostly expressed confidence in their abilities to recognize authoritative and appropriate sources, thanks in large part to participating in librarian-led instruction sessions. We reached these conclusions through an analysis of faculty interviews, surveys and interviews of students, and a rubric-based assessment of student’s completed bibliographies.

Although most students found appropriate materials (e.g., relevant and timely), the success rate for this area was lower than for authoritative materials. Because of this, and because of student comments we received expressing frustration with identifying appropriate sources, we have identified appropriateness as an area worthy of more attention.

Where students failed to meet faculty standards for authoritative and appropriate sources, faculty indicated students are most likely to go off track in the following areas: not using a variety of source types; only gathering the required minimum number of sources; and an inability to cite and reference materials properly.

More detail is available in our complete report, available as a supporting document for this outcome.

**Use of Assessment Results for Improvement:**

*A summary of how the unit used the information gathered from assessment activities to make program improvements is provided below:*

Based on our assessment results, we have chosen to place more emphasis in the coming year on elements related to appropriateness in our instruction sessions. We will develop teaching goals for the following:

* + Evaluating the appropriateness of sources.
  + Using a variety of source types.
  + Gathering sources beyond the required minimum.
  + Understanding the search process as iterative and explorative.
  + Student reflection on the research process.

We have also decided to talk to Writing Center staff about how we can better provide service to students who need citation assistance; options might include collaboration on workshops, write-ins, and table-sitting or other outreach.

Finally, as useful as this study’s results proved to be, we found the many aspects of the study a bit overwhelming, and not something we could reasonably complete every year. We have decided to make our student learning outcome assessment for next year more precise in its focus.
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**Outcome 2:**

Students will find physical spaces in the library to engage and explore in their intellectual pursuits.

**Assessment Measures:**

* Number of students using various spaces in the library, to be gathered via sampling and/or self-reporting (by such mechanisms as tally sheets in group study rooms)
* Questions on white boards in public spaces to prompt informal feedback
* Two surveys of students, one to be conducted outside the library and one inside the library, to assess students’ needs for working spaces

**Assessment Timeline:**

* Sampling and/or self-reporting will occur across the academic semesters; sampling will definitely take place during exam weeks, by our student assistants
* Luke will write questions on white boards at various intervals during the semester, when appropriate (for instance, a white board will ask for student feedback on new Reading Room furniture at the start of the semester)
* Luke and/or James, with the help of student assistants, will do surveys either in fall or spring semester, depending on when survey instrument is completed

**Assessment Results:**

*A brief summary of assessment results, analysis of results, and key findings is provided below:*

We conducted a census of library usage, over the fall final exam period and two randomly selected weeks in the spring, to establish a baseline of what spaces students are using in the building. Through this process, we identified underutilized spaces, such as the juvenile collection area and the first-floor group study rooms.

We conducted a survey of our study room users, to find out how they used the rooms and what they liked and disliked in our group study spaces. We discovered users tend to camp out in those spaces for two-plus hours, and the blinds and whiteboards that we installed at the beginning of the fall semester were extremely popular.

From a survey of Hollins students at lunch in Moody Dining Hall, we found that the library was the most popular study spot on campus, but there were some general issues (notably, lighting control and plug-ins), that we could address.

We also wrote one question on a library white board, asking students what they liked and what was missing in our refurbished reading room. We got a wide variety of responses, but a couple requests (for pillows and for clean blankets) caught our eye.

**Use of Assessment Results for Improvement:**

*A summary of how the unit used the information gathered from assessment activities to make program improvements is provided below:*

In regards to underutilized spaces, identified through the library census, we decided to change the furnishings in our juvenile section, to move from kid-sized tables to bean bags, which will still maintain the informal atmosphere but better serve students. We will continue to monitor the first-floor group study rooms, to see if other first-floor changes (namely, the development of the Center for Learning Excellence) will impact use of those spaces.

In regards to study room suggested improvements, we earmarked 2015-16 budget funds to install whiteboards and blinds in additional study rooms.

In regards to requests for lighting control and additional plug-ins, we added 12 new table-top lamps, featuring electric outlets and a USB port, purchased in the spring of 2015. Availability of snacks and drinks (always a common request of students, and echoed again in the study survey) has also been addressed through the opening of a new library café, which opened in the spring of 2015.

In regards to the whiteboard request for pillows and clean blankets, we purchased pillows, and we began a blanket washing schedule in which a library staff member washes them each month.

**Supporting Documents:***(Include only if needed. Supporting documents related to assessment of this outcome should be listed below and included in attachment form. Label documents clearly e.g. “Alumnae Relations Reunion Satisfaction Survey Summer 2013.” Acceptable formats: .doc, .pdf, .ppt, .xls)*

* “study\_survey\_results” – results of survey in Moody Dining Hall;
* “library\_usage\_counts” – spreadsheets from the three weeks we conducted the library census
* “wrl\_usage\_summary\_2015jan” -- Includes summary of group study room survey responses;
* “reading\_room\_whiteboard” – photo showing responses

**Outcome 3:**

The library will provide print materials in a timely and accurate fashion to facilitate student and faculty work.

**Assessment Measures:**

* Length of time required to fulfill rush cataloging/processing requests
* Amount of time books spend in cataloging/processing stage before being sent to shelves
* Number of errors found in book catalog records

**Assessment Timeline:**

* Rush request fulfillment times will be sampled in September and February by Susan Vandale
* Average book cataloging/processing time will be measured once current backlog has been cleared
* Error calculations will be based both on an informal measure (number of reports to Susan Vandale of cataloging errors that need to be fixed) and on random sampling of part-time cataloger work

**Assessment Results:**

*A brief summary of assessment results, analysis of results, and key findings is provided below:*

* **Rush requests:** In September 2014, we cataloged 15 rush items, with an average turnaround time of 2.13 days. A few items were cataloged the same day they were received, while most took one to three days. In February 2015, we cataloged 6 rush items, with an average turnaround time of 1.28 days. Four of those items were cataloged the same day they were received. Overall, based on statistics from both months, the average turnaround time was 1.86 days.
* **Average Processing Time:** Average processing time varied throughout the year. Our best turnarounds times were in the fall and early winter, after an initial backlog of older materials was cleared. In early December, we had less than a one-month turnaround time. However, following a wave of book arrivals after a Dec. 15 deadline for budget expenditures, we fell progressively further behind. As of the writing of this report, July 2015, the library has reverted to a three-month backlog on materials waiting to be cataloged.
* **Errors:** In August 2014, all reference desk staff received a request to record any catalog errors they encountered throughout the year. From August 2014 to July 2015, tech services librarian Susan Vandale received 11 unique reports of errors. Of those, 10 were cataloging errors. The errors themselves were minor – mostly bad links left in records, and the occasional brief record (created during the ordering process as a placeholder) that had not been deleted. Only one error presented a serious barrier to catalog discovery. The other portion of error tracking was checking the work of our two part-time catalogers. Beginning in November 2014, Susan sampled two books per week they had cataloged. From the beginning of November to the end of June we only found seven errors, all of which were minor and not barriers to discovery.

**Use of Assessment Results for Improvement:**

*A summary of how the unit used the information gathered from assessment activities to make program improvements is provided below:*

**Rush Requests:** The library has adequate turnaround time for such requests considering that we have only one full-time staff member in the cataloging department. Service in this area has not been significantly impacted by reduced departmental staffing.

**Average processing time:** The steady increase in turnaround time throughout the spring semester and summer has led us to re-evaluate the amount of work and extra projects the part-time cataloging assistants are asked to handle. We have eliminated one extra project from their duties and will be looking for additional ways to reduce processing time. We will be monitoring this in the coming fiscal year and re-evaluating in the spring/summer of 2016.

**Errors:** It is heartening to have found and received reports of so few errors throughout the year. Our part-time catalogers have shown they have the ability to do this work, and they also recognize issues about which they should ask.

**Supporting Documents:***(Include only if needed. Supporting documents related to assessment of this outcome should be listed below and included in attachment form. Label documents clearly e.g. “Alumnae Relations Reunion Satisfaction Survey Summer 2013.” Acceptable formats: .doc, .pdf, .ppt, .xls)*
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