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A Scalable Model for Monograph Assessment: A Case Study at Musselman Library

Abstract
The evolution of monograph assessment in Musselman Library resulted in a model that sustains concurrent assessment initiatives large and small, as well as time-bound and ongoing, with the purpose of shaping collections in support of the academic and creative interests at Gettysburg College. This presentation outlines the design of the 2012 assessment model that has become the foundation for assessing our circulating monograph collection, along with how the original model has been adjusted to assess more focused targets and larger initiatives, each with rapidly approaching deadlines. Finally, this presentation summarizes the workflows needed to support continuous decision making and provides a sample of the results from the assessment initiatives described.
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Meet Musselman Library
Musselman Library’s Assessment History

- 4 waves of books moved
- Outdated formats
- Print serials and Electronic Resources
- 98% Full in 2007
  - MusstAssess
  - Muss2Knouse
  - The Great Unread
The Question

Can we develop and implement a sustainable collection assessment process of our print monographs that would combine data-driven decisions with liaison input?
New Models

• Collection Mapping Model (2012)
  ✓ Ongoing
  ✓ Small chunks
  ✓ All Subject Liaisons

• Knouse Assessment Model (2014)
  ✓ Time-Bound
  ✓ Larger Lists
  ✓ All Subject Liaisons
Collection Mapping Model: The Design

1. Identify and provide a range-level data
Range-Level Data Examples

The chart illustrates the distribution of data across different range levels from 1920-1929 to 2010-2019. The highest data levels are observed in the 2000-2009 range, followed by 1990-1999. The data levels decrease significantly thereafter, with the lowest levels in the <1919 range.
Range-Level Data Examples

1589 items After 1992 57%

1196 items Before 1992 43%
Collection Mapping Model: The Design

1. Identify and provide a range-level data
2. Apply automatic keep criteria
Automatic Keep Criteria

- Recently purchased title within the last 8 years
- Not superseded by a newer edition [Policy]
- Circulated in the last academic year
- Circulated within the last 8 years
- Anything that has been on Reserve within the last 8 years
  - RCL Web title
  - Included in a subject specific core title list
  - Significant author – author has 10 or more titles in catalog
- Topic with high circulation statistics (20+)
  - Current Faculty members
Automatic Keep Criteria

- 1340 (43%)
- 1678 (56%)

Assessed based on Keep Criteria
Remaining for Liaison
Collection Mapping Model: The Design

1. Identify and provide a range-level data
2. Apply automatic keep criteria
3. Meet with Liaison to determine focus of assessment
4. Small carts of items are pulled and title-level data is captured on an assessment flag
5. Liaison decisions are captured on assessment flags
6. Carts are returned to Technical Services and a new cart is delivered to the liaison
Liaison Decision Time

**ASSESSMENT Research Slip**

Forwarded to:

Liaison on

Total usage

Last checked out

Do we have another copy of this book? YES / NO
If so, circle: Same edition, Different edition

Included in RCLWeb? YES / NO

Worldcat holdings = _____ libraries

Replacement cost:

New: ______ Used: ______

Newer edition? YES / NO  Cost: ______

Total books by this author in library? ______

Included in HathiTrust? YES / NO / n/a

**Liaison Use**

_____ This book is still needed.

_____ Keep in stacks

_____ Send to remote storage

_____ This book is not needed now. Withdraw.

_____ This edition's outdated but the topic is still important. Let's order a new edition.

_____ Consider for Special Collections If rejected by SC - Remote storage? Or Withdraw? [Circle one]

Initials: _____
The Results

- Started with 2,785 titles in JK

**Pie Charts:**
- Total Goners: 497
- Total Keepers: 2,288
- Auto Criteria: 1,678
- New Titles added: 159
- Liaison Decision: 451
Knouse Assessment Model: The Design

1. Limited title-level data is collected via ILS
2. Spreadsheets provided to each liaison
3. Liaisons schedule 2 hours/week for 12 weeks each summer
4. Items are flagged to indicate liaison decisions
5. Items are pulled and funneled through the assessment workflows that corresponds with each colored flag
Current Initiative

Collection Mapping Model + Knouse Assessment Model = Assessment 2.0
Assessment 2.0: The Goal

- Assessment 2.0 (2016)
  - Time-bound: Spring 2018
  - 40K in 2.5 years
  - Staggering Subject Liaisons
- Assessment 2.0 (2016)
  - Time-bound to each semester
  - 8K per semester
  - Staggering Subject Liaisons
Assessment 2.0 Model: The Design

1. Looked at range-level data for our circulating collection
2. Limited title-level data is collected via ILS
3. Meet with Liaison to present targets and timeline
4. Spreadsheets provided to each liaison
5. Liaisons schedule their own time
6. Items are flagged to indicate liaison decisions; or,
7. Liaisons record decisions on the spreadsheet
8. Items are pulled and funneled through the assessment workflows that corresponds with each colored flag
Assessment 2.0 Model: In the Stacks
The Results
What did we learn?

• It’s not just about weeding, stop saying that!
• Both models are applicable across whole collection
• Both models require staffing from multiple departments
• Use processes already in place
• Insert mini-assessments that evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the processes
• We know our collection better today than yesterday
• We are discovering amazing treasures and total duds
• Space is still a concern, but you can move beyond crisis
• Communication throughout the process
• Just do it, really.
Thank you.

Amy Ward, Director of Technical Services
award@gettysburg.edu
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