Evaluating library assessment capabilities
A measure of effectiveness

Simon Hart
University of Otago Library
http://www.matarikinetwork.com
Benchmarking

“…the process of identifying best practices and learning from others.

…enables a better understanding of practice, process or performance and provides insights into how improvements might be made.”

If we enable and support the academic endeavor how do we measure our effectiveness?
Two key problems in academic library assessment:

- the failure of libraries to select measures that demonstrate a contribution to the strategic plan of the institution
- the selection of performance measures that are not meaningful to campus administration.

• How do we measure our effectiveness?
• How do we assess our assessment?
• How could we frame our assessment to identify an improvement path?
• What should a mature approach to library assessment look like?
Collaboration

At this stage of the project we are learning from each other about what we do and the terms that we use in regards activities and practice for programmes that support the transition of first year students to University life.

We invite you to contribute to the discussion in the following areas:

Information Framework

responses from each partner to a series of preliminary questions

Terms & Definitions

a list of agreed words and meanings to be used in the project

Survey Questions

where we are considering the wording of the initial survey requests

Topics for discussion

where we are considering topics for further discussion
Detail the processes used to gather data that informed the development of the project.

Detail the performance measures used to evaluate the success of the project.

Outline plans you have for the ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the projects outcomes.
Capacity Maturity Model

1. Initial
   - ad hoc

2. Defined
   - documented

3. Repeatable
   - measured

4. Quantitatively managed
   - confirmed

5. Continuous improvement
   - optimized

ACODE
Leading in Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

Benchmarks for Technology Enhanced Learning
8 benchmarks

1-5 scale of capability

2 phased application
Procedure model for developing maturity models

- Need identified
- Process built in
- Comparison made
- Design & test model

Quality Maturity Model

Your roadmap to a culture of assessment. Free.

This website explains the purpose of the Quality Maturity Model and provides free tools to enable you to assess the quality maturity of your library. These tools are open source so you can adapt them to your environment, and there are full instruction in how to use them.

Why you need the Quality Maturity Model

A high quality library consistently meets, or even exceeds, the needs of its customers. A high quality library has a robust culture of assessment. But not all high quality libraries maintain their quality as customer needs evolve. This is because their assessment and quality processes are too rigid to adapt to the new situation.

A mature culture of quality enables a library to adapt to meet the needs of future customers, however quickly or radically they evolve. So how do you create a mature quality culture in your library?

The Quality Maturity Model enables you to locate your library within the quality maturity landscape. You can then use the model as a roadmap to plan your route to improvement.

This strategic approach to improvement allows you to make sense of the myriad improvement techniques available in terms of what is appropriate for you. So you will avoid costly mistakes.

JOIN THE COMMUNITY

Visit the Community page to add your name to the list of people and libraries interested in the Quality Maturity Model.

Using the Quality Maturity Model in your library? Let us know.

Adapted the documents for your own situation? Let me know and I will add them to the site.

Because if you don’t know where you are, a map won’t help.

And if you don’t know where you are going, any road will do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3 Progress monitoring</th>
<th>Level 1: Ad Hoc</th>
<th>Level 2: Repeatable</th>
<th>Level 3: Defined</th>
<th>Level 4: Managed</th>
<th>Level 5: Continuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no monitoring of progress in achieving goals.</td>
<td>There is no monitoring of progress in achieving goals.</td>
<td>There is (infrequent) monitoring of progress in achieving goals, but no corrective action taken.</td>
<td>There is monitoring of progress in achieving goals, and some corrective action is taken.</td>
<td>Progress in achieving goals is closely monitored and corrective action taken where necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1.4 Performance measurement | Only basic statistical measures are collected, but are used for competitive analysis ("we have more books than X") if at all. | Basic statistical measures are collected and used for competitive analysis. Customer feedback is also viewed as an indicator of performance. | Customer feedback and measures of internal processes (e.g., time taken to re-shelve a book) are used to determine how the service is performing. | A range of performance indicators are used to determine how the service is performing. Key Performance Indicators may exist, but are not necessarily fully aligned with metrics used or strategic aims of the service. | A range of balanced performance measures are used to monitor how well the service is achieving its aims. Metrics closely align with Key Performance Indicators, which closely relate to strategic aims and mission. Performance measures are regularly evaluated to determine whether they continue to accurately and appropriately measure performance. |

http://www.qualitymaturitymodel.org.uk/
### The Quality Maturity Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1: Ad Hoc</th>
<th>Level 2: Repeatable</th>
<th>Level 3: Defined</th>
<th>Level 4: Managed</th>
<th>Level 5: Continuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Gathering of feedback</strong></td>
<td>Feedback from customers is gathered ad hoc and reactively.</td>
<td>Feedback is gathered from customers proactively to assess satisfaction. Feedback is sought from a sub-set of customer groups only. A limited number of methods are used.</td>
<td>Feedback is gathered proactively via a range of methods.</td>
<td>Feedback is gathered proactively via a wide range of methods to access views of all customers. Feedback is proactively sought to assess impact of changes on customer satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Collation of feedback</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is not collated.</td>
<td>Feedback may be collated.</td>
<td>Feedback is collated separately for each source.</td>
<td>Feedback is collated across all feedback methods and analysed for consistency. Collated feedback is analysed over time to identify trends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stages of Assessment cycle

I. Objectives
(What are the objectives and how were they formulated?)

II. Methods And Data Collection
(How is success in achieving the objectives measured and tracked?)

III. Analysis And Interpretation
(How are results presented and interpreted?)

IV. Use Of Results
(How are results shared and used in improvement of the libraries and assessment plan?)

- Objectives’ clarity and specificity
- Target users
- Relationship between objectives and measures
- Types of measures
- Targets for measures
- Data sources and data collection process
- Evidence of validity

- Communication
- Improvement of services, collections or spaces
- Improvement of assessment process
- Presentation of results
- History of results
- Interpretation of results

## Assessment Capability Maturity Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of capability</th>
<th>Stages of the Assessment cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeateable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Assessment Capability Maturity Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of capability</th>
<th>Methods &amp; data collections: Gathering feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Assessment of methods and data reuse is used to improve feedback gathering exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed</td>
<td>Data from defined feedback methods is structured for use and reuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined</td>
<td>A range of repeatable methods are used to gather feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeatable</td>
<td>Feedback is proactively sought from sub-set of clients for specific purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>Feedback is client initiated and not collated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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