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Part I: Introduction & Background
The Value of Continuous Improvement

- Continuous Improvement is an approach to assessment focused on interventions and measured results
- Measure -> Change -> Measure: A runner’s 5K time never improved just because of a change in diet
- Assessment at three levels:
  - Assessment of Library Units
  - Assessment of the Library System
  - Assessment of the University
- Fall 2018 marks the second full year of Improve KSU
Jen’s Role
• Advance the Improve KSU initiative
• Inform and educate the campus community about Improve KSU
• Collaborate with assessment leaders in colleges and divisions
• Consult with assessment leads
• Provide qualitative feedback on assessment plans and improvement reports

Michael’s Role
• Liaison between library and university
• Communicated with all Department Heads on outcome creation and data reporting
• Input data for all units into the Improve KSU System
• Mapped all outcomes and units to the KSU strategic plan
Part II: Methodology

Are you too busy to improve?

No thanks!
We are too busy
Methods/Approach

- Consolidation – Reset and redesign institution-wide assessment process
- Campus Labs Assessment Tool (Planning) – one universal template
- Goals for Improve KSU:
  - Build culture of assessment and continuous improvement as a University
  - Help drive our narrative as an institution
  - Improve tracking of strategic plan
  - Compliance with accreditation standards
  - Track assessment in a central location: number of units, alignment
Foundational Documents: Vision, Mission, Strategic Plan, Values

Assessment Model at Kennesaw State
Adapted from Linda Suskie (2018)
The Outcome Template

- Performance Outcome
- Related to Federal Grant?
- Results
- Documentation (File upload)
- Documented Improvement
- Brainstorming
- Strategy for Improvement

The Measure Template

- Measure 1
  - Data Source
  - Direct or Indirect
- Measure 2
  - Data Source
  - Direct or Indirect
- Measure 3, etc.
Outcomes and Measures, Examples

Example from Library Facilities

- **O1:** Increase availability of seating for KSU Library System
  - **M1:** Seat count for both Sturgis and Johnson Libraries
  - **M2:** List of types of available seating
  - **M3:** Benchmark of available seating at peer institutions

Example from Technical Services

- **O1:** Decrease turnaround time for new books
  - **M1:** Length of time to receive a new book following the initial request in GOBI
  - **M2:** Length of time to create metadata and complete processing of a new book

Three indicators of improvement: Year over year, benchmark, and seats as a % of headcount
Part III: Results
## Library System-Level Result: Headcount / Library Personnel for KSU and 3 GA Comparators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Library Personnel</th>
<th>University Student Headcount</th>
<th>Headcount / Library Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY ‘17</td>
<td>FY ‘18</td>
<td>FY ‘17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Comp. #1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Comp. #2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>12,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Comp. #3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11,302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*ACRL Trends and Statistics Survey*
## Unit-Level Result: (Technical Services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Random Sample Size</th>
<th>Processing Time in Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shelf Ready Orders</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book Firm Orders</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Book Firm Orders</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--Ariel Turner, Director of Technical Services
Conscious Tying of Decisions to Assessment Results

“To meet generally accepted seating guidelines for academic libraries that suggest a minimum of 10% of FTE, the Library System needs to add considerably more seats ... . Short-term solutions focus on re-locating carrels from the Johnson Library to Sturgis [Library] ... .”

“Add approximately 50 carrels on areas of the Sturgis Library third floor where there is empty book shelving. ... Another strategy ... will be flexible use of existing spaces. Classrooms and meeting spaces not in use can be made available for group and individual study during peak study periods and final exams.”

--Alan Lebish, Director of Library Facilities
Top Performance Outcome Themes

- Recruitment and Enrollment: 46%
- Retention, Progression, Graduation: 11%
- High Impact Practices: 11%
- Branding, Visibility, Communication: 13%
- RCA (Research Creative Activity/SoTL): 10%
Example of Institution-Level Improvements

• University Focus on Student Success Initiatives
  • Increase in number of students participating in High Impact Practices
  • Curriculum Review - work to keep students at 120 hours
  • Momentum Year – focus on having students complete 30 hours in first-year
  • Focus Areas – created to decrease number of undeclared students
Part IV: Lessons Learned
Some Outcomes are Better than Others

SMART Outcomes

• The "A" in SMART causes confusion
  • Achievable is meant to mean possible
  • Often interpreted as targets, but we are focused on continuous improvement, not meeting certain thresholds
  • Targets okay if based on historical data and not arbitrary

SMART+ Outcomes

• SMART might not be enough
  • Improvable
  • Mission-critical
  • Student-Focused
How Improvable Are These Results?

2017 Results: <1.5% Dissatisfied

2018 Results: <1% Dissatisfied
Revising Forward

Kennesaw State University

• Improve “assessment synergy” throughout the university
• Reduce duplication of efforts in reporting
• Greater focus on improvement and use of results
• Improve the online template, feedback forms, and resource/educational materials
• Increase efficiency in the administration of Improve KSU

KSU Library System

• Moving from unit-based outcomes to one based on strategic priorities
  • Resource Management
  • Facilities
  • Services
  • Organization
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