



# Revisiting a Library Impact Map

Holt Zaugg, PhD

Assessment Librarian, BYU



# Purpose of Library Impact Map (LIM)

- Created by Megan Oakleaf in 2012
- Indicate degree of data collection, use, and dissemination
- Alignment of library services to university areas of focus
- Promotes use of data to improve library services and resources
- Re-administration identifies move to Culture of Assessment



# Review of LIM

- Uses grid of library services and university areas of focus to show degree of data collection
- Five codes used:
  - **Y++** = Yes, there is an impact, we have evidence/data, and we've communicated the impact to stakeholders.
  - **Y+** = Yes, there is an impact, and we have evidence/data of the impact.
  - **Y** = Yes, we believe there is an impact relationship between this institutional focus area and this library service, expertise, or resource.
  - **CB** = There could be an impact if we did something better or differently.
  - **N** = No, there is no impact.



		AUL	Public Services				Learning Commons, Reference Librarians, Family History	
		Department Head	Subject Librarians					
Library Goals	University Areas of Focus	Reference, Physical	Reference, Digital	Reference, Subject Guides	Liaison Services	Facilities, Learning Commons	Facilities, GSRs	
FDC	Faculty Teaching	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	CB	
FDC	Faculty Innovation, Entrepreneurship	CB	CB	CB	Y	N	N	
FDC	Faculty Research Productivity	Y	Y	Y	Y+	N	N	
FDC	Character Building	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
FDC	Student-Faculty Academic Report	N	N	N	Y	N	N	
IDAR	Student GPA, Test Achievement	Y	Y	Y	Y	CB	Y	
IDAR	Student Learning Outcomes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
IDAR	Spiritually Strengthening	Y	Y	Y	Y	CB	CB	
IDAR	Student (Retention, Completion, Graduation)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	
IDAR	Institutional Athletics	N	N	N	CB	N	N	
IDAR	Undergraduate Research	Y	Y	Y	Y+	Y	Y	
PSTF	Student Career Success	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
PSTF	Institutional Efficiencies	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	
PSTF	Student Experience, Engagement	Y	Y	Y	Y+	Y	Y	
PSTF	Student Recruitment, Enrollment	N	N	N	N	Y	N	



# LIM Changes

2013

2019

- University areas of focus = 29
- Library services = 46
- 1,334 points of intersection
- Five codes
- 15 employees populate LIM

- University areas of focus = 28
- Library services = 58
- 1,624 points of intersection
- Six codes: CBW added
- 34 employees populate LIM
- More than one rater for some services

Library Code	AUL		M1 - Public Services				M2 - Collection Development & Technical Services				M3 - Special		M4 - Communications, Assessment and Personal & Outreach		M5	M6	M7	M8	
	Department Head	CS	IZ	BAW	MSB	MSL	MSR	MSU	MSV	MSW	MSX	MSY	MSZ	MSA					MSB
Library Impact Map																			
DOFL Faculty Teaching	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DOFL Faculty Innovation, Entrepreneurship	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DOFL Institutional Brand	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DOFL Institutional Development, Funding, Endowments	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DOFL Faculty Research Productivity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DOFL Local, Global Engagement, Community-Building, Social Inclusion	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DOFL Character Building	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Student GPA, Test Achievement	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Student Learning Outcomes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Faculty Recruitment, Tenure, Promotion	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Faculty Service	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Faculty Grant Seeking	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Faculty Patents, Technology Transfer	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Institutional Prestige	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Institutional Accountability	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Institutional Accreditation, Program Review	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Local, Global Economic Growth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Specialty Strengthening	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Intellectual Enterprise	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Student Retention, Completion, Graduation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Alumni Lifelong Learning	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Institutional Athletics	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Service Lifelong Learning	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Undergraduate Research	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Student Career Success	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Institutional Effectiveness	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Student Experience, Engagement	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Student Recruitment, Enrollment	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IRAC Student Faculty Academic Report	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y



# Methods

- University areas of focus & library services updated
- Employees with responsibilities over service asked to rate
  - Sent only service with all university areas of focus
  - Reminders sent until completed
- Patterns of change (negative, positive, no shift) for:
  - All points of intersection
  - Each code
  - Each library service
  - Each university area of focus



# Results: All Points of Intersection

	Y++	Y+	Y	CBW	CB	N	Total
2013	15	40	429	-	346	504	1,334
	1%	3%	32%	-	26%	38%	
2019	27	116	543	25	279	634	1,624
	2%	7%	33%	2%	17%	39%	

- CB , Y, and N codes decreased by 8%, 1% and 1% respectively
- Y+ and Y++ codes increased by 4% and 1% respectively
- Slight shift towards collecting, using, and sharing data
- 2% (25 instances) wanted to start collecting data



# Results: Rating Shifts

Rating	2019					Percentage of Shift			
	Y++	Y+	Y	CB	N	Positive	Negative	No Shift	
2013	Y++	5	2	7	1	0	-	1%	0.3%
	Y+	0	11	17	3	10	0%	2%	0.7%
	Y	13	38	267	50	131	3%	12%	17%
	CB	6	37	126	164	130	11%	8%	11%
	N	3	24	106	74	342	13%	-	22%
Total Percent						27%	23%	51%	

- Most codes (51%) had no change in rating – consistent over time
- Simultaneous increases & decreases
  - Total negative changes = 23%: Most with Y code
  - Total positive changes = 27%: Most with N code
  - CB code had second highest decrease and increase





# Results: Library Services Shifts

Library Services	Change in Codes				
	Y++	Y+	Y	CB	N
Acquisitions	=	=	++	=	--
Archives	--	--	+	++	+
Cataloging	=	-	+	=	-
Circulation (FDS, Pickup, Holds added in 2019)	=	-	-	--	++
Collection Development	=	=	+	-	=
Collections, Data/Statistics	=	=	=	+	-
Collections, E-Books	=	=	+	-	=
Collections, E-Resources	=	=	+	-	=
Collections, General	=	+	++	--	+
Collections, Government Documents	++	++	++	--	--

- 2019 percent totals subtracted from 2013 percent totals
- Similar pattern of increases and decreases for most services
- Changes depend on library service
- Moderate increases for most services, but some exceptions



# Results: University Areas of Focus Shifts

University Area of Focus	Change in Codes				
	Y++	Y+	Y	CB	N
Alumni Lifelong Learning	=	+	++	--	+
Character Building	-	+	-	=	+
Faculty Grant Seeking	=	-	+	-	+
Faculty Innovation, Entrepreneurship	=	+	+	--	-
Faculty Patents, Technology Transfer	=	+	+	-	+
Faculty Recruitment, Tenure, Promotion	=	+	+	-	-
Faculty Research Productivity	+	-	+	-	=
Faculty Service	=	+	++	--	--
Faculty Teaching	+	+	-	--	++

- Simultaneous increases and decreases with overall moderate increases



# Summary

- Purposes of LIM highlighted in 2013 remain and are still useful
- Addition of CBW code facilitates new data collection
- Process of developing culture of assessment is an ebb and flow of data collection, use, and dissemination
- Shifts may be slow – maintaining areas of data collection, use and sharing will increase the rate of shift towards culture of assessment
- N code will always be present
  - No one service for all university areas of focus
  - No university area of focus needs all library services



# Limitations to 2019 LIM Assessment

- Larger group of raters (more than double)
  - Greater possibility for variance among raters but stronger connection to library service
- Poor understanding of university areas of focus
  - Clarity provided for those needing
- 15 services had two or more raters
  - Most rating consistent, but where differed, used higher rating
- All raters were first timers



# Future LIMs

- Repeating LIM more frequently to allow the use of same rater
- Better identification and definition of university areas of focus
- For services with multiple raters show range of LIM (high and low)
- Only one indicator of culture of assessment – should combine with other assessments



# Contact Information & Questions

Holt Zaugg, PhD  
Assessment Librarian  
BYU, Lee Library  
[holt\\_zaugg@byu.edu](mailto:holt_zaugg@byu.edu)

*In God we trust, Everyone else needs to bring Data*

