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Introduction
ARL SPEC Kit Survey #352 addressed a gap in libraries between collection assessment theory and practice.

Objectives
• “…how collection assessment methods, measures, and practices are currently employed and how the results are utilized at ARL libraries.”
• Focus on what is being done rather than rehashing what should or could be done.

ARL SPEC Survey #352

60 questions
134 ARL member libraries
71 responses – 57% response rate


Results
Processes, Purposes & Outcomes of Collection Assessment
- Nearly all go beyond national surveys
- Almost half do formal and informal assessments
- 30% have plans to conduct future assessments
- 4% no plans to conduct future assessments

Scope of Collection Evaluations

What is being evaluated?

Reasons for Initiating Collection Assessment

How Assessments are Used

Assessment Methods

Areas of Future Study
• Opportunities for collaboration
• Benchmarking with peer institutions
• Data Sharing - external stakeholders and others

Importance of Skills – Ranking & Three Groups

Climate for and Attitudes About Assessment

Agreement with statements about…

Spreading the Knowledge

% Uses of Collection Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Uses of Collection Assessments</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select physical materials for weeding or remote storage</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate serials or database for selection or de-selection</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify database overlap</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust allocations of expenditures or funds</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate value to the institution</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate level of activity</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift staff and faculty morale</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate collection strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the adequacy or inadequacy of collections for accreditation</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49% Commonly evaluated collections

Commonly evaluated formats

Commonly evaluated disciplines

Factors

45% Local dissemination of knowledge

Global dissemination of data

Audience

Local dissemination of knowledge

Library administration

Collection Development Manager

Other

Global dissemination of data

Accreditation
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