

## LHU Libraries

### Assessment to Budget Linkages 2005-2007

The Chancellor got special performance monies to support system libraries in 2005/2006 and in 2006/2007 – we have until 2009 to spend all those funds. One thing we decided to do was spend about \$8000 to get two years worth of access to the OCLC Collection Analysis software. The software allows us to compare specific parts of our book collection with peer institutions, to analyze the age of our collection, etc. Through this benchmarking, we will identify weaknesses in the collection. We are setting aside \$50,000 of the special performance money to fill in the gaps identified through this process. Moreover, an overall satisfaction survey indicated that students wanted more up-to-date books. This special performance funding will help us to build up the book collection in those areas identified as high need.

The nursing accreditation body noted that our book and media collection at Clearfield was outdated. Therefore we allocated an additional \$1500 of Academic Equipment funds to buy new materials, and are weeding out more of the outdated materials.

An overall satisfaction survey indicated the perennial desire for more computers in the library. Since the university will soon be requiring students to come in with their own laptops, it did not make sense to us to put in more permanent workstations. So we requested technology fee monies to buy 10-15 laptops which would circulate within the library for a few hours at a time to meet this need. The request was approved for 2007.

An overall satisfaction survey indicated that students wanted more dvds in the media area. We had started in 2004 to put extra seed money into starting the dvd collection, and had been making enough progress that the dvd collection was now visible and being used, thus creating the demand for even more. So we decided to use some of the special performance funding money for 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 to add more educational dvds to the collection – approximately \$15,000.

We had been doing a series of what we called “liberal arts assessments,” which involved interviewing students and faculty in specific departments each year. In 2005 the Foreign Language department overwhelmingly identified international films as an area of need. We set aside some of the academic equipment money to buy representative foreign films, approximately \$2500 worth.

An overall satisfaction survey in 2006 showed great satisfaction with our website and a desire for an electronic form of information sharing, such as email bulletins. Our library newsletter was getting expensive to duplicate and mail to faculty, and didn't help students, so we are moving our financial resources from printing newsletters to providing a library blog in 2007.

A survey of users of the Curriculum/Children's Library in 2006 indicated that we needed some serious attention to signage. At the end of the year, when some other expected expenses came in at a lower price than expected, I was able to divert those monies to buy

three new large signs to distinguish the three main sections. We used regular budget monies to buy new shelf labels over the summer as well. (Total cost was just under \$4000.) When students returned in the fall, the room was significantly easier to navigate. We have received very, very positive feedback from students.

The 2006 satisfaction surveys above also indicated user concern with the following: noise, old paint, inadequate lighting, odd smells, outdated look, inconvenient bathrooms, uncomfortable furniture, overcrowding, insufficient group study spaces, and inadequate staff (especially technical staff). I have continually put forward to Senior Staff the following needs:

- 1) Our 37 year old facility needs to be remodeled to accommodate new usage patterns in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
- 2) The last master plan showed that the campus is over 40,000 sq. ft short of library space – thus an addition would be in order.
- 3) By ACRL quantitative standards and benchmarking we are staffed for 2500 students rather than 5000 students.

Unfortunately, we have yet to be seen as a priority in facilities planning, materials budgeting or personnel needs. In fact, when we had someone go on leave for two months in the spring, a replacement was refused.

We conducted a benchmarking project in 2006, comparing our 2004 data with thirteen other similar institutions, from which we gleaned the following.

- 1) Every other building was at least seven years newer than ours; eight of the eleven institutions answering this question had been built or renovated since 1990 – that is, 21 years more modern than Stevenson Library.
- 2) We spent about half as much on library materials as the group median, and about 40% of the average. In fact, we take money for books from a special fee charged to students – library books are not considered an operating expense at Lock Haven.
- 3) On average, the group had 6.33 staff per 1000 FTE students; LHU had 5.88.
- 4) On average, the institutions spent 4.1% of their educational expenses on the library; LHU spent 3.4%.

In sum, major investment is needed in the library to bring us up to benchmark standards.