
Assessment and evaluation of library performance can inform both internal and external decision making, and libraries are increasingly being held accountable to a variety of stakeholders; therefore, it is important that any measurements of library use, services, collections, and patron attitudes reflect the value and impact of the library. Traditionally, libraries have demonstrated their worth via input and output measures, but the demand has increased for public libraries to begin measuring more complex outcome measures to assess their performance. This research study involved a survey of the 77 public library systems of North Carolina about what performance concepts they are measuring, how they are measuring these concepts, and identifying any barriers to collecting performance measures. The study found that NC public libraries are now commonly measuring input and output measures, while beginning to assess more complex performance concepts as the demand for demonstrating value and impact increases.
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Introduction

“Libraries cannot demonstrate institutional value to maximum effect until they define outcomes of institutional relevance and then measure the degree to which they attain them” (Oakleaf, 2010, p. 5).

The practice of assessment and evaluation of performance is a common task among both for-profit and non-profit organizations. Any organization that relies on external or time-limited sources of funding has probably become familiar with the need to assess and evaluate their services: whether a coffee shop looking at income and expenditure statistics, or a public library trying to persuade the local government to provide adequate funding for the upcoming year, both organizations are assessing their performance as “a scientific/statistical means by which to ensure a future” (Logan, 2009, p. 225).

Historically, libraries were able to demonstrate their value by reporting their inputs or holdings. Input measures illustrate aspects of library performance such as operating costs, number of staff, number of resources (e.g., books, electronic, etc.), and amount of equipment and space. In the 1980s, the focus of assessment in libraries started migrating towards the inclusion of output measures. Output measures, unlike input measures, evaluate the downstream use of library services and materials. Output measures commonly gathered by libraries include door count (e.g., how many people use the library), circulation counts (e.g., use of library collection), number of reference transactions, and so on. Output measures were thought to provide a measure of implicit “goodness”: if the library and its services were being used, then it was “good” (Matthews, 2008). More recently, the field of library assessment has found that input and output
measures are not enough; they do not show the real value or impact of the organization. In order to measure impact and value (e.g., changes in patrons’ attitudes, skills, knowledge, or behaviors) libraries needs to start measuring outcomes (Matthews, 2008). Outcome measures, unlike its predecessor methods, are far more complicated to collect. Measuring impact and value takes time and careful planning, but when combined with other input and output measures, can create a more robust and diverse assessment of library performance (Matthews, 2008; White, 2007).

Therefore, to assume that libraries will be funded indefinitely on the basis that they are “good” for their community or that they are the “heart of the university” is no longer a practical viewpoint. Rather, accountability is beginning to play an ever-increasing role in library funding (Oakleaf, 2010; Weiner, 2005, p. 432). Libraries are increasingly being held accountable to their own mission statements and goals, as well as the expectations of their stakeholders (Kostiak, 2002; Wright & White, 2007). The library is being asked to prove that it is valuable, to show that it makes an impact, and to demonstrate the effectiveness and quality of its services. In order to meet the demand for accountability, libraries have had to integrate ongoing systems and measures of assessment and evaluation into their everyday practices.

Assessment and evaluation of libraries supports accountability both internally and externally. Internally, assessment and evaluation support accountability to the mission of the library, inform decision making, and work to improve library operations and services (Dugan, Hernon & Nitecki, 2009). Externally, conducting assessment and evaluation measures supports accountability to library stakeholders. Dugan, Hernon, and Nitecki (2009) assert that stakeholders “demand information about costs and affordability … and institutional demographics presented transparently and in a comparative way” (p.157). Assessment and evaluation in libraries is necessary for setting and measuring intra-organizational goals and for demonstrating progress towards extra-organizational expectations. Knowing what concepts libraries are assessing as a means to inform practice and demonstrate worth to stakeholders can inform future library assessment practices. The libraries designing and conducting assessments
will have a benchmark to see what and how peer institutions are assessing their services and collections, and the multiple stakeholders will be better informed about what and how they can expect a library to assess.

The purpose of this research study is to explore the current library assessment practices of public libraries in North Carolina. Specifically, the research questions that this study addresses are:

- Which types of performance concepts are currently being measured in public library systems throughout North Carolina?
- How are these performance concepts being measured by public library directors (or by professional staff to whom assessment responsibilities have been delegated)?

For the purposes of this study, a performance concept is defined as any manner or quality of functioning within an organization that can be observed in terms of how successfully it was performed; in other words, a performance concept must be based on some form of collected evidence of performance which is either internal or external to the institution. The research presented in the following literature review provides an overview of some of the different performance concepts that can be and are currently being measured as a means to assess library performance.

**Literature Review**

One way to classify library performance concepts is to divide them into either tangible or intangible. Tangible concepts are those that can be easily measured and quantified (e.g., number of full-time staff, number of reference questions asked), whereas intangible concepts (e.g., quality of service, value to the community) are often qualitative in nature and harder to measure because they are not defined in terms that can be easily quantified (White, 2007), are more diffuse, perception-based concepts, or are subject to debate as to what fundamental qualities these concepts reflect. Tangible concepts are often measured via input measures or output measures;
however, intangible concepts are better measured via outcome measure, and as mentioned earlier this is not the easiest task.

In the past, libraries and other organizations appear to have been satisfied with gathering data on tangible concepts and letting the intangibles remain unexamined, but with the continued increased demand for accountability to organizational priorities and stakeholders the field of library evaluation has had to rise to the occasion and begin seeking out ways to measure the seemingly-immeasurable (Baker & Lancaster, 1991, p.4). Whether libraries measure traditional tangible performance concepts (e.g., Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Statistics, the Public Library Survey) or contemporary intangible performance concepts (e.g., LibQUAL+, Friendliness Factor), much of the literature agrees that the most effective assessment and evaluation of library performance will come from measuring a combination of tangible and intangible aspects of the organization’s services (Baker & Lancaster, 1991; Weiner, 2005; White, 2007). To explore each of these concepts further, this literature review will focus on research related to measuring tangible performance concepts in libraries, research related to measuring intangible performance concepts, and, finally, a discussion of research that has studied whether libraries are using tangible or intangible performance measures.

**Measuring Library Tangibles**

One category of library evaluation is tangible or traditional assessment. Often times these tangible concepts are gathered as quantitative measurements of inputs (e.g., collection size, number of staff) and outputs (e.g., number of circulations, number of reference questions) that lend themselves well to being quickly counted and analyzed. While libraries have long taken advantage of these easily compiled and measurable statistics, there seems to be a push in the field of library assessment to measure more intangible concepts (White, 2007). However, the foundation provided by the tangible performance measures continues to be an important basis for library assessment and evaluation (Weiner, 2005).
One major area of research concerning the collection of quantitative data in libraries that is discussed in the literature is the national collection of library data through statistical surveys. Two of the most well known national library surveys are the Academic Library Survey (ALS) and the Public Library Survey (PLS). These surveys are government mandated and require that both academic and public libraries produce certain easily quantifiable statistics each year. The resulting data are then compiled and analyzed to show trends and allow for comparison across libraries of the same type (i.e., academic, public).

Similar to the national surveys’ collection of input and output data, the academic community also collects yearly data from several large scale library surveys, such as the ARL Statistics and the American Library Association sponsored Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Statistics (www.arl.org, www.acrl.org). The data solicited in these surveys are all tangible measures of library performance that are easily quantifiable. For example, some of the major concepts that the ARL Statistics survey are number of volumes, number of journal subscriptions, number of staff, number of renewals, number of reference transactions, and size of library budget (2009 ARL Statistics).

For the library whose main function is to collect and store books, these tangible measures are exactly the assessment that they need, but as libraries are asked to report how they add value to a community, these statistics may no longer be enough (Weiner, 2005; White, 2007). In response to this assumption about the lack of usefulness in measuring tangibles, Weiner (2005) conducted a research study to find out if specific measures within the ARL statistics were related to newer measures of library service that evaluate quality and impact. The study looked at three variables from the ARL statistics survey related to service—namely number of reference transactions, number of instructional sessions, and number of people who attended instructional sessions—and found that there is a relationship between the ARL index (which measures quality by collection size and expenditures) and quality of library service. This research is important because it shows that factors related to tangible concepts of library service, including expenditure,
staffing, clientele, and collection size, among others are highly correlated with library services. While one may not cause the other, the connection might be enough to say that these tangible measures are still worthwhile and useful when libraries are trying to measure quality with regard to certain aspects of library service (Weiner, 2005, p. 436).

Understanding that measuring tangible concepts can be useful is, at the very least, a start for public libraries to begin analyzing the statistics collected about their performance. Similar to the collection of ARL statistics from ARL member libraries, the Federal-State Cooperation System (FSCS) also collects yearly performance statistics from public libraries. In 2007 the responsibility for publishing these statistics fell to the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and resulting from this move was the Public Library Survey (PLS). The Public Library Survey data are manipulated and then reported to show comparisons across libraries (Varvel, 2010).

In 1999, Hennen created a rating index in order to help public libraries analyze and utilize the FSCS data that libraries already collect. Hennen’s American Public Library Rating index (HAPLR) uses both library input and output data in order to evaluate public libraries and their services. The strengths of HAPLR are that it makes cross-library comparisons possible for public libraries and aids in the library decision making process (Hennen, 1999). Whether allocating time, resources, or funding it is important for public libraries to understand and utilize the data they collect and the comparisons they can make. Since its inception, there have been many criticisms of HAPLR. The main concern is that since HAPLR has not been scientifically validated, the measurements of library quality, value, and excellence published by the studies are not actually conclusive (Lyons, 2008, p. 37).

Measuring tangible concepts has been a practice in libraries for many years now, and while there is some research showing that these data are still useful for establishing some measure of library service quality, value, and impact – the measures are quite subjective. The attitude that “data will never define excellence in library service” exists (Hennen, 1999). However, it is the
goal of many professionals invested in library assessment to capture the intangible aspects of library service and overall performance (e.g., a friendly greeting or smile, the excitement of a child at story time, service quality, and library value).

**Measuring Library Intangibles**

Public service organizations frequently have long term goals and missions that are intangible in nature. For example, strategic plans and mission statements often suggest lifelong learning and adding value to their community. These aspirations for library performance are common, but not always easy to measure. Evaluating the performance, quality of service, value, and impact of a library is difficult, but necessary.

One area where libraries often need to measure intangibles is the assessment of library value. Due to its relatively elusive nature, there have been many attempts to measure library value, and there are many suggested methods. To consolidate a lot of the research that had already been completed, Imholz and Arns (2007) conducted a review of the recent literature in the field of Library Valuation. What Imholz and Arns (2007) found was that there were three main types of studies used consistently throughout recent publications relating to measuring library value: cost benefit analysis, economic impact, and social returns on investment. The trend in determining library value seems to be looking towards the field of economics for something more than a simple survey to measure the subjective intangible that is value (p. 32-34). The report also notes that most of the valuation studies reviewed assessing library value in economic terms that would speak to their funding agencies and other stakeholders (p. 34). Unfortunately, economizing library value does not account for the value of a library’s social impact and therefore more research in the field is needed (p. 48).

Library impact is another intangible product that unfortunately is not easily measured. For example, Usherwood (2002) explores efforts to measure library impact of two Australian libraries with a technique he adapted from the “qualitative measurement of social auditing”. The
study measured how each library impacted the intangible measures of social cohesion, community empowerment, local identity, creativity, and well-being. In his explanation of this intangible assessment tool, Usherwood (2002) acknowledges the current necessity for libraries to demonstrate quality and accountability to stakeholders. Conversely, Usherwood (2002) also notes that statistics are merely quantification that cannot begin to truly demonstrate library value and impact.

Similar to Usherwood’s locally derived methods of quantifying library impact there have been several other locally derived methods or literature guided attempts to quantify intangible performance concepts such as quality of service and friendliness in libraries (Kostiak, 2002; Jordan, 2005; Oakleaf, 2010). Kostiak (2002) conducted a study in which the public library used The Libraries’ Contribution to Your Community manual as a guide to create their own measures by which to evaluate their specific library. From the manual, the Barrie Public Library chose three categories to measure, each with the hope that the quantified results would emphasize the library’s quality and value. The study implemented to demonstrate how valuable the Barrie Public Library’s services were to the community was successful and as a result the library saw a 23% increase in their operating budget (p.161). So why does every library not use the same methods to determine value and service quality? Unfortunately, many of the methods they used—focus groups and interview—are all still time-consuming; for the public library suffering from lack of time and funds, this may not be the best method of evaluation.

Apart from all of the how-to’s and locally developed attempts to assess library intangibles, the field of library and information science does have a time-tested and evaluated tool for measuring the intangible qualities inherent to libraries. The LibQUAL+ survey was developed by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and Texas A& M University researchers and was first used to evaluate library service in 1999. LibQUAL+ is an adaptation of SERVQUAL and has been used to measure library service quality from three different dimensions; affect of service, information control, and library as place. To measure affect of
service the LibQUAL+ survey asks respondents to rate their interactions with library staff; to
measure information control respondents rate the scope of the print/electronic collection and the
ease of access to that content; to measure library as place respondents rate library spaces with
regard to hours of access, overall atmosphere, and so on.

The primary goal of LibQUAL+ is to “help libraries better understand user perceptions of
library service quality” (Cook & Maciel, 2010, p. 5). However, Cook and Maciel discuss that the
survey is only the first step to understanding service quality. In order for the survey to be an
effective decision making tool the library will likely want to form focus groups around these three
dimensions once they have received their results from the LibQUAL+ survey. The focus groups
would enable the library to find out what specific changes students and faculty would like
implemented. Through the analysis of LibQUAL+ trend data from Texas A&M University, Cook
and Maciel demonstrate that appropriately informed changes made at regular intervals will result
in an increase in positive scores in all three dimensions of the LibQUAL+ survey.

Both user perceptions and service quality are aspects of library service that must be
measured through intangible assessment. According to A Decade of Assessment at a Research-
Extensive University Library Using LibQUAL+ (2010), LibQUAL+ continues to succeed in
measuring these three intangible dimensions of library service quality. As a result of the effective
measurement of intangible concepts, academic libraries have been able to use the results of the
survey to improve many aspects of library service.

Tangible vs. Intangible: What are they measuring?

“To assess, in general, is to determine the importance, size, or value of; to evaluate”
(Wright & White, 2007). So whether a library is collecting ARL, HAPLR or PLS data or
measuring quality and value of library services through the use of LibQUAL+, a locally designed
method, or simply observing the number of smiles on their patrons’ faces, it is important to the
evolving field of library assessment to know what performance concepts libraries are choosing to
assess and how they are measuring them.

In 2007, the ARL sent out a survey to all 123 ARL libraries asking them about their assessment practices. The survey was returned by 73 libraries and the results indicated that all but one of the libraries measure aspects of their library performance above and beyond the ARL statistics (Wright & White, 2007). While the supplementary areas assessed by the responding ARL libraries varied widely (along with the methods they used), there were a few popular items being assessed. Nearly all of the libraries indicated that they were evaluating their website and many were also conducting user satisfaction surveys (e.g., LibQUAL+). One of the areas Wright & White (2007) identified as needing improvement is that libraries need to provide more training on assessment practices and devote more staff time and participation in assessment related activities.

While the 2007 Library Assessment SPEC Kit results gave an overview of what is being measured and evaluated in academic libraries, the last comparable study done for public libraries was in 1987 by Sharon Baker. In 1987 Baker surveyed the North Carolina public libraries about their use of “Output Measures for Public Libraries”; a tool that provided libraries with a standardized set of twelve output measures by which to evaluate their achievement. This document was meant to replace the older set of quantitative standards that measured inputs. Baker found that despite the tool’s claim to have widespread use among public libraries three quarters of all of the responding libraries indicated that while they were familiar with the tool and acknowledged that it could be useful to library decision making and budget allocation they still were not using the tool or gathering any data above and beyond the tangible input statistics requested by the state each year (p.5).

Wright and White (2007) indicated in their report, that for academic libraries, the largest growth in assessment activity occurred between 1990 and 2004 (p.11). In that same time frame there have been public libraries and library assessment people who have published research on assessing quality and library service as well as how to manuals, but it is unknown if libraries are
actually using the research that has been done and putting these assessment guidelines into practice. Therefore, researching what public libraries are measuring today can inform both the field of library assessment and future directions of public library practice.

The field of library assessment and evaluation is anything but a straightforward set of guidelines for how libraries can measure everything from the tangible numbers to the intangible desires to provide quality service that is valuable and makes an impact on the community. Further, as the field continues to expand, so do the expectations of library stakeholders. This conundrum of “not easy, but increasingly important” provides a unique challenge to many libraries. Once they have mastered measuring one concept of library performance, they are asked to produce another, each subsequent aspect of quality, value, and so on more difficult to define than the last (Wright & White, 2007; Imholz & Arns, 2007).

While much of the literature agrees that the most effective assessment and evaluation of library performance will come from measuring both tangible and intangible aspects of the organization (Baker & Lancaster, 1991; Weiner, 2005; White, 2007), information on which tangible and intangible concepts libraries choose to measure is relatively non-existent. Therefore, it would be valuable to the field to find out which tangible and intangible performance concepts are being measured in libraries. If we knew what public libraries were measuring we might be able to infer what aspects of quality, impact, or value are most important to stakeholders, as well as which set of evaluation guidelines is most practical for the public library today. Research in this area would also provide a benchmark for library assessment and evaluation to refer to when looking at the development of the field and its relative implementation in public libraries.

**Method**

The purpose of this research study is to discover how public libraries in North Carolina are attempting to assess their overall performance. The research questions for this study include:
• Which types of performance concepts are currently being measured in public library systems throughout North Carolina?

• How are these performance concepts being measured by public library directors (or by professional staff to whom assessment responsibilities have been delegated)?

To answer these research questions this study used a self-administered online survey which, depending upon a participant's responses to particular items, consisted of no more than 10 questions. The survey was sent to the directors of all 77 North Carolina public library systems. These participants were recruited via email message (and weekly follow-up messages; see Appendix B and Appendix C) containing a link to the online survey, administered via the Odum-branded version of Qualtrics, with a uniquely-generated link for each public library in North Carolina. Data collection for this study occurred over a four week-period, from late-February to late-March.

Participants

This study recruited participants from among North Carolina public library directors (or library staff to whom these directors delegate assessment responsibilities) in the form of a census. The most recently published North Carolina state library statistics, representing 2008-2009, showed that 77 public library systems are currently operating in North Carolina. Therefore, the 77 North Carolina public library directors, or comparable library staff members, were contacted in order to obtain a response to the survey. The contact information for the North Carolina library directors was obtained from the 2010 “Directory of North Carolina Libraries” available on the State Library of North Carolina’s website.

To be included in this study, participants had to hold the title of “library director” of a NC public library system or have been delegated managerial roles within their libraries. Research indicates that employees who hold a managerial role are generally more concerned with organizational effectiveness and ways it can be improved (e.g., assessment, evaluation, and
marketing) (Singh, 2009). Therefore, it was determined that library directors would be most likely to know the answers to the survey questions. However, library directors who received the recruitment message were encouraged to forward the message to another staff member if the director considered his/her delegate to be more knowledgeable about specific assessment practices at the library.

Directors of "public library systems" (e.g., county, regional, or municipal libraries) -- as opposed to public library buildings (e.g., central, main, and/or branch libraries) -- were the focus for this study for the following reasons:

- The Federal State Cooperative Survey of public libraries (currently run by IMLS) retrieves output data by library system yearly. Since all the libraries in a given library system are required to report jointly on these specific output measures it makes sense to survey the libraries about other “measures” and assessment concepts and techniques in the same way.

- A complete list of North Carolina public library systems, with links to the respective library homepages, is already available through the North Carolina State Library. See http://statelibrary.ncdcr.gov/library/publib.html.

Because this study was conducted as a census of public library directors (or assessment staff) from all of the 77 public library systems within North Carolina, issues of representativeness and sampling were not applicable for this population.

Survey Instrument

For the purposes of informing the research questions presented above, a self-administered online survey design was selected as the preferred method of data collection. “Survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population.” (Creswell, 2009, p.145) A survey design is appropriate when a researcher desires know something about a large population but cannot survey everyone.
The survey design allows for the researcher to sample the population under inquiry and to use the results from the sample to make generalizations about the population (Creswell, 2009, Schonlau, 2002 & Wildemuth, 2009). However, in order for the generalizations and trends highlighted by a survey to be considered valid, several considerations with regard to constructing the survey instrument, survey mode, and sample selection must be considered.

When designing the survey instrument, the self-administered online survey was selected because it made data collection fast and economical. These two traits of administering an online survey were desirable because data collection was being conducted over a restricted time period on a limited budget. The use of a survey instrument also allowed for gathering data that was quantifiable; this allowed for analysis of the responses with minimal coding and minimal researcher bias. Finally, choosing a fast, economical method with quantifiable results allowed the research findings to be generalizable to the greater population of public libraries outside of North Carolina.

In order to discover how public libraries in North Carolina are attempting to assess their overall performance, a brief, 10 question, online questionnaire was developed in Qualtrics. The 10 questions were developed to assess what performance concepts public libraries are currently measuring, and how they are measuring them. The survey questions are available in Appendix A. The questionnaire begins with a series of questions indicating performance concepts and ways in which they can be measured. In addition, assuming that not all libraries would necessarily be assessing performance concepts, the survey also included questions about the barriers to assessing performance concepts in public libraries and importance of assessing performance concepts.

The list of performance concepts in question 5 came from Joseph Matthews’ book, “Scorecards for Results”. He identified the listed performance concepts as “Critical Success Factors” (Matthews, 2008, p.28). However, there is no limit to what a library could be assessing, so question 6 was developed to allow for “other” responses. These two questions are directly assessing the first research question posed by this study, “Which types of performance concepts
are currently being measured in public libraries throughout North Carolina? The options for questions 7 and 4 came from Matthews (2009) “Selecting Performance Measures” (p. 66).

Mainly, the survey instrument was designed to solicit some of the most basic information about assessment practices (what information they are measuring and how they are measuring it) in public libraries. The data gathered will hopefully be useful as a launching pad for future research.

**Procedures**

This study involved the email distribution of an online survey (see Appendix A) of no more than 10 questions to each library director of a public library system in North Carolina. The survey instrument, collected data, and means of administering the recruitment process were hosted by the Odum-branded version of Qualtrics. Once the survey was developed, the potential participant contact information gathered, and the research project approved, recruitment and data collection began.

On February 21, 2011, each director from among the 77 public library systems in North Carolina received the initial recruitment message via email (see Appendix B) with a link to the online survey. If deemed appropriate by the recipient of the recruitment message, library directors were encouraged to forward this recruitment email to a member of their staff to whom assessment responsibilities have been delegated. Each recruitment email contained a survey link that was uniquely generated by the Qualtrics system for that specific institution. Two follow-up messages—one sent a week after the initial recruitment message, and another sent two weeks after the initial recruitment message—were automatically generated and set to potential participants who had not yet completed the survey. Overall, potential participants received no more than three email messages throughout the four week data collection period.

Each of the participants received a recruitment message via email with a link to the online survey which is unique to their institution, thereby (temporarily) linking their responses to
their e-mail addresses; this data was stored and password-protected within Qualtrics. Once the
data collection period has ended, the email addresses of participants were used to identify the
responding library in order to categorize each library according to publicly available data
concerning most current (2008-2009) operating budgets and service population size. Once the
publically available budget and population data was added, the final data set was stripped of e-
mail addresses and all other library specific information, producing a de-identified version of the
data for analysis and coding.

Analysis

Once the data collection period ended, on March 21, 2011, two different forms of
analysis were conducted. For closed-ended survey questions, the Qualtrics system, JMP and
Microsoft Excel were used to compile, code, and summarize the quantitative data. The closed-
ended questions include nominal- and ordinal-level variables and required that a numerical label
be assigned to each possible response for analysis purposes (e.g. 1=Paid Staff, 2= Operating
Revenue). There is one question that is measured as a scale, but since most of the closed-ended
questions are nominal and ordinal this limited the analysis options.

The remaining questions in the survey are open-ended. For these questions, qualitative
content analysis was used to identify themes across participants' responses. Once the open-ended
responses were grouped by theme the results were presented as a narrative discussion within the
reports from this study.

Results

Of the 77 North Carolina public library directors surveyed, 43 completed surveys were
received resulting in an overall response rate of 56%. The operating budgets of those 43 libraries
range from as little as $200,000 to more than $5,000,000 annually. The majority of responding
libraries, 53%, are currently operating on a budget between $1,000,000 and $4,999,999, while
19% are operating on $400,000-$699,999, and 16% are operating on $700,000-$999,999 annually. 30% of the libraries who responded to the survey serve a population of 100,000-249,999 and 28% serve a population of 50,000-99,999.

The second question, “Does your library provide assessment data to the IMLS as part of the Public Library Survey?” had a 100% response rate. Thirty-two libraries, 74%, responded positively, indicating that they did provide assessment data to IMLS. Eleven libraries, 26%, responded negatively, indicating that they did not provide data to IMLS. Of the 32 libraries who report data to IMLS annually, 18 of those libraries (78%) had an operating budget of $1,000,000-4,999,999; the rate of reporting data to IMLS was highest for libraries in this budget range. See Figure 1 for a more detailed breakdown of the relationship between operating costs and reporting data to IMLS annually.

![Figure 1. Operating Costs and Reporting Data to IMLS.](image)

The third survey question, “Which types of Public Library Survey data does your library report to the IMLS?” was only seen by the 32 respondents who answered yes to question 2. Of those 32 respondents, 30 completed this question for a question-specific response rate of 94%. Since, this question allowed the participants to select multiple measures, the maximum number of
responses for each measure was 30. Library Collection was the only measure selected by all 30 responding libraries; making it the most commonly assessed aspect of public libraries.

Assessment of the library collection was followed closely by gathering data on Budget (i.e., Paid Staff (93%), Operating Revenue (93%), Operating Expenditures (90%)) and Library Programs (90%). In addition, 87% of responses indicated that they collect data about library services, 83% collect interlibrary loan data, 60% of libraries collect data about capital revenue and capital expenditures, and 57% reported collecting data on other electronic information. The full breakdown of responses is also outlined in Figure 2.

The fourth question, “What methods does your library use to collect assessment data for the IMLS Public Library Survey?” was seen by 32 participants and was responded to by 30 participants. The most frequently selected method by which Public Library Survey data is gathered was, “A calculation using data stored in an automated system”; this response was selected by 97% of the respondents who report to IMLS. This method was followed closely by, “a count of transactions”; selected by 27 (90%) of the 30 respondents. Data collection by survey was selected by 47% of respondents and assessment by a trained individual was selected by 7% of respondents. The lower response rates for data collection by the survey method and/or a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid staff</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenditures</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital revenue</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditures</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library collection</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library programs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other electronic information</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
trained individual might indicate that these methods are typically not necessary for providing the input and output measures solicited by the Public Library Survey.

The fifth question, “For which of the following performance concepts, if any, does your library collect assessment data?” was seen by all 43 participants and received 34 responses, for a response rate of 79%. The most commonly assessed performance concepts selected were “Number of Program Offerings” with 30 libraries, 88%, indicating that they collect data about this performance measure and “Quality of Service” with 20 libraries, 59%, indicating that they collect data about this performance concept. The least common performance concepts being measured by the responding NC public libraries were measuring “Consistent Service” and “Staff Attitudes”, both yielding response rates of only 21%. The complete set of response frequencies and percents can be seen in Figure 3. In Figure 3, the number of responses represents the number of NC public libraries currently collecting that specific performance measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Concept</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsive Service</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Attitudes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Staff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Efficiently</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Effectively</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing the Customer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Information Technology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability of the Library Website</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Library Catalog</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Information Resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display of Materials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Program Offerings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question six, “Does your library assess any performance concepts/measures other than those previously mentioned? (Please list other concepts/measures below)” was an open ended
exploratory question that was intended to collect information about any performance concepts that NC public libraries are currently measuring, in addition to those listed in question five. This question had a total of six responses, for a response rate of 14%. There does not seem to be any consistency or themes present in the limited responses received to this question. However, each non-response could be interpreted as the libraries’ not measuring any performance concepts other than those they selected in question 5. The participant’s fill-in responses are listed below in Figure 4.

Question 7, “How does your library collect information about the performance concepts selected/listed above? Select all that apply,” was responded to by 38 participants, for a question response rate of 88%. The most frequently selected method by which performance concept data is gathered was, “a count of transactions”; this response was selected by 92% of libraries who measure performance concepts. “A calculation using data stored in an automated system” was selected by 74% of the 38 respondents. Data collection by survey was selected by 63% of respondents and assessment by a trained individual was selected by 16% of respondents. Also, there were 2 “other” responses; one response did not specify what “other” method they use to collect data about performance concepts, the other response indicated that their library uses a “Library Resource Reaction Form”. The participant also indicated that this form, unlike a solicited survey is like a comment card that users can fill out at any time to communicate
thoughts about library staff and services. These responses indicate that data collection by the survey method and a trained individual are more commonly used when obtaining data pertaining to performance concepts (outcome measures), than when collecting input and output measures to the Public Library Survey. See Figure 5 for a comparison of the responses between methods used to gather input and output measures versus outcome measures.

The eighth question, “Are there any performance concepts (listed above or otherwise) that your library does NOT currently measure but would benefit from measuring?” was answered by 30 participants. Of those, 19 (63%) responded that there were no other measures beyond what they were already measuring that would benefit their libraries. The remaining 11 responses (37%) indicated that there were measures that would benefit their libraries if they were to implement them. Nine of the 11 participants, who responded yes, also specified the measures that would be beneficial to their libraries. The majority of the responses indicated a desire to assess
quality, value and other outcome measures (which they are not currently measuring). The individual responses are listed below in Figure 6.

Question nine, “What challenges or barriers exist for the library with regard to measuring these performance concepts?” was completed by 34 of the 43 participants for a response rate of 79%. This question allowed participants to select multiple answers. The most commonly selected barriers to measuring performance concepts that the library would ultimately benefit from were “Not enough staff” (68%), “The staff does not have the expertise needed for planning and implementing these kinds of tasks” (50%), and “It takes too much time” (47%). The least common barriers to measuring beneficial performance concepts were “The measure would be nice, but is too complicated for our needs” (12%) and “The measure would not be worthwhile considering the cost in time and money it would require” (9%). In the middle of the response set were barriers indicating that the libraries are, “Too busy coping with important things to worry about anything else” (29%) and others that, “Just have not gotten around to doing it yet” (24%). Several “other” responses reflect that “lack of budget” is also a common barrier to measuring performance concepts.

Question 10, “How important is assessment of library services and collections for the following tasks (i.e., Management, Budgeting, Quality Improvement, Advocacy, Comparison to
Peer Institutions) within your library?” was answered by 41 of the 43 participants, for a response rate of 95%. Each of the 5 tasks was responded to by all 41 participants, except for “comparison to peer institutions” which was received 40 responses; for a total of 204 individual selections within this question. Overall, 83% of the responses were selected on the “important” end of the scale (“somewhat important”, “very important” or “extremely important”), 11% of the responses were selected on the “unimportant” end of the scale (“somewhat unimportant”, “very unimportant” or “not at all important”), and 6% of the responses were selected as “neither important nor unimportant”. For the category of “management”, most respondents indicated that assessment was “very important”. For “budgeting”, most respondents felt that assessment was “extremely” important. For “quality improvement”, the most frequently selected response indicated that assessment was “extremely important” for this task. For “advocacy”, most libraries considered assessment to be “very important” for this task. For “comparisons to peer institutions”, most respondents felt that assessment was only “somewhat important” for this task.

The trend presented by the responses to this survey question indicates that for most North Carolina public libraries, assessment of library services and collections is important for management, budgeting, quality improvement, advocacy and comparison to peer institutions. See Figure 7 for a complete matrix of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons to Peer Institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Responses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The purpose of this research study was to determine what performance concepts public libraries in North Carolina are measuring and how those performance concepts are being measured, while also adding to the existing body of literature and knowledge about public library assessment practices. Overall, the results of this study show that most, if not all, North Carolina public libraries are conducting some form of assessment and that the data is being collected using a variety of different methods. Currently, the most commonly-assessed aspects of public libraries in North Carolina are the library collection, budget, programs, and services (including quality of service), and the most commonly used methods for collecting data are counts of transactions and calculations from data stored in an automated system.

The top performance concept, which was not an easily measured output statistic, being measured by more than half of the North Carolina public libraries, was quality of service. Other than concluding that quality of service is difficult to measure, the library and information science literature has little research on how public libraries measure this specific performance concept. This study only identified that, despite its apparent difficulty, quality of service is being measured and future study is needed to determine how certain outcome measures (like quality of service) are obtained.

The other noteworthy conclusion directly related to the original research questions is that there was a clear difference in how input and output measures (like PLS statistics) and outcome measures (like quality of service, attitudes and value) are measured in North Carolina public libraries. As the results show in figure 5, PLS statistics require high use of counts of transactions and calculations of data stored in automated systems, but low use of surveys or assessments by trained individuals. Conversely, when assessing performance concepts (largely comprised of outcome measures) counts and calculations are still used, but the use of surveys and assessments by trained individuals had noticeably surpassed their usage for PLS data gathering.
While not directly related to the original research questions, but completing the picture of assessment practices and motivations in public libraries, the survey results also indicated that about two thirds of public libraries in North Carolina are generally satisfied with the performance concepts they are currently measuring. This could be evidence that the field has begun to adequately address issues which have impeded meaningful library assessment; barriers to rudimentary assessment of services and collections seem to no longer be lack of funding or training as professional practice in this area has matured; however, over one third of public libraries reported that would like to continue gathering more and different measures in order to benefit their libraries.

Also, not only do many public libraries want to improve and add to their current assessment practices, but the North Carolina public libraries overwhelmingly indicated that assessment is important to their library. The survey results indicated that assessment is important and necessary for effective management, budgeting, quality improvement, and advocacy. However, assessment does not come without its challenges. Even the libraries not looking to add more measures to their repertoire face the obstacles of not enough staff, time, money or training to assess many of the performance concepts that would help ultimately help them improve their libraries.

Clearly, despite the high rate of libraries performing various activities and the two thirds of the libraries who are satisfied with the types of assessment their library currently conducts, there is still a need for continue support of assessment in public libraries. Public libraries need assessment measures for management, budgeting and quality improvement; public libraries need assessment for continued customer satisfaction and they need customer satisfaction in order to get more funding. Therefore, even those libraries who measure everything already or who do not have a desire to measure anything more than government-requested statistics could benefit from added funding and staff time dedicated to assessment activities.
The data from this study highlights public libraries’ growing interest in measuring more than just government-solicited input and output measures. The results of this survey also show that public libraries are beginning to use more complicated methods (survey and trained assessment personnel) in order to measure the more complicated performance measures. The results of this study also presents several opportunities for further investigation into specific performance concepts that we now know are being measured by a significant subset of North Carolina public libraries. Also, despite several comments that lack of funding is a barrier to performing more advanced assessment activities, this study was unable to draw any conclusions about the direct relationship between library budgets and frequency of assessment activities.

Conclusion

In 1987, Baker conducted a study to discover whether or not North Carolina public libraries were using output measures, as opposed to the commonly used input measures. Baker found that public libraries were doing the bare minimum (e.g., not collecting a lot of output measures) due to lack of time, staff, or funding. However, the field of library assessment and evaluation has changed significantly since then, and now, measuring public library performance via both input and output measures is commonplace through the use of the IMLS Public Library Survey and the popular HAPLR survey.

In spite of these widespread changes in library assessment practices there was little to no contemporary research on what public libraries are choosing to assess outside of the IMLS input and output measures. Much of the literature in the field of library assessment points to the need to measure more than just the tangible inputs and outputs, but to begin measuring outcomes. Therefore, in response to this gap in the research, the purpose of this study was to investigate what performance concepts (many of which are outcome based measures) North Carolina public libraries are measuring and how those performance concepts are being measured.
This study has concluded that, in addition to gathering input and output measures, North Carolina public libraries are also beginning to assess performance concepts. The current research found that most North Carolina public libraries perceive assessment as an important contributor to library effectiveness, and while many libraries are satisfied with their current assessment practices (combination of input, output, and possibly outcome measures), a good portion of North Carolina public libraries see room for improvement, and desire to start measuring more outcome measures.

Also, while library assessment practices have advanced since Baker’s study in 1987, and some public libraries are now not only measuring inputs and outputs, but also measures of quality, value and impact, the public libraries are still facing many of the same barriers to assessment. Instead of struggling to collect output measures, public libraries are now struggling to find the time, staff, training and funding to support learning about and implementing outcome measures. Some libraries have already been successful, others are just beginning, and even then there are others who show no interest in advancing assessment practices towards this new set of measures. That said, as public libraries are increasingly being asked by stakeholders to provide satisfactory evidence of their value and impact, this research study provides evidence that many North Carolina public libraries are not performing advanced enough assessment to provide substantive evidence of value and impact. Thus the expectations of the stakeholders may be unattainable for many North Carolina public libraries at this point in time. However, this study helps bring attention to the fact that if stakeholders continue to request measures of value and impact, public libraries are going to need help to overcome some of the common barriers to implementing assessment, including training and funding.

The current research study has concluded that North Carolina public libraries are now measuring both tangible and intangible performance concepts; consistently gathering data about input and output measures, and increasingly gathering data about outcome measures. This study also serves as a benchmark to further situate the past, present and future research regarding
library assessment in public libraries. Furthermore, this study has provided a basis for future research about the effectiveness of individual measures of performance being used by public libraries. Finally, this research has informed stakeholders about the types of performance concepts they can reasonably expect their public library to generate.
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**Appendix A - Survey questions**

Library Assessment in Public Libraries [IRB Study #11-0227]

Dear participant,

The following survey, which will ask you questions about your library's assessment practices, should take approximately 15 minutes of your time and is voluntary. You may stop taking the survey at anytime, and you may skip any question for any reason. You will not receive any direct benefit from being in this research study. All possible measures have been taken to protect the confidentiality of your answers.

I will report only summaries of the aggregated data. This means that your responses will be combined with all of the other responses received and will not be able to be identified as yours. Deductive disclosure which is the discerning of an individual respondent's identity and responses through the use of known characteristics of that individual is also possible but unlikely.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, you may contact me via email at asinnott@email.unc.edu or my faculty advisor, Phillip Edwards, at phillip.m.edwards@unc.edu.

All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research subject you may contact, anonymously if you wish, the Institutional Review Board at (919) 966-3113 or via email at IRB_subjects@unc.edu with study number 11-0227.

By selecting "yes" to the following question and completing the survey, you agree to be a participant in this study.

Thank you,
Amy Sinnott
MSLS Candidate 2011
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
asinnott@email.unc.edu

1. I have read the above consent form and wish to participate in this study. (Please check the appropriate box below.)
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

Every year, the U.S. Census Bureau sends out a survey requesting information from public libraries on behalf of the Institute for Museums and Library Services (IMLS). This voluntary census is known as part of the Public Library Survey. The Public Library Survey collects and publishes descriptive statistics on more than 9,000 public libraries annually.

2. Does your library provide assessment data to the IMLS as part of the Public Library Survey?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
3. Which types of Public Library Survey data does your library report to the IMLS? (Please select all that apply.)

- Paid staff
- Operating revenue
- Operating expenditures
- Capital revenue
- Capital expenditures
- Library collection
- Services
- Interlibrary loan
- Library programs
- Other electronic information

4. What methods does your library use to collect assessment data for the IMLS Public Library Survey? (Please select all that apply.)

- A count of transactions (manually or automatic) (e.g., performing a manual count of tic marks or automatic count generated by door sensors to determine the number of library users)
- A calculation using data stored in an automated system (e.g., running a report from a library database to determine total number of registered library patrons)
- A survey of a sample of the population (printed, internet or phone) (e.g., asking program attendees to fill out a questionnaire to determine user satisfaction with a library program)
- An assessment by a trained individual (e.g., external consultant or trained library employee recruits participants and asks them to perform certain searching tasks and then evaluates their performance to determine usability of the library webpage)
- Other: (please specify) ____________________

Assessment of library services and collections may take a variety of forms and be conducted for a variety of purposes.
5. For which of the following performance concepts, if any, does your library collect assessment data? (Please select all that apply.)
- Responsive Service
- Consistent Service
- Quality of Service
- Staff Skills
- Staff Attitudes
- Quality of Staff
- Working Efficiently
- Working Effectively
- Knowing the Customer
- Reliable Information Technology
- Usability of the Library Website
- Quality of Library Catalog
- Availability of Information Resources
- Display of Materials
- Number of Program Offerings

6. Does your library assess any performance concepts/measures other than those previously mentioned? (Please list other concepts/measures below.)

7. How does your library collect information about the performance concepts selected/listed above? Select all that apply.
- A count of transactions (manually or automatic) (e.g., performing a manual count of tic marks or automatic count generated by door sensors to determine the number of library users)
- A calculation using data stored in an automated system (e.g., running a report from a library database to determine total number of registered library patrons)
- A survey of a sample of the population (printed, internet or phone) (e.g., asking program attendees to fill out a questionnaire to determine user satisfaction with a library program)
- An assessment by a trained individual (e.g., external consultant or trained library employee recruits participants and asks them to perform certain searching tasks and then evaluates their performance to determine usability of the library webpage)
- Other: (please specify) ____________________

8. Are there any performance concepts (listed above or otherwise) that your library does NOT currently measure but would benefit from measuring?
- Yes: (please specify) ____________________
- No
9. What challenges or barriers exist for the library with regard to measuring these performance concepts? (Please select all that apply.)
- It takes too much time.
- Not enough staff.
- The staff does not have the expertise needed for planning and implementing these kinds of tasks.
- The measure would be nice, but is too complicated for our needs.
- Too busy coping with important things to worry about anything else.
- Just have not gotten around to doing it yet.
- The measure would not be worthwhile considering the cost in time and money it would require.
- Other: (please specify) ____________________

10. How important is assessment of library services and collections for the following tasks within your library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix B - Invitation e-mail with survey link to be sent to selected participants

Hello,

My name is Amy Sinnott and I am conducting a research study, in partial fulfillment of my degree requirements, in the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill under the supervision of my faculty advisor, Dr. Phillip Edwards. I'm studying the library assessment practices of North Carolina public libraries.

As an individual occupying a managerial role in a library you have been specially selected to represent your public library in this study. Research indicates that those individuals who hold a managerial role in libraries are generally more concerned with organizational effectiveness and ways it can be improved (e.g., assessment, evaluation, marketing, etc.) (Singh, 2009).

Your perspective on library assessment, as well as, the information about what library assessment your public library may or may not conduct will be valuable to the advancement of library assessment and public libraries.

I invite you to participate in this study by completing a 10 question survey about your public library’s assessment and evaluation practices. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes. Please complete the survey by March 21, 2011. The survey can be accessed by clicking the link at the bottom of this e-mail.

If you delegate assessment responsibilities to another member of your staff please feel free to forward this email to that particular individual.

Your participation is voluntary. You may stop participating at any time. You may skip any question you choose not to answer for any reason.

If you choose to participate in this study, your participation will be confidential. The Qualtrics software used to administer the survey ensures that any identifying information will be held confidentially and available only to me, the researcher. All responses will be de-identified prior to analysis.

Please feel free to contact me via email at asinnott@email.unc.edu or my faculty advisor, Dr. Phillip Edwards, at phillip.m.edwards@unc.edu if you have any questions regarding this survey. You may access the survey by going to the following link: [insert survey link here]

Thank you,

Amy Sinnott  
MSLS Candidate 2011  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
asinnott@email.unc.edu

All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research subject you may contact, anonymously if you wish, the Institutional Review Board at (919) 966-3113 or via email at IRB_subjects@unc.edu. Be sure to reference IRB study # 11-0227.
Appendix C - Follow-up e-mail with survey link

Hello,

My name is Amy Sinnott and I am conducting a research study, in partial fulfillment of my degree requirements, in the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill under the supervision of my faculty advisor, Dr. Phillip Edwards. I’m studying the library assessment practices of North Carolina public libraries.

In mid-February, you received a link to a survey about your library system’s assessment practices, and I just wanted to remind you that as an individual occupying a managerial role in a library you have been specially selected to represent your public library in this study. Research indicates that those individuals who hold a managerial role in libraries are generally more concerned with organizational effectiveness and ways it can be improved (e.g., assessment, evaluation, marketing, etc.) (Singh, 2009).

Your perspective on library assessment, as well as, the information about what library assessment your public library may or may not conduct will be valuable to the advancement of library assessment and public libraries.

I invite you to participate in this study by completing a 10 question survey about your public library’s assessment and evaluation practices. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes. Please complete the survey by March 21, 2011. The survey can be accessed by clicking the link at the bottom of this e-mail.

If you delegate assessment responsibilities to another member of your staff please feel free to forward this email to that particular individual.

Your participation is voluntary. You may stop participating at any time. You may skip any question you choose not to answer for any reason.

If you choose to participate in this study, your participation will be confidential. The Qualtrics software used to administer the survey ensures that any identifying information will be held confidentially and available only to me, the researcher. All responses will be de-identified prior to analysis.

Please feel free to contact me via email at asinnott@email.unc.edu or my faculty advisor, Dr. Phillip Edwards, at phillip.m.edwards@unc.edu if you have any questions regarding this survey. You may access the survey by going to the following link: [insert survey link here]

Thank you,

Amy Sinnott
MSLS Candidate 2011
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
asinnott@email.unc.edu

All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research subject you may contact, anonymously if you wish, the Institutional Review Board at (919) 966-3113 or via email at IRB_subjects@unc.edu. Be sure to reference study # 11-0227.