

Researchers, Instructors, & Staff Scholarship

---

11-14-2014

## Engaging Faculty and Students through Collection Assessment

Brian Gray

*Case Western Reserve University, bcg8@case.edu*

Daniela Solomon

*Case Western Reserve University, dxs594@case.edu*

Mark Eddy

*Case Western Reserve University, mxe37@case.edu*

Stephen Toombs

*Case Western Reserve University*

Author(s) ORCID Identifier:

 Daniela Solomon

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.case.edu/staffworks>

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Solomon, D., Gray, B., Eddy, M., & Toombs, S. (2014). Engaging Faculty and Students through Collection Assessment. Academic Library Association Of Ohio Annual Conference 2014.

This Poster is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarly Commons @ Case Western Reserve University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Researchers, Instructors, & Staff Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons @ Case Western Reserve University. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@case.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@case.edu).

CWRU authors have made this work freely available. [Please tell us](#) how this access has benefited or impacted you!



# Engaging Faculty and Students through Collection Assessment

This poster session by Brian Gray (brian.c.gray@case.edu), Daniela Solomon (daniela.solomon2@case.edu, Mark Eddy (mark.eddy@case.edu), and Stephen Toombs (stephen.toombs@case.edu).

**Engagement issue summary:** How do faculty and graduate students provide input for collection development? How well have librarians understood the research needs of recently tenured faculty or recent graduates?

**Engagement issue approach:** Four librarians from four different collection areas — the humanities, the social sciences, and 2 unique areas in engineering — all set out to see if evaluating the collection against recent publications by faculty and students can foster stronger engagement between them and the subject collectors in their areas.

## Methodology and Results

	<i>Humanities</i>	<i>Social Science</i>	<i>Engineering</i>	<i>Engineering</i>
<b>Content analyzed</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monograph by music professor.</li> <li>2. Journal article by music professor (approaching tenure).</li> <li>3. PhD dissertation music education.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dissertation by Sociology grad student.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Articles since at CWRU from Macromolecular faculty awarded tenure 2012.</li> <li>2. Articles since at CWRU from Macromolecular professor promoted to professor 2013.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Articles (since at CWRU) by electrical engineering &amp; computer science professor in new research area (bioinformatics &amp; computational biology).</li> <li>2. Master thesis of student from above faculty member.</li> </ol>
<b>Tools used</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CWRU catalog</li> <li>• OhioLINK</li> <li>• WorldCat</li> <li>• Method of collection analysis: manual tabulation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CWRU catalog &amp; e-journal portal</li> <li>• OhioLINK catalog &amp; EJC</li> <li>• CWRU and OhioLINK databases</li> <li>• Method of collection analysis: manual tabulation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web of Science</li> <li>• EndNote Web or RefWorks</li> <li>• Excel</li> <li>• Catalog</li> <li>• OhioLINK</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CWRU catalog</li> <li>• OhioLINK</li> <li>• Internet</li> <li>• EndNote</li> <li>• Method of collection analysis: manual tabulation in Excel.</li> </ul>
<b>Results</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monograph: KSL holds 72%.</li> <li>2. Journal article: KSL holds 55%.</li> <li>3. Dissertation: KSL holds 94%.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 88% access coverage for all cited sources.</li> <li>2. Cited source type - 79% articles, 21% books.</li> </ol>	<p>Faculty publications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 94% of articles available.</li> <li>• 548 citations in 20 article but 230 duplicate citations.</li> </ul> <p>2. Faculty publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2331 article citations from 75 journal articles (not deduped yet and book citations not analyzed).</li> <li>• preliminary results are 99% availability.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faculty publications KSL holds 44%; 30% free online. Types of documents: 80% articles; 2% books; 11% proceedings (mostly free online); 2% software; 3% websites; 1 dataset.</li> <li>2. Master thesis KSL holds 57%; 13% free online. Types of documents: 87% articles; 4% books; 9% proceedings.</li> </ol> <p>Interesting: 7% reference pre 2000s; explosion of sources after 2002.</p>
<b>Collection development adjustments</b>	Heavy collecting of PhD dissertations in music education not supported by this study. Heavy use of and need for primary source material in any format is justified.	This example suggests that current collection strategies in this research area are sufficient, with no adjustments needed under the current budget structure.	No adjustments but confirmation that macromolecular faculty use the primary journals of field mostly and library must fight to keep those titles.	Supports the current budget structure 80% articles, 20% books. Since many sources are open access, there is no need to increase subscription to improve coverage.
<b>Engagement opportunities</b>	Engagement during analysis limited to author of the monograph, but extensive engagement before analysis in the form of collaborative retrospective acquisitions. Librarian interacted much more with the graduate student during her research, including acquisitions tailored to her research.	No engagement with the author. Analysis supports possible future networking strategies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage authors about unavailable resources.</li> <li>• Engage faculty/researcher networks for future analyses.</li> <li>• Track student/faculty research networks and processes.</li> </ul>	Conversations with faculty have centered on management of citations since the quality of some was suspect through this process. Also, conversations about their subset of research have developed based on abstracts and subject terms of the articles used.	No prior engagement. After analysis: discussions on quality of citations and how to improve it, "cited reference search" in WOS, author unique identifier such as Researcher ID and ORCID, purchasing recommendations, metrics, public access policies. Interesting note: we discovered we have a common interest and are considering collaborations on a research project!

## The Future

**Future engagement** with faculty and students via collection analysis may include: a.) the study of "research clusters" — faculty mentors and their graduate student advisees and how the needs of the current group may anticipate the needs of students, or faculty yet to enter a degree program; b.) discussions with faculty on the adequacy of existing collecting profiles; c.) discussion with university administrators about the fit of collections and research, including the introduction of new programs and the hiring of new faculty. More detailed results of this pilot project may be seen via a LibGuide at: [researchguides.case.edu/alao2014](http://researchguides.case.edu/alao2014).