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Introduction

We have embraced our first academic program review as an opportunity to:

1.) use a review method that is a common institutional process for academic programs and thus familiar to faculty and academic administration;
2.) use a process that is understood and accepted by our faculty colleagues as a valuable process for institutional planning and resource allocation;
3) engage the entire campus, faculty, students, administrators, and library personnel, in a comprehensive, rigorous review and study of library programs, services and resources, highlight the value of the library in the academic mission of the institution;
4.) develop a better understanding for librarians and teaching faculty of information literacy as the library’s academic program;
5.) inform our stakeholders of the changing role of academic libraries in the 21st century;
6.) establish a baseline for future reviews.

Adapting the Academic Program Review

The multi-month process has been an exercise in project organization, teamwork, consensus, prioritization and communication.

Developing the Self-Study

Established 10 self-study topics based on current library trends and ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education: Communicating Value; Budget and Development; Information Technology; Curriculum, Teaching and Learning; Information Services; Physical and Digital Collection Development and Management; Scholarly Communication; University Archives; Re-engineering Library Faculty and Staff; and Repurposing Library Space
Staff Involvement

1.) all library staff involved in workgroups from the outset
2.) expert project organization and management has been necessary to involve all library staff in teams, determine a consensus-building process, and coordinate decision-making, research and writing from multiple participants
3.) project managers coordinated staff teams in consensus-building and decision-making and coordinated research and input from students, faculty, and campus institutional research, assessment and administration

Campus Participation

Sought institutional, faculty and student input

Draft Review Process

1.) internal iterations/staff input
2.) library subcommittee and internal reviewers
3.) external reviewers

Lessons Learned

1.) internal and External reviewers provided useful comments for framing and testing justifications
2.) internal and External reviewers corroborated areas which need work
3.) Library Profile data: Association of Research Libraries (ARL) annual statistics and National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data more useful than institutional (IR) data
4.) ACRL Standards do not completely articulate growing interest in scholarly communication beyond the institutional repository e.g. altmetrics, copyright, publishing venues, impact, open access
5.) Final step: importance of Action Plan and operationalizing the program review