

**Executive Summary**  
Academic Program Review  
Gleeson Library|Geschke Center

**External Reviewers**

Michelle Millet, Director of the Library, John Carroll University  
Jennifer Nutefall, University Librarian, Santa Clara University

**Campus Visit**

October 23-25, 2017

Dear Dean Cannon and Associate Dean Calhoun,

First, thank you very much for inviting us to be the external reviewers for the Gleeson Library|Geschke Center at the University of San Francisco. We appreciated the opportunity to be involved in your review process and learn more about USF. Prior to our visit, we read the self-study written by the Dean of the University Libraries, Associate Dean, and department heads. Additionally, we were provided with USF's Vision, Mission, and Values statement, and a number of supporting documents.

Our site visit included meetings with each library department, and library staff around topics such as library facilities, marketing and outreach, and the budget. We also met with the Provost and selected faculty.

We would like to start our summary with what the library is currently doing well. It was a pleasure meeting the library staff and we appreciated their candor and openness. It was clear that the library staff are collegial and value each other's work. We appreciated their openness and sense of doing more with a real and perceived notion of less. Library staff consistently mentioned successful communication within library departments. The faculty we met with spoke well of their experiences with individual librarians and their ability to collaborate on projects and classroom teaching. Finally, we want to commend the library renovations that have occurred over the last several years. In these current financial times, the Provost's contribution towards the recent \$2 million renovation is significant and is clearly having a positive outcome for students. During our site visit we saw a lively building, filled with engaged students.

1. How did the external review committee rate the quality of the program - excellent, very good, good, adequate, or poor? How does the program compare with benchmark top-tier programs nationally? Please provide a brief rationale for the external review committee's rating.

We give the library a rating of good. The library currently supports the needs of the campus community and there are opportunities for advancement as articulated in our four priorities below.

2. What are the most important general issues that emerged from the external review process?

There are four priority issues that emerged from our review. More information on each is articulated below. The themes are to:

- Disband and reconfigure the liaison program
  - Create an integrated instruction/information literacy program
  - Realign the organizational structure to reflect the library's priorities and address issues within the organization
  - Articulate a clear sense of priorities
3. What specific recommendations for improving the program's quality has the external review committee made to the Dean?

Our recommendations focus on four priority areas.

### **Priority 1: Disband and reconfigure the liaison program**

It was clear throughout our discussions that there is discontent with the liaison program, where librarians should be focusing their time and attention, and some struggling with trying to decide if everyone should, in fact, be a liaison. Many libraries are currently struggling with the structure of their liaison programs and a literature review and environmental scan would be useful as the library rethinks its program. Some of the questions that should be discussed include what the liaison duties involve, what the percentages of the liaison's duties are, who participates, and how academic/co-curricular departments are assigned. We heard from many meetings that there is an increasing focus on instruction, and rightfully so, that can assist with conversations on priorities and how the program could be structured.

### **Priority 2: Create an integrated instruction/information literacy program**

Library learning outcomes were created as part of the self-study process. We applaud this move and think there are excellent opportunities for continuing discussions and revision of the learning outcomes. Most notably the librarians should align their teaching with the learning outcomes, implement assessment of the learning outcomes, and put together a comprehensive assessment plan prior to fall 2018. As teaching is connected to the redesign of the library liaison program we also recommend that teaching is aligned with appropriate interest and skills of librarians.

### **Priority 3: Realign the organizational structure to reflect the library's priorities and address issues within the organization**

The library organizational structure should be revisited. While this work should evaluate all library positions and work, a few areas that would benefit from particular attention include:

- The Dean and the library need a second Associate Dean position. One Associate Dean position could potentially oversee teaching, learning, and engagement while the other position would oversee areas such as collections, scholarly communication, digitization, and systems.
- The library's leadership team should consist of the Dean and Associate Deans with a larger group consisting of the department heads meeting on a regular basis.
- The Associate Deans should take on the role of mentoring new librarians allowing the Dean to focus on encouraging experienced librarians to continue with their professional growth, service, and scholarship and also fundraising.
- With the upcoming retirement of the Systems Librarian, the position description should be revised to include coordination of all library technology. A priority should be placed on implementing automation opportunities and eliminating manual systems work.
- A strong leader is needed for the instruction program. This individual should spearhead discussions of the draft learning outcomes, assessment of the learning outcomes, creation of learning opportunities and discussion for all librarians who teach, and develop and implement a 3-5 year instruction and assessment plan.
- A position should be developed from existing staff lines to create a full-time library marketing/outreach role.

#### **Priority 4: Articulate a clear sense of priorities**

It was clear for our meetings and discussions that many staff felt they did not have a clear sense of priorities and where they should be focusing their time and effort. At a minimum, the library needs to come to an understanding around library-wide priorities. One suggestion is framing a library-wide discussion on priorities in terms of "what we value." From our discussions possible priorities could include student learning and instruction, outreach, space renovations, streamlining manual workflows, and support for faculty research. As was mentioned in the self-study document, the library should update its mission statement as this could also provide clarity to the library staff on its priorities.

4. In the opinion of the external review committee, is the program following the University's strategic initiatives?

The Library directly ties into several aspects of USF's [2028 Planning](#) Document, specifically under the area of academic excellence. The library "Supports a faculty of teaching scholars whose pedagogy is informed by rigorous research and who engage in their disciplines, participate in scholarly discourse that constitutes serious inquiry and involve students in their research efforts." Support is provided through information literacy instruction, faculty/librarian partnerships and collaborations, and the electronic and print collections.

5. In what ways is the program contributing to the goal of making the University of San Francisco a premier Jesuit, Catholic urban university with a global perspective that educates leaders who will fashion a more humane and just world?

Both external reviewers believe that libraries are at the heart of the Jesuit mission of educating men and women for others. Libraries provide safe places where conversation and critical thinking are not only encouraged and valued, but are at the heart of what we do.

6. What is the timetable for the response to the external review committee's recommendations for program improvement? What can the Office of the Provost do to appropriately respond to the review?

We believe that the Provost's Office should and will continue to support the Dean as he makes appropriate position changes and aligns the libraries with upcoming changes and university priorities. A plan that divides priorities into short term (one year) and long term (2-3 years) might be one way to ensure that the momentum evident in the library from the self-study and external review is maintained.

7. What general comments or issues, if any, are crucial to understanding the reviewers report?

The library is well positioned to continue delivering quality services to its community. With the increased focus on student learning the library should sharpen its focus on key initiatives that support and enhance student learning. This can be accomplished through articulating priorities, reorganizing with a focus on student learning, and leadership.

No additional information is necessary to understand the report.