

worthwhile suggestions for new strategies and ideas in those chapters addressing their strongest areas.

**Sara Arnold-Garza**, *Albert S. Cook Library, Towson University*

*The Quality Infrastructure: Measuring, Analyzing, and Improving Library Services.* Edited by Sarah Anne Murphy. Chicago: ALA Editions, 2014. Pp. xiii+186. \$60.00 (paper). ISBN 978-0-8389-1173-0.

Academic libraries are increasingly called upon to demonstrate the value they bring to the academic experience. Proving value by improving existing services and programs, as well as proactively responding to actual user needs, can be more easily accomplished through ongoing and sustained assessment programs. This collection of case studies presents a variety of approaches undertaken by academic libraries in developing robust assessment programs—their own “quality infrastructures.” Although the examples primarily feature large research institutions or institutions with resources to spare, the lessons shared in this collection make it an excellent primer for anyone seeking to develop or expand upon assessment activities at their library.

The volume editor, Sarah Anne Murphy, has worked at the Ohio State University Libraries since 1999 and is their current coordinator of assessment (171). Each chapter of the work features a different institution. Murphy charged her contributors to discuss how a “systematic quality or assessment program” (ix) became established at their library, to describe the roles of those in the program, to provide a discussion on recent projects or efforts, and to “indicate how their program has affected sustainable change within their organization as evidenced by continuous learning and improvement” (ix). Thus, each chapter strikes a balance between “how we did it” details and a more holistic view of assessment. Readers may not learn the ins and outs of LibQUAL, but they will learn how to develop institutional support and the kinds of staff skills need for assessment activities, making the work valuable to librarians within a range of assessment program experience. Viewed as a whole, the chapters reveal several universal truths about assessment programs in academic libraries: the need for a culture of assessment, a strong focus on the user, the importance of staff and staff development, and the use of “data-driven” decisions.

The first four chapters feature large research institutions with decades of assessment experience. The first chapter, on the University of Washington Libraries, is written by Steven Hiller and Stephanie Wright. Hiller serves as the libraries’ director of planning and assessment, and his long background in assessment resonates throughout the entire volume. His work on assessment with the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) either as a consultant (141) or

through his development, with Jim Self, of the ARL program ESP: Effective, Sustainable, and Practical Library Assessment (36) appears in at least half the chapters. Wright is coauthor of the ARL SPEC Kit on Library Assessment (8) and is also cited by a number of institutions as an important resource. Although more an overview of the history of assessment at the University of Washington, this chapter establishes many of the volume's larger themes, particularly the importance of a "culture of assessment" (2)—meaning assessment is embraced as an institution-wide priority and as a vital component of daily work.

The University of Virginia Library, featured next, has perhaps the longest history of assessment, with recorded activities dating back to the 1920s (25). Lynda S. White, coauthor of the aforementioned ARL SPEC Kit on Library Assessment, focuses on assessment as generating "data to make choices" (26), a theme echoed throughout the work. White describes University of Virginia's movement from simple user surveys to the implementation of the Balanced Scorecard management tool. The Balanced Scorecard is a form of self-assessment that "balances four perspectives: the *customer*, or our users' needs or customer service; *internal processes*, or how well we manage our processes to provide customer service; *finance*, or what it costs us to provide our materials and services; and *learning and growth*, or how well we are positioned to learn and change as our users' needs change" (32). Showing that assessment can take time, fine-tuning this implementation has been a decade-long process, with the newest iteration emerging in 2013 (33).

The third chapter demonstrates how assessment programs shift as an organization changes and grows. The University of Arizona Libraries have completed assessment for more than 20 years. In that time they experienced "three major organizational restructurings . . . and several small-scale reorganizations" that impacted "the implementation and use of quality approaches and tools" (41). Instead of using a formal assessment program, the University of Arizona relies on Total Quality Management (TQM) as a guiding principle, focusing on "customer satisfaction, continuous improvement, empowerment, and teamwork" (42). In line with this, the University of Arizona implemented elements of Balanced Scorecard. This chapter's discussion of the challenges of assessment is valuable, especially establishing outcomes measures and assessing complex systems and processes (53–54). Syracuse University, in the fourth chapter, likewise presents a combined methodological approach. Syracuse established a Program Management Center, incorporating elements from the Six Sigma and Project Management Professionals methodologies (60). In a chapter that is oriented toward process and program, the authors illustrate how to systematically investigate workflows and describe the development of a "Library Measures Data Repository" (68–70) to support library-wide approaches to improving service.

Two institutions in this work describe implementing the Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence, which "consists of sets of questions within seven key categories deemed critical to successful organizational performance" (75). The Information Services Office (ISO) at the

National Institute of Standards and Technology, though not an academic library, is well situated within this work because of its focus on research, liaison programs, and efforts to demonstrate its value to its parent organization. The four authors describe “how the ISO introduces new hires into its organizational culture” (74), a user-focused culture guided by the Baldrige Criteria. This culture is well defined, with a clear philosophy and vision supported by “role model” practices and documentation (74). The emphasis here is not just on collecting data but also on knowing “what data to collect, how frequently to collect it, and how to interpret it” as the key to success (81). The authors from Emory University, in chapter 6, describe the Baldrige Criteria as “a framework that promotes continuous improvement by focusing on the customer using an integrated management system approach and data to achieve measurable results” (92). This leads to the establishment of an overarching “Business Plan” initiative and a reworking of their existing assessment program (93).

Chapter 7 provides a consortial perspective on assessment, describing the role of the evaluation and assessment librarian for the Ontario Council of University Libraries. Librarians interested in electronic resource management, statistical interoperability, and assessment tools for collaborative collection development will find this chapter of particular interest. Librarians looking to add an assessment librarian or analyst in their institution will find chapter 8 and the example of University of California, San Diego, libraries enlightening. The analyst is a “hybrid of positions found both in academia and the private sector” (119) who provides the institution with the support necessary to “make well-informed, data driven decisions” (119). The authors reveal how the analyst supports a variety of library projects as well as outlining the myriad questions an institution must answer before implementing such a role.

Guidance for developing new assessment staff is also provided in chapter 9, which describes the process undertaken by Kansas State University Libraries to establish an Office of Library Planning and Assessment in 2010. As with the University of Arizona Libraries, Kansas State University’s position was the result of an overhaul to the libraries’ organizational structure, one that hoped to “reflect the goals of the twenty-first-century academic library” (130). Interestingly, the libraries reorganized along “user groups rather than academic disciplines,” which has provided its own unique benefits and challenges (130). This office of four works together on projects such as implementing LibQUAL and supporting the university’s reaccreditation. This support for accreditation and the libraries’ deep involvement in the university’s strategic planning greatly enhanced not only the libraries’ visibility but their value on campus (139).

Chapter 10 provides a liberal arts perspective as author Lucretia McCulley describes the creation of the University of Richmond Boatwright Library’s assessment committee. McCulley identifies the keys to assessment in a small liberal arts institution as “support from the library director, commitment to assessment at the university level, and motivation and desire among library staff” (152). After a visit by ARL consultants Jim Self and Steve Hiller in 2008 (141),

University of Richmond developed a cross-departmental committee to guide assessment work (142). Early priorities of the committee members were to educate themselves on assessment as well as to “educate and inform the staff on what assessment means to them, the library organization, and the institution” (143). The committee also established an important collaboration with the university’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness (144), bringing greater visibility.

The final chapter also provides the perspective of an institution that relies on an assessment committee, though in the case of the Washington University in St. Louis Libraries a volunteer assessment team is led by a full-time assessment coordinator (155). Established in 2006, the committee began after undertaking the aforementioned ARL program on assessment (157). Here the authors note that the “concept that assessment is everyone’s job has been an important ingredient in mainstreaming the libraries’ assessment program” (158). Their assessment model focuses on a “hub of knowledge” as staff works together to develop and identify the skills and experience needed for ongoing assessment (159). Staff expertise in assessment is thus developed outside the committee and becomes an accepted and relied-upon aspect of daily work, leading to a true culture of assessment.

Throughout the volume, the authors ably demonstrate that assessment “not only improves the value of library services, but aids a library or library organization in communicating its value” (vii). Readers understand how the results of a survey or program lead to changes or innovations in service and witness relationships developed across departments and across campus. However, I felt a need for further discussion on how these institutions defined value and how this value is articulated to various stakeholders. Overall, this is a fine overview of the positive role that assessment plays in academic libraries and a good introduction for those looking to implement a program.

**Margaret E. Dull**, *Goucher College*

*Implementing an Inclusive Staffing Model for Today’s Reference Services: A Practical Guide for Librarians.* By Julia K. Nims, Paula Storm, and Robert Stevens. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2014. Pp. xvii+143. \$65.00 (paper). ISBN 978-0-8108-9128-9.

**I**mplementing an Inclusive Staffing Model for Today’s Reference Services: A Practical Guide for Librarians attempts to address core issues for modern reference services. The authors’ primary argument is that patrons’ ability to seek information for themselves on the Internet has made it so that questions received in libraries no longer fall along a wide spectrum of difficulty. Instead, librarians are now most likely to receive extremely simple questions that do not require in-depth reference training—such as directions within the building—or more difficult questions that require significant staff time and expertise. In