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Rollins: The facts

Location: Winter Park, FL

Carnegie Class: Master's/L

Endowment: $366,900,000

Students: 3,264 FTE

Faculty members: 233

Olin Library: 10 librarians
Liaison “Job Description”

- Program Goals—further strategic priorities, expand instruction, support the college, develop collection development, partner with faculty.

- Expectations—Two way communication, partnership, development, innovation.

- Liaison Goals—personal contact, two way communication, partnerships around information literacy, collection development, innovative projects,

- Tips & Tricks—persistence, interest, problem solving, learning, communication, understanding.

See [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_facpub/72/](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_facpub/72/) Appendix 1 for more details.
Evaluate the liaison librarian, not the Program

- LibQual and MISO—but needed more detail.
- Based on faculty perceptions (including adjuncts.)
- Simple to use for both librarians and faculty.
- Respect the confidentiality of respondents and the privacy of librarians
- Formative not normative. A self-reflective assessment that supports continued development.
- At a small college will faculty be prepared to give their librarian colleagues honest feedback?
- Conducted every two years (next up: Round 3, Spring 2017.)
The survey (Appendix 2)

- Respondents identify their department, then their liaison (or “I don’t know.”)
- Select interactions from a list of 18 (e.g. He/she instructed or presented to a class of mine.”)
- Rate the interactions overall (with room for comments.)
- Identify how much interaction they want (less/more/about the same.)
- Comment on how the liaison could do better.
- Demographics: rank and seniority.
- General comments.
Formative Assessment

- Librarians as a group review anonymized, aggregated results.
- Each liaison reviews their own results (including results from respondents who identified with one of “their depts.”, but did not know the liaison (~11%))
- Reviews previous liaison plan and prepares updated plan.
- Meet with the director.
- Relationship between interaction rating and amount of interactions desired.
- Comments give useful feedback on what works and what does not.
- Assessment as “push poll.”
Liaison as “Vulnerable method”
(Larry Miller, 1977)

- Three rounds of surveys by 2017.
- Librarians are free to use them in P&T reviews.
- Temptation to try and ID respondents.
- Power dynamics of the meeting with the director.
- Faculty members are prepared to give honest feedback.
Want more details?

- [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_facpub/72/](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_facpub/72/)
- These slides [http://www.slideshare.net/JonathanMiller70/rollins-liaison-evaluation-arl-meeting-ala-conference-2016](http://www.slideshare.net/JonathanMiller70/rollins-liaison-evaluation-arl-meeting-ala-conference-2016)