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Data Trends
1. Most Important Issues

- Data is not expressing uniqueness of materials
- Relevance to teaching, learning, research not adequately reflected (elusive, but need to answer this question)
- Collections go beyond printed volumes
- Research library is more than collections – include its services; ARL is not telling the story
2. Purpose of Measuring?

- Historical significance of long dataset to show trends
- Accounting for university’s investment
- Evaluate collections
- Comparison; benchmarking
3. Local Uses of Variables and Index

- Used to go to the administration for money
- Current statistics give perception that size matters (measures “tonnage”)
- Three times as many directors found the index not helpful rather than helpful; index is a membership criteria, for others not helpful
- More concerned with how libraries serve their community
5. How to Define Content and Distinguish Between That Which is Owned and Not Owned

- Concern about measuring content from user perspective vs. library perspective
- Call to measure what you can deliver just in time
- Users more concerned about when I can get it
- Obligation to preserve
- Credit for being a provider beyond local library (loaning, partnering, collaboration, local digitization)
- Measure use
Very Preliminary Recommendations

• Membership Committee
  – Clarify purpose of use of membership index in current research library environment; ask Membership Committee to review/revise 5 variables

• Statistics Committee
  – Needs to address changing nature of collections more aggressively
  – Develop pilot grid of what measures we would like to see
Very Preliminary Recommendations …

• Measurements
  – Reassess all measures currently collected
  – Measure outcomes (somehow)
  – Measure contributions to local community
  – Separate print and electronic counts
  – Research library is more than collections (e.g., services); ARL needs to tell the library story
  – Define “collections”; what can we deliver just in case/just in time
Very Preliminary Recommendations …

• Rankings
  – Dropped, except for local use
  – Use collections budget
  – Expenditures might be valid measure (for collections, services)
Very Preliminary Recommendations …

• Develop a membership profile (useful to Membership Committee: “what is a research library”)
  – Use
  – Collections (strength)
  – Quality of service
  – Provide to the national community (ILL, preservation, digitization)
  – Partnerships
  – Unique contributions
  – Good local stewardship needs to be described
Very Preliminary Recommendations …

• Published statistics
  – Submit different information to Chronicle of Higher Education
  – Or submit no information at all