1. **Introductions and Overview (5 minutes)**

The following members have completed their service to the Committee: William Highfill (Auburn), Ellen Hoffman (York), Ed Johnson (Oklahoma State), and Frank Rodgers (Miami). We would like to welcome the following new Committee members: Ray Metz (Case Western Reserve), Carolyne Presser (Manitoba), and Gloria Werner (California, Los Angeles). Bill Studer (Ohio State) was reappointed to the Committee.

The members of the CARL Task Force on Statistics have been invited to attend this meeting; the members of the Task Force are:

- Claude Bonnelly (Université Laval)
- Richard H. Ellis (Memorial University of Newfoundland)
- Richard Greene (University of Ottawa)
- Ellen Hoffman (York University)
- Amos Lakos (University of Waterloo)
- Ralph Manning (National Library of Canada)
- Tim Mark (CARL/ABRC)
- Frank Winter (University of Saskatchewan)

The first part of the meeting will include discussion on existing projects and surveys. The second part of the meeting will examine a proposal submitted by the Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement, Martha Kyrrillidou, requesting permission to use the last fifteen years of the *ARL Annual Salary Survey* data for her dissertation research. An extensive discussion on the future directions of the program will follow and conclude the last part of the meeting. The discussion on the future of the program will guide the members of the committee, the chair, and ARL staff, on the long term direction for the program and the projects that are under its aegis. Duane Webster will join us during the second part of the meeting.

2. **Approval of minutes and feedback on the Activities Report for the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program (5 minutes)**

   - Attached 2a Minutes of the Meeting of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee on October 18, 1995
   - Attached 2b Section on ARL Statistics and Measurement from the Activities Report.

3. **User Surveys Initiative (25 minutes)**

   Members of the Statistics and Measurement Committee who represent libraries that have explored user surveys as a planning and evaluation tool are invited to describe related issues and provide feedback for Kendon Stubbs as he proceeds in drafting the manual on how to conduct user surveys. If your library has conducted such a survey, please give a copy of relevant documents to
Attachment 3 Brief description of progress

Outcome expected Committee members describe their experiences with developing user surveys, challenges and lessons learned, and how the results are being translated into decisions and actions. Provide feedback to Kendon Stubbs.

4. Annual projects update (25 minutes)

(a) ARL Statistics - no major changes planned; clarification of the following is needed:

1. When reporting government documents that have been retrospectively cataloged, libraries should revise their Volumes Held figure from the previous year (Question 1a) and exclude these items from Volumes Added Gross (Question 2).

Attachment 4a1 Old and new versions of instructions to Questions 2 and 9

2. The instruction for Expenditures for Other Library Materials (Questions 18) should be rephrased to indicate explicitly that the preferred methods of reporting expenditures for electronic resources and microforms is under the appropriate category, i.e., Monograph Expenditures (Question 16) or Serial Expenditures (Question 17), if applicable.

Attachment 4a2 Old and new versions of instructions to Question 18

(b) ARL Annual Salary Survey - no changes planned

(c) ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics

(d) ARL Preservation Statistics

(e) ARL Supplementary Statistics

1. There is an effort to attract funding for further research on the questions that are included in the ARL Supplementary Statistics on expenditures for electronic resources.

Attachment 4e1 Proposal to attract funding

2. Change the 1994-95 question on number of databases loaded on institutional computers to number of databases accessed via gateways.

Attachment 4e2 1994-95 Supplementary Statistics Survey and instructions; draft of 1995-96 Supplementary Statistics Survey and instructions

Outcome expected Agreement on revised Question 6 and its instructions

(f) Library Expenditures as a Percent of E&G University Expenditures

(g) New project: Survey on Emerging Services in Research Libraries

Attachment 4g Draft of Survey

Outcome expected Provide feedback and agreement on distribution

5. SERVQUAL project (15 minutes)

ARL submitted to the Council on Library Research a proposal drafted by Danuta Nitecki on measuring library service quality. The proposal asks for matching funds to apply SERVQUAL to a group of six ARL libraries. Each library will contribute approximately $3,300 if funding is secured. If funding cannot be secured, ARL is willing to offer this project on a cost-recovery basis (costs are estimated to be approximately $8,000 per library).

Outcome expected Inform committee on status of proposal

6. Report of relations with external constituencies (15 minutes)

(a) NCES Postsecondary Cooperative

Attachment 6a Promoting Quality, Comparability, and Utility of Postsecondary Data and Information In Support of Policy Development, and summary memorandum
7. Proposal to document the historical ARL Salary Survey data files and analyze salary trends for professionals in ARL libraries since 1980. (15 minutes)

Martha Kyrillidou will present the proposal and leave the room. She will rejoin the meeting after discussion.

Outcome expected Discuss project and provide feedback.

8. Long-term program goals (60 minutes)

This is a brainstorming session for the future goals of the program. The Committee developed a planning document in the last two years, but given recent Board discussions and comments from some members it seems timely to discuss the future of the program and the importance of the different goals and projects for which the program is responsible. Is the ARL Statistics and Measurement program aggressively measuring important aspects of the library's operations through its surveys? What should we measure? Would libraries still collect the traditional data which ARL collects if ARL did not do it?

Attachment 8a Questions to be addressed
Attachment 8b Statistics and Measurement Plan

Outcome expected Building consensus on the importance of the statistical projects and determining long term goals.

9. Information items

(a) The Board will forward a positive recommendation inviting Ohio University to become an ARL member. The recommendation was made after discussions about the site visit that was done by Gloria Werner, Chair; Sheila Creth, and Nancy Cline.

(b) Four workshops are planned for 1996.

Attachment 9b Workshop Announcements

(c) Meeting of the ARL survey coordinators during ALA in San Antonio took place on Friday, January 19, from 4:00 to 6:30pm.

(d) Mary Jo Lynch, Director of the Office of Research of ALA, has conducted a survey of Electronic Services in Academic Libraries (ESAL). Jennifer Cargill participates in the ESAL Advisory Committee.

(e) ACRL repeated the biannual survey for the Research I, II, Doctoral I and II institutions that are not ARL members for 1994-95. They used the ARL instrument. A copy of their publication is available from ALA.

(f) The Association of SouthEastern Research Libraries (ASERL) also published data for its members using the ARL survey. The ASERL report has been posted on the ARL gopher. ASERL has 31 members, of which 19 are also ARL members.

(g) The American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Salary Survey was published in January 1996. It is the first library related salary survey that includes data on support staff salaries. Martha Kyrillidou summarized the results in an article that appeared in the American Association of Law Libraries Newsletter.
(h) NISO has established a working group to determine if the NISO standard on criteria for price index standards needs to be revised. The working group met in November 1995 and is comprised of:

Gay Dannelly, Ohio State University
Steven Bosch, University of Arizona
Christopher Schneider, Gordon & Breach
John Tagler, Elsevier
Martha Kyrillidou, ARL
Adrian Alexander, Swets
Ron Akie, Dawson/FAXON
ARL Committee on Statistics and Measurement

Minutes

Wednesday, October 18, 1995
8:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. Committee Meeting
Woodlawn Room, Washington Vista Hotel, Washington, DC

Present: Jennifer Cargill; William Crowe, Chair; Janet Fore; Ellen Hoffman; Bobby Holloway; Edward Johnson; Ray Metz; Frank Rodgers; William Studer; Don Tolliver; Gordon Fretwell, Consultant; Kendon Stubbs, Consultant; Stanley Wilder, Visiting Program Officer; Martha Kyrillidou, Program Officer; Kim Maxwell, Research Assistant

Absent: William Highfill; Carla Stoffle

Overview and Introductions

Everyone introduced himself or herself. Bill Crowe thanked Bill Studer for his last minute substitution in the chair in May, reviewed the agenda, and opened the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the May 1995 meeting were approved as distributed.

Martha reviewed the summary of activities of the Statistics Program during the past year. She highlighted the ongoing value of the electronic lists that were established for communication among survey coordinators. She hopes that the program can be successful in persuading members to meet deadlines for returning surveys. The meetings of the ARL survey coordinators during ALA also have proved very helpful, and we hope they can continue. The electronic publication of ARL Statistics is particularly promising. She thanked Kendon Stubbs and UVA for making that initiative possible.

Discussion of the Early Bird Session: Assessing Research Library Performance

The committee briefly reviewed the agenda for the early bird session scheduled for the next day and discussed the desirable outcomes of this short presentation. It was agreed that since time was limited, it should be cast largely as an opportunity to update the directors who are not on the committee and receive feedback on major points.

The possibility of sending out a formal survey seeking information about measuring library goals vs. institutional goals, as a way of measuring performance, was mentioned. Martha indicated that ARL has asked each member to send in a copy of the library's annual report, to review current trends. Another source of information for ARL staff are member library newsletters. From these sources, program staff can learn what themes are being enunciated, what priorities are apparent. If we were to do this systematically, there might be a way to draw some generalizations about current trends in measuring performance at the institution level.

Another member mentioned that the institution's governing body is seeking performance indicators, especially as they relate to funding. They want the "bottom line": how much does something cost? Members need information to help steer such discussions into constructive areas, and really address the "bottom line" mentality in so doing.

The committee thought it important to discuss during next day's early bird session the level of satisfaction with research libraries overall. What do students have to say about the place of libraries in their own education? What did they like about their experience at a given institution. Members noted that libraries seem to rate highly consistently. User satisfaction surveys seem to be very hot these days. Should we be doing some user surveys of our own? Could there be common user satisfaction assessment indicators?

Stanley Wilder on the Demographics of Librarians

Stanley briefly reviewed his work on the demographics of and discussed some of the challenges facing the profession. He sees the age profile as anomalous. In the United States, most ARL and other librarians fall into the "over 45" category. This profile does not fit with comparable professions. What does this say about who librarians are? Who is attracted to the field? There is a
"scarcity of young people," and that is a potential weakness in the profession.

Retirement projections are startling, especially so as librarianship has more "competition." When librarians retire, are we going to be able, and allowed, to replace them? The decrease in catalogers is especially large, and they are not being replaced on a one for one basis. The pace of the change is provocative, but not perhaps the direction.

Stanley's greatest concern is whether the skill mix we have in the libraries is adequate for the future. We can't look just to new hires to bring in the skills we lack. We need to retrain many current staff.

Bill Crowe wondered if "librarians" in the future be required to have an MLS. We know that there are ARL libraries that have librarians who do not hold the MLS. An example of a position that might not require an MLS is the "Head of Imaging Center." Some members see this as an asset, others aren't sure.

Ellen Hoffman said we should point out the positives in these demographics. We have fewer catalogers, but is that a bad thing? The move is toward direct user service. There are 7% more reference librarians, and that should be seen as a GOOD thing. It might be interesting to see what support staff are doing. Is cataloging itself decreasing, or are we just shifting the responsibilities by outsourcing, or to support staff, instead of having MLS librarians do that work? Bill Crowe remarked that we do not need to sound defensive about these changes. We have always adapted to change, and we must continue to do so. The challenges here are in training and whether we are changing fast enough. It was mentioned that the "younger folks" coming into the field have the technical skills, but they do not necessarily have the intellectual or institutional political skills. The younger group can certainly learn from the more experienced among us - which is an indication that we all need to work together and to gain from each other.

In terms of what kind of people are becoming librarians, Bill Studer wondered how much we can attribute to low library school enrollment by young people, and to the low salary and other financial considerations? This is an issue that Stanley addressed in the conclusion. Low salary is a problem for young people, but not necessarily so strong an issue for middle-aged people entering the profession.

Another question that was raised is how academic librarians' salaries compare to faculty salaries. We tend to compare among librarians, but not to the faculty. Would this be a useful comparison? A concern was expressed that if there is a difference, there would not be any action taken to bridge the gap. If librarians are to be paid on a faculty scale, they might have to do such things as publish at the level the faculty do.

Stanley's work will be an ARL publication. We talked about strategies for publicizing the results, especially in the Chronicle of Higher Education. Stanley could write an article for them if there is interest.

Usage Statistics on Electronic Resources

Usage logs related to the ARL Statistics on the Web were examined, and the question of how to evaluate access to these electronic resources was posed. We don't know who is accessing the material, if it was useful to them, or how much time they spent there. Is there a way that ARL can develop a pilot to study usage of WWW resources? Kendon remarked that it may be premature to try to develop measures for the WWW. Bill Crowe said we need to do something, at least to acknowledge that we are thinking about these issues. It would be useful to find someone on sabbatical who might be interested in pursuing this further.

Measurement of User Satisfaction and Service Quality

Kendon Stubbs has been appointed Visiting Program Officer, to develop a user surveys manual for academic libraries. The committee proposed to establish an advisory committee on the subject and approved a committee comprised of David Ferriero (MIT), Brinley Franklin (U. of Connecticut), Jimmie Y. Davis (North Carolina State), Martha Kyriilidou (ARL), and Maureen Sullivan (ARL/OMS). The advisory committee will meet in January to decide on the contents of a guide. Kendon Stubbs will present the outline for the contents at the survey coordinators meeting at ALA Midwinter in San Antonio. The material developed can then be tested by developing a one-day workshop at ALA in July. Bill Crowe said that initial reaction to the project was very positive. The need to establish more workshops in the Statistics and Measurement Program was expressed.

* * * * * * * * * * * * B R E A K * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Danuta Nitecki and SERVQUAL

Danuta Nitecki was invited to present the results of her dissertation work to the committee. Her research used the SERVQUAL instrument to measure aspects of some services in academic libraries. As libraries are facing a more competitive environment, it becomes increasingly
important to establish and measure service quality. If we can find out what our users want, we'll be able to provide better service. We also need to better understand what influences users' judgments about service quality, e.g. what is expected from specific services, and what improvements in service can be made. SERVQUAL, a marketing instrument developed by researchers at Texas A&M and York, can help accomplish these goals.

She began by explaining her current research at the McKeldin Library at the University of Maryland. Briefly, she used the SERVQUAL instrument to measure three types of library services: reference, interlibrary loan, and reserves. She summarized her findings and suggested further areas where more research is needed.

There was some discussion of what services the committee would like to evaluate and if ARL should pursue such a project. There was a recognition that users of reference services, for example, may value different criteria in judging service quality than do users of reserves or interlibrary loan services. This is not surprising, since the nature of reference is very different from reserves or interlibrary loan. The later services are very concrete, with yes or no answers, while reference is much harder to qualify. When discussing what services we might want to measure, Danuta explained that SERVQUAL is designed to address interactions between human beings, which is why she picked the services she did. Evaluating the public catalog, for example, might not work very well because the interaction is between a person and a machine.

The committee agreed to serve as an advisory group for a future funded project. Danuta could serve as a visiting program officer if ARL can secure funding. Support for dissemination of the findings will be necessary, either via a paper publication, a conference, a workshop, or some combination thereof. There was strong support for this project.

**Project Updates**

*ARL Supplementary Statistics:* We need to revise the question on number of databases. We could ask members to report the number of databases that are both locally mounted and what they provide gateways to. What are we trying to show with this question? Are we trying to show "access" or "ownership?" Would access be too hard to count? What would we gain by collecting that information? The committee advised that we should revise this question.

There was also a proposal that we count rare books. Surrounding questions include: how to count them? what is the difference between "rare books" and "special collections?" Could we ask how many original editions does a library have, or works printed before a specific date? Should we have a one-time survey of rare books and manuscripts, apart from the supplementary statistics? The committee did not reach any definite conclusions.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.