From the 130th ARL Membership Meeting

AGENDA

ARL Committee on Statistics and Measurement

Wednesday, May 14, 1997

8:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

Enchantment Ballroom B, Hyatt Regency Hotel, Albuquerque, NM

Note: The parenthetical times shown are estimates only to aid in moving the meeting along. If an issue warrants, we will take as much time as necessary.

1. Introductions and Overview: (5 minutes)

2. Approval of Minutes and Feedback on the 1997 Program Plan for the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program: (10 minutes)

Attachment 2a Minutes of the Meeting of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee, October 16, 1996

Attachment 2b ARL Statistics and Measurement Program summary from 1997 ARL Program Plan

Outcome: Approval of minutes; feedback on 1997 priorities

3. The Character and Nature of Research Library Investment in Electronic Resources: (60 minutes)

The Council on Library Resources (CLR) awarded ARL $11,800 to address how to calculate the investments libraries are making in electronic resources. Tim Jewell, ARL Visiting Program Officer, will share his findings from consultations and report on his analysis of ARL’s supplementary statistics data.

Attachment 3a Interim project report submitted to CLR

Attachment 3b 1995-96 ARL Supplementary Statistics Questionnaire

Attachment 3c 1995-96 ARL Supplementary Statistics Summary

Outcome: Recommendations for additional investigation; advice on changes to ARL surveys

*** Break 9:45 - 10:00 ***

4. SERVQUAL Project: (10 minutes)

The proposal submitted to the Council on Library Resources to measure library service quality with the SERVQUAL instrument was not supported. If funding had been secured, ARL would have offered the project on a cost-recovery basis (costs were estimated for the CLR proposal to be approximately $8,000 per library). Since the proposal was not supported, next steps for generating interest in this project requires discussion and action.


Attachment 4b "Changing the Concept and Measure of Service Quality in Academic
5. Wisconsin-Ohio Reference Evaluation Instrument: (10 minutes)
A short discussion was held regarding this instrument at the October 1996 meeting. Committee members were asked to review the materials about the instrument and come to the May meeting with a recommendation.

Attachment 5a Letter of request
Attachment 5b Reviews

Outcome: Recommendation for action

6. Annual Projects Update and Discussion: (20 minutes)
Status reports on the annual surveys and opportunity for discussion.

(a) ARL Statistics (any discussion would also apply to ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics): No new questions have been brought for clarification.

(b) ARL Annual Salary Survey:
1. How can we best collect job title information?
2. ARL staff have been asked for data regarding faculty status; is this data worth collecting as part of the salary survey?

Attachment 6a ARL Annual Salary 1996-97 survey and instructions
Attachment 6b Examples of new positions

Outcome: Advice on data collection methods, Advice on changes to the survey

(c) ARL Preservation Statistics: Report of progress on discussion between Chairs of Statistics and Measurement and Preservation committees and ARL staff regarding production plans for the publication.

Attachment 6c ARL Preservation Statistics 1995-96 survey and instructions

Outcome: Advice on changes to the survey

(d) ARL Supplementary Statistics: Discussion of this publication and any action items are subsumed in agenda item 3, the report of the CLR study.

(e) Library Expenditures as a Percent of E&G University Expenditures: Changes in national accounting rules will cause changes in the data on university expenditures reported to IPEDS by academic institutions. This year some private institutions received new forms to pretest the instrument.

(f) Survey on Innovative Services in Research Libraries

(g) Developing Indicators for Academic Library Performance, Ratios: Are there items within this analysis that could provide clues to new measures? What useful measures can be derived from existing data?

(h) WWW data entry for ARL Statistics: Templates to collect ARL data via the WWW have been created for the main, law, and medical library statistics and there will be a new method for data collection by member libraries in 1997.

7. ARL Workshops: (10 minutes)
Report on workshops held to date and recommendations for future activities.

(a) User Surveys: Five workshops have been held. Evaluations have been very good, although many participants would prefer either more concentrated work on some modules or a longer period of time to allow for questions and discussions. No new workshops are currently scheduled, but there is interest in holding at least one more next fall.

(b) Electronic Publishing of Datasets on the WWW: The workshop held at Harvard in March was sold out and very well received by those who attended. Evaluations were excellent. Preliminary plans are to try to hold another one on the West Coast late in the summer. The workshop requires use of a computer lab and an institutional server for three days, making scheduling more difficult. The market for this workshop can also be expanded to data suppliers as well as to those who are responsible for managing it in library settings.

8. Horizon Issues: (20 minutes)

(a) Performance Measures/Assessment Conference: One means to encourage the use of alternative measures of effectiveness may be to introduce the subject to a wider audience through a conference. The attendance and interest expressed at the ARL organized ACRL conference panel discussion on Performance Measures and discussions with ARL staff indicate there is interest in this topic. An early winter 1997 conference may be one option.

Attachment 8a ACRL Panel Discussion Handout
Attachment 8b ACRL Selected Reading List on Performance Measures, Outcomes Measures and Assessment

(b) Consortia: The ARL Board has asked that this committee address the impact of consortial activities on measures for and characterizations of research libraries. What strategies should be developed to respond to the Board’s request?

9. Report of Relations with External Constituencies: (5 minutes)

(a) National Postsecondary Education Cooperative
Attachment 9a Summary of NPEC Steering Committee Meeting

(b) National Benchmarking Council for Higher Education
Attachment 9b Statement of Purpose
Attachment 9c Meeting Minutes for November 23, 1996

(c) IPEDS Academic Libraries Advisory Committee: This committee is also grappling with the issue of how best to collect data about electronic resources.

(d) SCONUL

10. Information Items: (15 minutes)

(a) ARL survey coordinators meetings
February 13, 1997 summary
June 27, 1997 4:30-6:30 Nikko Ballroom, Hotel Nikko, San Francisco

(b) ALA Survey of Librarians’ Salaries: ALA’s Office of Research is asking some ARL libraries for permission to release ARL salary data for inclusion in this survey.

(c) The Association of SouthEastern Research Libraries: ASERL again used the ARL
survey instrument for collection and subsequent publication of data about their members. The results are posted on the ARL gopher.

(d) NISO working group on criteria for price index standards

(e) American Association of Law Libraries: ARL will oversee and provide analysis for the AALL Biennial Salary Survey 1997.

(f) IFLA: The IFLA Section of University Libraries and other General Research Libraries is interested in performance measures.

Attachment 10a Table of Contents and pages from the Introduction of Measuring Quality (KG Saur, 1996)

Attachment 10b Performance Assessment Survey instrument

(g) Use of ARL data for research projects: Martha Kyrillidou is analyzing ARL salary data to support her dissertation investigation into earnings differentials and intra-occupational segregation.

Attachment 10c Tables from M. Kyrillidou’s dissertation
From the 129th ARL Membership Meeting

Minutes of the
ARL Committee on Statistics and Measurement

Wednesday, October 16, 1996
8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.
Ashlawn South Room, Washington Vista Hotel, Washington, DC

Committee Members Present:
Jennifer Cargill
Ray Metz
Carolynne Presser
Carla Stoffle
William Studer
Don Tolliver
Gloria Werner
William Crowe, Chair
Martha Kyrillidou, ARL Senior Program Officer

Guests:
Paul Kobulnicky, Guest
Fred Friend, Guest
Timothy Jewell, Visiting Program Officer
Gordon Fretwell, Consultant Emeritus
Kendon Stubbs, Consultant

William Crowe convened the meeting and welcomed Paul Kobulnicky and Fred Friend. The minutes of the May 15, 1996, meeting were approved and the section on ARL Statistics and Measurement from the Activities Report was briefly reviewed.

The User Surveys Initiative was discussed at length. To date, workshops have been offered in conjunction with ALA in New York City, at UNC in Chapel Hill, and at North Carolina State in Raleigh. All were well-attended (there have actually been more people interested than we have been able to accommodate) and, judging from the evaluations, well-received. Plans are in the works to offer the workshop again in March 1997 at the University of California at Irvine and in April 1997 at Nashville in conjunction with the ACRL meeting.

The future of this workshop was then discussed. The number of participants at each workshop has been large (50-60 people) and that has put some limitations on what we have been able to provide. Should the workshop be offered at different skill/education levels? In other words, should there be something like User Surveys I and User Surveys II?

Concern was expressed for the workshop presenters and how much time they have spent preparing for and leading these workshops. Kendon indicated that at this point four times per year would be the upper limit to how many times the workshop could be offered, and more realistically twice or three times a year. Evaluations indicate great interest in the topic, with many suggesting the workshop be two days rather than one. They feel that the material cannot adequately be covered in only one day. Adding more hours would increase the time burden placed on presenters.

Comparisons were made to how ARL's Copyright Workshop functions. One idea was to identify people around the country whose areas of expertise roughly match those of Ron Naylor, Brinley Franklin, and Jimmie Davis (the current core group of presenters). Dawn Talbot from The University of California at San Diego will be participating in the workshop at Irvine. Conversations have also been held with Bob Molyneux. It was pointed out that we should try to identify a similar group from within the Canadian ARL member libraries, so that a workshop can be offered in Canada. Also, there was general agreement that whomever we might choose to include as a presenter for this workshop really must have a library background.

The idea of using "trainers" was also discussed. Could we offer a workshop to train people to be presenters for this workshop? There might be a prerequisite, such as taking a course in survey design (or an equivalent) at one's home university, to attend the training workshop.

We might also consider following up with our participants to find out who has actually gone back
and conducted a user survey at their institution. It is one thing to attend a workshop, but quite another to actually take something away from the workshop and apply it. Should we be measuring the success of the workshop in this manner?

It was noted that, next to the ARL Annual Salary Survey and the ARL Statistics, the User Surveys workshops we offer could be the most important thing we do in the Statistics and Measurement Program. This is a critical area for future development, and we need to continue to focus our energy on these workshops.

**Annual Projects Update and Discussion**

1. Should question 34 on Reference Transactions in the ARL Statistics (and in ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics as well) count number of users or number of questions? Transaction is defined as "an encounter with a user" and the committee concurred that the current definition and instructions are adequate and there is no need to limit the term "reference transactions" to either users or questions. Counting number of questions vs. number of users was seen as problematic and confusing. What we are really trying to address with this question is the number of sessions with a user. If you have four sessions with a user in one day, that is four transactions, regardless of how many individual questions they ask. It should be left to the library to determine whether a specific interaction involved multiple transactions or one.

2. Should libraries report that part of their ILL lending activity based on cost recovery in ARL Statistics (and in ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics)? The instructions appear to encourage libraries to include these activities in their ILL lending counts. However, depending on local circumstances, it may or may not be appropriate for a library to include these counts and in that case a footnote describing local practice should be included.

3. Should libraries report one or multiple subscriptions for question 5 (number of serials purchased) in ARL Statistics and in ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics for full-text of journal titles accessible through databases? Although there was not general agreement on the issue, it was pointed out that depending on how libraries get these counts they may include them or not. The committee encouraged the program to explore this issue further, possibly in conjunction with the project on the "Character and Nature of Electronic Investments" by Tim Jewell.

Jan Merrill-Oldham arrived to talk about the future of ARL Preservation Statistics. She highlighted some of the changes that are being discussed (in relation to preservation digitizing) and that could be made to the survey, as well as ways to keep the costs of production down. Perhaps we should just do the tabulations and leave the analysis up to the reader; perhaps we should only publish the data on the Web and not in print; perhaps we should identify a consultant that would be interested in completing the compilation on an annual basis. Jan pointed out that the data are important and are being used by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and by the Library of Congress (LC). She mentioned that the Council of Library Resources considers this data compilation one of the most important contributions ARL makes in the area of preservation, an area where ARL invests less compared to other areas. It was decided that the issue should be further explored by the chairs of the two committees.

Fred Friend reported on SCONUL's efforts in collecting library statistics in the UK. SCONUL's membership is comprised of 120 diverse libraries, virtually all the institutions in the UK. There is also a smaller group of the major 15 libraries called CURL, who hold influence over SCONUL. Staffing and support for SCONUL's statistics gathering and production are handled on more or less a volunteer basis. The SCONUL Secretariat is a small organization -- only three staff members -- so much of the work is done by member libraries themselves. Fred is interested in comparing library statistics on an international level, and is looking for ways to compare the SCONUL data with the ARL data. SCONUL is also concerned with performance indicators, as is ARL, and with conducting user surveys. In relation to user surveys, they have been basing their work in that area on that of Nancy Van House for the ACRL Ad Hoc Committee on Performance Measures, Measuring Academic Library Performance: A Practical Approach (ALA, 1990), which includes information on output measures, and adapting this work to their needs. SCONUL is facing the same kinds of questions in adapting its questionnaires that ARL has been facing. Fred pointed out that there are many commonalities between the two organizations and that we should be able to benefit from working together.

Timothy Jewell, Visiting Program Officer for Electronic Resources, asked for the Committee's input on his work in the area of "Library Investments in Electronic Resources." What do we expect to be able to do with his work when he is finished? He outlined his action plan of goals, methods, and strategy. In his "Invisible College" list of groups and people with whom to consult, he will add Claude Bonnelly as the contact at CARL and also will have a contact at CNI.

**Questions/issues for Tim Jewell's work to address:**

- how much libraries are spending on electronic resources. Since these expenditures are coming from different cost centers in different libraries, it will be a formidable task identifying the various cost centers and the specific amounts spent.
• will probably focus on the information resources, rather than the technological infrastructure.
• somewhere there needs to be an accommodation of what money is expended not by individual institutions, but by consortia like OhioLink; it is now a hidden expenditure that should be reported somehow, but is not.

The Wisconsin-Ohio Reference Evaluation Instrument was briefly addressed. Can it be adapted for ARL use? Committee members should read it over and come with a recommendation at the May meeting.

The SERVQUAL proposal is still held up at CLR. If CLR decides not to fund it, the participating libraries have agreed to look at doing it anyway on a cost recovery basis. ARL will support those efforts.

Last, the possibility of reviewing the job titles in the ARL Annual Salary Survey is a topic that we will discuss again in May. There seems to be a concern by a number of libraries that our job coding scheme needs to be reviewed and possibly updated but at the same time we should be able to preserve the historical continuity of major job functions. Interest was expressed in collecting job title information from the member libraries in the forthcoming year to inform our future discussions and decisions in this area.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 am.