Enclosed are the agenda and supporting documents for the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee meeting that will take place from 8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 14, 2003, in the Calumet room of the Marriott Griffin Gate Hotel, Lexington, Kentucky.

The meeting will focus on (a) proposed changes for the annual statistical compilations as a result of what we have achieved through the New Measures work so far, (b) updates in relation to various new measures projects; and (c) information on other related projects.

Thank you for your interest and participation in the work of this committee. We look forward to a productive meeting.
AGENDA

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.** The ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee has a new chair, Brinley Franklin. We are also welcoming new committee members: David Ferriero, Ruth Jackson, Mod Mekkawi. One member was renewed for 2003-2005: Paul Wiens (10 minutes)

   Attachment 1: ARL Statistics and Measurement Program Plan 2003

   Outcome: Understanding and supporting the Program Plan

2. **Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)**

   Attachment 2: Minutes of the Meeting of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee, October 2002

   Outcome: Approval of minutes

3. **Lessons Learned from New Measures: What can we change in the annual data collection (60 minutes)**

   Attachment 3: Draft Proposed Changes to the ARL Data Collection Activities: Informed by lessons learned from the New Measures work

   Outcome: Understanding the issues and developing consensus

4. **Changes to the Functional Specialist Category of the ARL Salary Survey.** The ACRL Personnel Administrators and Staff Development Officers Discussion Group agreed at ALA Mid-winter 2003 to look at the Functional Specialist category and then submit its recommendations to the ARL Statistics and Measurements Committee for discussion. The following recommendations have been forwarded by Deborah Stansbury Sunday, Director, Library Administrative Services and the Regional Campus Libraries, University of Connecticut. (15 minutes)

   Attachment 4: E-mail communication by Deborah Stansbury Sunday
Outcome: Developing a response/course of action

5. New Measures Activities (90 minutes)

Measures for Electronic Resources

A. Emetrics. The ARL E-Metrics Project is underway with 39 ARL libraries attempting to collect data related to electronic resources. Sherrie Schmidt (Arizona State) and Rush Miller (Pittsburgh) are supportive of moving this effort to the annual ARL Supplementary Statistics and folding back the lessons learned into the regular activities of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee. Gordon Fretwell has been supporting this effort on a volunteer basis but we may also need to engage a visiting program officer in the coming year to move this effort into an operational status.

Outcome: Developing shared understanding over next steps

B. Project COUNTER. As part of the set of activities supported under Emetrics, ARL is sponsoring Project Counter. Peter Shepherd has informed us that Release 1 of the Code of Practice has been released. This was made available on the website (www.projectCounter.org) on 14 January 2003. Since then, the Code has been heavily requested and a number of vendors, including Elsevier, Oxford University Press, HighWire Press and Ingenta have already declared their intention to become COUNTER-compliant in the course of 2003. While Release 1 of the Code of Practice is an important first step towards COUNTER’s ultimate goal, it is only the beginning of a process. We have set a number of further objectives for COUNTER for 2003. These include:

- Promotion of the Code of Practice to publishers, librarians and intermediaries, achieving widespread implementation of Release 1 for the beginning of the 2004 subscription year.
- Obtaining feedback on implementation of the Code of Practice by early adopters.
- Making plans for the development and expansion of the Code of Practice. It is envisaged that subsequent releases will cover a broader range of content categories (such as e-reference works) and will provide more granular reports (such as individual article level usage reports).
- Development of a detailed XML DTD for the usage reports.
- Defining the detailed auditing requirements for COUNTER-compliance from 2004, and completing a list of COUNTER-approved auditors.
- Defining and setting up the administrative/funding structure that will be required to support COUNTER in the longer term.

Outcome: Feedback regarding the Project COUNTER objectives

C. Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services: A Survey Methodology for Research Libraries. Brinley Franklin (Connecticut) and Terry Plum (Simmons)
examined the methodology and results from patron use surveys of electronic services to determine if there is a simple methodology that could be applied to in-library and remote web use. A proposal to test this methodology for Research Libraries is in development.

Attachment 5C: Draft article to appear in the ARL Newsletter

Outcome: Feedback regarding this new initiative

**Service Quality**

**D. LibQUAL+™** Currently in its last year of the FIPSE three-year funding cycle, LibQUAL+™ had 308 libraries that collected data on more than 120,000 library users. Plans call for holding a results meeting in conjunction with ALA in Toronto as well as separate meetings for NY3Rs, OhioLINK, and AAHSL. LibQUAL+™ will be moving into an ARL operation in the coming cycle implementation. New marketing materials will be mailed later in the year to ensure the program’s widespread recognition and sustainability.

Outcome: Understanding current developments

**E. NSDL LibQUAL+™.** The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and the Texas A&M University Libraries are collaborating on a joint project for assessing service quality in digital libraries.

Attachment 5E: The National Science Digital Library: Developing a User-Based Assessment Protocol

Outcome: Understanding current developments

**Learning Outcomes**

**F. ARL Working Group on Learning Outcomes.** The Learning Outcomes Project is attempting to identify measures that libraries can use to demonstrate their contribution to campus learning outcomes. The Working Group meets in conjunction with ALA meetings. Carla Stoffle was chairing this group and has requested that Karen Williams now undertake that role on her behalf.

Nan Seamans (Virginia Tech) updated the working group that “On Saturday, April 12, George Kuh spoke at the ACRL meeting in Charlotte. Kuh is with the Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning at Indiana University, which is where the CSEQ originates. His topic was The Role of the Academic Library in Promoting Student Engagement in Learning and he presented information from the CSEQ on the undergraduate experience with the library. There is a link to Kuh's paper at <http://acrl.telusys.net/acrl/charlotte/program/invitedpapers.html>. He presents in this paper -- on a global scale -- what Joni Kanzler [Notre Dame] and I have been working on
trying to do with CSEQ and ARL libraries, and effectively answers most of the questions we've been asking ourselves. In addition, the March/April 2003 issue of Change has an article by Kuh that talks generally about using data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to benchmark institutional effectiveness. Though not specifically talking about libraries, it provides a sense of what might be done with data from another national survey and mentions possible links to the UCLA's entering student survey, which is where we started the conversation about using national surveys to determine a library's impact on student learning.”

Also, the long-awaited National Postsecondary Educational Cooperative Student Outcomes Common Language Report is still not yet available on the NPEC web site, as "it is currently going through the NCES edit and review process," it will be posted when this process is completed. In the meantime, an interactive dictionary of terms is available on the James Madison University website at http://www.jmu.edu/assessment.

A subset of Working Group members are also preparing a SPEC survey regarding learning outcomes and campus activities.

Outcome: Understanding current developments

G. Kent State SAILS project. (Julia Blixrud, Mark Weber) (15 minutes). The SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) project is led by a team from Kent State University to develop a tool to measure information literacy skills and assess the impact of information literacy on student learning. A partnership agreement between ARL and Kent State was signed earlier this year outlining responsibilities for instrument development, project management, and governance. Several libraries are participating in Phase I and the call for participation in Phase II of SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) was announced in early April <http://www.arl.org/arl/pr/SAILSII.html>. The call includes information on the participation criteria and a project FAQ provides additional information for libraries interested in participating <http://sails.lms.kent.edu/plans/FAQ.html>. The deadline for expressing interest is May 15, 2003. Julia Blixrud <jblix@arl.org> serves as the ARL staff contact for the SAILS project.

Attachment 5G: SAILS Project Status

Outcome: Understanding current developments

Cost Studies


A total of 77 libraries are participating in the Assessing ILL/DD Services Project. This activity updates, replicates, and expands the 1997 ARL ILL/DD Performance Measures Study to obtain current data on the performance of mediated and user-initiated (unmediated) interlibrary loan (ILL)/document delivery (DD) operations in research and
academic libraries. Tom Delaney (Colorado State University), Bruce Kingma (Syracuse University), and Mary Jackson (ARL) are managing this project. For further information, see the project web site <http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/ill-dd.html>.

Attachment 5H: Assessing ILL/DD Services Study: Current Status, May 2003

Assessment and Management

I. Impact of assessment on library management decision making.

Susan J. Beck, Head of Public Services in the Rutgers University Paul Robeson Library, served as Visiting Program Officer to investigate the impact of assessment on library management decision-making processes and the degree to which assessment data has influenced change.

Attachment 5I: Making informed decisions: the implications of assessment by Susan Beck

Outcome: Feedback regarding findings of this study

J. Service Quality Evaluation Academy.

ARL and Texas A&M are sponsoring a Service Quality Evaluation Academy, an intensive five-day workshop emphasizing basic concepts and skills in measurement and data analysis that are applicable to service quality evaluations (12–16 May 2003). The Academy curriculum focuses on qualitative and quantitative methods for collecting and analyzing library service quality data. Time will be devoted to relevant software skills, including the use of ATLAS.ti to analyze the content of interviews or responses to open-ended survey questions and the use of SPSS for quantitative data analysis. The 2003 participants are:

Joe Aufmuth, University of Florida
Damon Camille, University of Houston
Joan Cheverie, Georgetown University
Joan Conger, University of Georgia
Francine DeFranco, University of Connecticut
John Felts, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Christine Hannon, Smith College
Daniel Lee, University of Arizona
Jim Shedlock, Northwestern University
Lisa Kammerlocher, Arizona State University West
Noreen McGuire, Pace University
Beth McNeil, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Alicia Miller, George Washington University
Lanell Rabner, Brigham Young University
Marina Schreiber, Inter-American Development Bank
Douglas Joubert, Medical College of Georgia
Laurie Thompson, SUNY Upstate Medical University
Jennifer Ward, University of Washington
6. Information Items

A. Academic Libraries Advisory Committee/NCES. Advisory committee is meeting in conjunction with ALA meeting and chaired by Mary Jo Lynch, Director of the ALA Office of Research. Brinley Franklin and Martha Kyrillidou are members of this advisory committee.

B. ACRL Library Statistics data collection for 2001-2002 is currently underway. ARL is working closely with ACRL to eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort by exchanging data with institutional permission.

C. NISO The Library Statistics Standard, ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995, was first released in 1968, and revised in 1983 and 1995, and currently a draft version of the standard is available for comment. With each revision the Standard has grown and changed. When the 1995 edition of the Library Statistics Standard was released, the committee that developed it acknowledged that the standard did not address two important emerging areas: measurement of electronic resources and performance measures. The current revision is trying to address these issues. Sherrie Schmidt is serving on the revision committee.

D. ISO Performance Measures and Statistics Standards Revision Process. Fred Heath, Denise Davis and John Carol Bertot are the US representatives to the ISO committees.

E. DLF/Outsell Inc Study. Results of this study have been published by CLIR and they are available at: http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub110/contents.html

F. Known to this group as the Technical Services Cost Study by Dilys Morris, Dilys is working with a small group of ARL libraries including Vanderbilt and Notre Dame in developing a time allocation study across different functional areas.


H. Bob Molyneux is the new director of the NCLIS Library Statistics Program and developed the following conceptual paper “A new direction for library data?” <http://www.nclis.gov/statsurv/surveys/stla/reports/reports.html>

7. Workshops/Presentations/Event Calendar

(a) United Arab Emirates talk regarding assessment; Julia Blixrud (October 1, 2002)
(b) NY3Rs/LibQUAL+™ introductory workshop; Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Consuella Askew, Amy Hoseth (November 4, 2002, Albany, NY)
(c) NY3Rs/LibQUAL+™ introductory workshop; Consuella Askew, Amy Hoseth (November 8, Rochester, NY)
(d) SCONUL/LibQUAL+™ introductory workshop; Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Consuella Askew (January 7-8, 2003, Bristol, UK)
(e) OhioLINK/LibQUAL+™ new participants workshop; Consuella Askew (January 14, 2003, Columbus, OH)
(f) LibQUAL+™ Process Management workshop; Consuella Askew, Amy Hoseth (January 24, 2003, Philadelphia, PA)
(g) LibQUAL+™ Workshop for 2003 Participants; Duane Webster, Fred Heath, Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Martha Kyrillidou, Consuella Askew, Jonathan Sousa, Amy Hoseth (January 26-27, 2003, Philadelphia, PA)
(h) “Creating a Culture of Assessment” workshop; Julia Blixrud, Melanie Hawks (January 30-31, 2003, Georgia)

(i) “Creating a Culture of Assessment” workshop, Rice University; Julia Blixrud, Melanie Hawks (February 10-11, 2003, Houston, TX)


(k) “Old and new measures...Why bother?” Georgetown LibQUAL+™ presentation; Martha Kyrillidou, Consuella Askew (February 24, 2003, Washington, D.C.)

(l) Webwise 2003 IMLS Conference; Martha Kyrillidou (February 26, 2003)

(m) “LibQUAL+™: An innovative, technology-based assessment tool for libraries.” Online Northwest 2003 Conference; Julia Blixrud (February 28, Corvallis, OR)

(n) “Creating a Culture of Assessment” workshop, Georgetown University; Julia Blixrud, Melanie Hawks (March 11-12, 2003, Washington, D.C.)

(o) NSDL planning meeting; Duane Webster, Fred Heath, Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Martha Kyrillidou (March 31 – April 1, 2003, College Station, TX)

(p) “LibQUAL+™: 2002 Results,” Texas Library Association Meeting; Fred Heath, Colleen Cook (April 2, 2003, Houston, TX)

(q) “LibQUAL+™: Assessing library service quality,” ACRL Conference poster session; Consuella Askew (April 10-13, 2003, Charlotte, NC)

(r) “New Ways of Listening: LibQUAL+™” ACRL pre-conference workshop; Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Consuella Askew (April 10-13, 2003, Charlotte, NC)

(s) NSF/NSDL grant – Math Forum Meeting; Fred Heath, Martha Kyrillidou (April 28, 2003, Philadelphia, PA)


(u) “Creating a Culture of Assessment” workshop, Case Western Reserve University; Julia Blixrud, Melanie Hawks (May 7-8, 2003, Washington, D.C.)

(v) “Service Quality Evaluation Academy,” five-day program in qualitative and quantitative methods; Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Consuella Askew (May 12-16, 2003, San Antonio, TX)


(x) “The ARL E-metrics Project,” Boston Library Consortium Output Measures Task Force Workshop; Brinley Franklin (May 27, 2003, Boston, MA)

(y) NSDL Evaluation Work Group; Fred Heath, Yvonna Lincoln, Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson (May 27, 2003, Houston, TX)


(aa) IATUL (International Association of Technological University Libraries) New Measures presentation; Julia Blixrud (June 2-5, 2003, Ankara, Turkey)

(bb) LibQUAL+™ Process Management workshops; Consuella Askew, Amy Hoseth (2 sessions, June 20, 2003, Toronto, CAN)

(cc) LibQUAL+™ 2003 Results Meeting; Colleen Cook., Bruce Thompson, Martha Kyrillidou, Consuella Askew, Jonathan Sousa, Amy Hoseth (June 21, 2003, Toronto, CAN)

(dd) LibQUAL+™ Assessment to Action workshop; Consuella Askew, Amy Hoseth (June 21, 2003, Toronto, CAN)

(ee) Measuring Library Service Quality, Online Lyceum workshop developed by Danuta Nitecki and Toni Olshe (June 23 – August 4 and October 13 – November 21)

(ff) UIUC Outcomes Assessment workshop; Consuella Askew, DeEtta Jones (July 7-18, 2003, Champaign-Urbana, IL)

(gg) LibQUAL+™ NY3Rs results meeting; Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Amy Hoseth (July 18, 2003, New York City, NY)

(hh) LibQUAL+™ NY3Rs results meeting; Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Martha Kyrillidou (July 21, Albany, NY)

(ii) SCONUL/LibQUAL+™ results meetings; Martha Kyrillidou, Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson (July 28, 2003, UK)
“LibQUAL+™ from the UK Perspective,” 5th Northumbria Conference; Colleen Cook, Fred Heath, Bruce Thompson (July 28-31, Durham, UK)

“Cross-cultural implementation of LibQUAL+™: the French language experience,” 5th Northumbria Conference; Martha Kyrillidou, Toni Olshen, Fred Heath, Claude Bonnelly, Jean-Pierre Cote (July 28-31, Durham, UK)


“Data informed decisions in academic libraries: an analysis of nine Association of Research Libraries in the US and Canada,” 5th Northumbria Conference; Susan Beck (July 28-31, Durham, UK)

“Organizational Assessment: one library’s approach,” 5th Northumbria Conference; Brinley Franklin (July 28-31, Durham, UK)

Note: A number of other ARL librarians are presenting assessment-related papers at 5th Northumbria; for the complete list of presenters, go to <http://online.northumbria.ac.uk/faculties/art/information_studies/lmri/PM5/PM5.htm>.

IFLA (August 8-8, Berlin, GER)

ACRL Harvard Leadership institute; Consuella Askew (August 3-8, 2003, Cambridge, MA)

NSDL focus group at DLESE Annual Meeting; Yvonna Lincoln, Amy Hoseth, Kaylyn Hipps (August 3-5, 2003, Boulder, CO)

NSDL focus group at MERLOT Annual Meeting; Yvonna Lincoln, Amy Hoseth, Kaylyn Hipps (August 6–8, 2003, Vancouver, CAN)

OhioLINK/LibQUAL+™ results meeting; Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Consuella Askew (August 18, 2003, Columbus, OH)

“E-metrics: Lessons learned from the ARL E-metrics project, challenges and opportunities,” ACS National Meeting; Martha Kyrillidou (September 8, 2003, New York City, NY)

“Library Usage Patterns in the Electronic Information Environment,” 2003 Conference on Users in the Electronic Information Environments; Brinley Franklin and Terry Plum (September 8-9, 2003, Espoo Finland)


“LibQUAL+™: an e-service for assessing the library of the 21st century,” Frontiers in Service Conference; Fred Heath, Colleen Cook, Martha Kyrillidou (October 26, 2003, College Park/Bethesda, MD)

AAHSL/LibQUAL+™ results meeting; Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson, Martha Kyrillidou (November 11, 2003, Washington, D.C.)
PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance Measures incorporates the Statistics and Measurement program and the New Measures Initiative. These programs describe and measure the performance of research libraries and their contribution to teaching, research, scholarship, and community service. They also develop new approaches and models for measuring and improving library service effectiveness, diversity, and leadership. In 2002, the Statistics and Measurement program continued its 40-year effort to collect and publish descriptive statistics about ARL member libraries. In addition, the New Measures Initiative, begun in 1999, focused attention on a number of specific topics to measure and describe the libraries’ contributions to teaching, learning, and research. Performance Measures receives guidance from the Statistics and Measurement Committee.

STATISTICS AND MEASUREMENT

The Statistics and Measurement program supports the production of publications and member-distributed reports regarding the operations of research libraries. Strategies include collecting, analyzing, and publishing quantifiable information about library collections, personnel, and expenditures, as well as expenditures and indicators of the nature of research institutions. In addition to print publishing efforts, the program continues to have a strong presence in electronic publishing activities. Of special significance is the electronic publication of the ARL Statistics on the Web, which is supported by the staff at the Geospatial and Statistical Data Center at the University of Virginia. In addition, the program’s Web site is updated regularly with information and data from new editions of ARL’s statistical publications.

Priorities for 2003 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

As member libraries add e-journals and e-books to their collections, the Statistics program continues to clarify and refine existing definitions to ensure that data about these new formats are systematically and consistently represented in ARL statistics. The program answers questions from its survey coordinators about counting these resources through the use of the FAQ at <http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/arlstatqa.html> and the electronic mailing list for ARL survey coordinators. Also in 2003, more clarification about counting electronic resources will emerge through the E-Metrics project and be incorporated into the regular data reporting process.

Additional demographic data were collected through the ARL Annual Salary Survey in 1986, 1990, 1994, 1998, and 2000. These additional data provide an overview of human resource issues and will be collected every five years starting in 2005. The program conducted an extensive analysis of these demographic data in 2002 with Stanley Wilder and two demographers, Dr. Murray Gendell and Dr. Michael Irwin, to update the 1995
projections regarding the age structure of ARL librarians. This year ARL will publish revised retirement projections and analysis in a monograph.

Program staff serve as liaisons or experts with other groups such as the ALA/IPEDS Advisory Committee, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Library Cooperating Working Group, the National Council of Postsecondary Information, the National Information Standards Organization, the International Organization for Standardization Technical Committee 46 Subcommittee 8 (ISO TC46/SC8), the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA), LibEcon, CENDI, and the National Science Foundation.

Other operating priorities include:

• Enable on-schedule and error-free production of data collected for all statistical publications.

• Work closely with survey coordinators through biannual meetings and electronic communications to ensure timely and accurate data submission (see <http://www.arl.org/stats/coordinator.html>).

• Enhance data collection and the publication process by taking advantage of new technologies.

• Provide custom reports from the ARL Annual Salary Survey and ARL Statistics data.

• Analyze and prepare reports and tables regarding demographic and compensation trends in ARL libraries (age, job positions, experience, education, and salaries).

• Update the Statistics and Measurement program Web site with new data and reports as they become available.

• Work with the Office of Leadership and Management Services to coordinate data collection and survey management for SPEC kits.

• Provide workshops in programmatic areas related to statistics, data management, and assessment.

**Developmental Priorities**

• Identify new descriptive data elements for research libraries as their environment changes from one of input measures to one of outcome measures.

• Develop trend reports on electronic resource investments.

• Look for opportunities to develop reports or articles using collected data to increase the understanding and value of ARL data.
- Look for ways to streamline the data collection, analysis, and publication processes for improved efficiency.
- Increase opportunities for library staff to develop measurement and evaluation skills by organizing workshops on a cost-recovery basis and working with OLMS, as appropriate, to deliver them as in-person events or Online Lyceum courses.

Financial Strategy for 2003

The Statistics and Measurement program is supported by a robust mix of dues, cost recovery, grants, and member and non-member contributions for specific projects. A continued strategy for 2003 is the high level of grants activity and member contributions that has allowed expansion of the program. One goal is to make the annual data-collection efforts more self-supporting and the publication production fully cost-recovery by increasing revenue from the printed publications, custom report services, workshops, and electronic data services. Because of increased efficiencies in the data-collection and production process, some dues resources have been reallocated from support of the annual data-collecting services to the development of the New Measures Initiative.

Allocation of Resources

**Staff Allocation**

45% Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement  
25% Director of Information Services  
100% Research Assistant  
17% LibQUAL+™ Program Specialist  
[Plus 4.4 FTE program staff and 1 Project Assistant deployed for projects and funded by grants and member contributions.]

**Total Dues Allocation**

$139,500

**Total Budgeted Expenditures**

$291,100  
[Plus grant and project expenditures of circa $841,000 that are reflected in the Office of Research and Development restricted-fund accounts.]

Staff Contacts

Martha Kyrillidou  
Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement  
<martha@arl.org>
Mark Young
Statistics Research Assistant
<mark@arl.org>

<http://www.arl.org/stats/>
NEW MEASURES INITIATIVE

Since January 1999, the New Measures Initiative has promoted the development and use of tools to better manage libraries. The initiative has developed new ways to describe and measure traditional and networked information resources and services; mechanisms to assess the relationship between campus information resources, high-quality research, and the teaching and learning experiences of students; and workshops on statistics and measurement issues in research libraries.

When first begun, the New Measures Initiative identified eight areas of interest that have been modified to focus on the following topics: higher education outcomes assessment, including the library’s support for research and for student learning outcomes; service effectiveness measures across libraries; usage measures of electronic resources; identification of cost drivers; and further improvements to interlibrary loan and document delivery. Modifications will most likely continue in 2003.

The New Measures Initiative currently supports the following projects: LibQUAL+™, E-Metrics, NSDL Digital Library Assessment Project, Assessing ILL/DD Services, and the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS). These projects are described separately in the following sections.

Priorities for 2003 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

- Support the development of the New Measures agenda by coordinating projects, managing electronic mailing lists, maintaining a Web site of documents and information about performance measures, and producing reports and publications as needed.

- Continue developing steps to identify measures that indicate the roles libraries play in support of campus learning outcomes, including testing the use of adding questions to various campus-wide surveys.

- Define next steps for the outcomes project work by Doug Jones (Arizona), who served as a Visiting Program Officer investigating the role libraries play in support of research and the research process.

- Define next steps for determining how libraries support institutional outcomes.

- Support the work of Eileen Hitchingham (Virginia Tech) on developing an instrument to collect data on the allocation of staff time to library service areas.

- Explore the applicability of the technical services cost study methodology developed by Dilys Morris (Iowa State) to other functional areas.

- Identify alternative frameworks for cost accounting by looking at high-impact library functions that are susceptible to cost savings and performance
enhancement as research libraries move into a more technologically sophisticated environment. The topics and criteria for evaluation of potential functions to study were gathered at the 2002 ALA Midwinter Meeting <http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/costdriver.html>. Possible areas for study include: the cost/benefit of remote storage and retrieval within a consortia; electronic reserves; and a public services function such as reference or circulation that could be modeled on the technical services methodology.

- Prepare a special issue of ARL: A Bimonthly Report to document progress of the New Measures Initiative.

**Developmental Priorities**

When part of a New Measures project is complete, the Statistics program, in conjunction with the Statistics Committee and with guidance and feedback from the ARL Board, will determine how best to deploy the results of the project. Likely scenarios for many of the projects include the incorporation of data elements into the Statistics program, the development of workshops and consulting services for performance measures (in conjunction with OLMS), and the establishment of data-gathering and statistical-analysis tools that the Statistics program can offer on a cost-recovery basis.

The New Measures experiences have indicated that libraries need a cadre of professionals who understand and effectively deploy assessment skills, especially in relation to learning and research outcomes, service quality, and the use of digital resources. To help research library staff develop this talent, ARL will look for ways to create workshops and other training opportunities such as the ARL Service Quality Evaluation Academy.

**Financial Strategy for 2003**

Staff time of .25 FTE has been allocated for developing projects and responding to member interest in the New Measures Initiative. Specific projects developed in this area either will be self-financed by member libraries or, when possible and appropriate, grant funds will be sought.

**Staff Contact**

Julia Blixrud  
Director of Information Services  
<jblix@arl.org>

<http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/newmeas.html>
**LIBQUAL+™**

LIBQUAL+™ addresses a specific interest of ARL members: how to measure user perceptions of, and satisfaction with, library services. The project emerged from a pilot spearheaded by Fred Heath and Colleen Cook of Texas A&M University Libraries. The goals of the project include the development of tools and protocols for evaluating library service quality, development of effective Web-based delivery mechanisms for those tools, identification of best practices in providing library service, and the establishment of an ongoing, cost-recovery, service quality assessment program at ARL. From the original 12 ARL participating libraries in 2000, the project has grown to 43 participants in 2001, 164 in 2002, and 316 in the upcoming spring 2003 implementation. In 2002, the project collected data from more than 78,000 survey respondents regarding their perceptions and expectations of library service.

**Priorities for 2003 and Beyond**

**Operating Priorities**

- Continue to refine the LIBQUAL+™ instrument and Web interface. The hardware for this service is located at Texas A&M University Libraries; software development and support services are conducted at ARL.
- Administer the refined LIBQUAL+™ instrument via the Web at 316 academic, research, and public libraries.
- Provide data and analysis to spring 2003 participants and conduct additional analysis to establish the stability of the LIBQUAL+™ norms.
- Disseminate information about the project to the academic library community via professional conferences, publications, and the Web.
- Offer participants training in service quality issues and project activities.
- Manage the FIPSE grant that partially funds the project.

**Developmental Priorities**

- Market participation to the non-ARL postsecondary library community.
- Work collaboratively with consortia and groups of libraries that want to implement LIBQUAL+™ as a total-market survey.
- Engage a usability expert to improve the LIBQUAL+™ Web site design.
- Make the system as autonomous as possible so administrative functions are automated and customer support questions are minimized.
- Improve the content of and automate the production of deliverables.
• Identify areas in which subsequent project participants will need assistance and
refine training and consultation activities in those areas.

• Develop a business plan and identify the operational assumptions for
LIBQUAL+™ on a fully cost-recovery basis.

• Explore ways to integrate the annual ARL statistical surveys into the current
LIBQUAL+™ infrastructure and consider offering the ARL Statistics service at
no cost to LIBQUAL+™ participants in order to increase market penetration of
the project.

Financial Strategy for 2003

ARL was awarded a three-year (October 2000–September 2003) grant by FIPSE to
further develop the LIBQUAL+™ instrument and service. The FIPSE funding is
allowing ARL to refine the survey questions, service quality dimensions, and data-
gathering processes and develop a cost-recovery service that ARL libraries and other
academic and research libraries can use to determine their own service effectiveness.
The FIPSE funds of $498,368 cover 49.5% of the estimated costs of the project, with ARL
and Texas A&M University contributing the remaining 50.5% of the total project costs.
In addition, institutions participating in the project are charged a modest administrative
fee.

In 2003, ARL will contribute 10% of the salary of the project director and the cost of the
computer hardware acquired at ARL to administer the project. FIPSE funds and
participants’ fees will cover project expenses of $650,000, including salaries for 3 FTE
program staff and one project assistant.

Staff Contacts

Consuella Askew
LIBQUAL+™ Program Specialist
<consuella@arl.org>

Amy Hoseth
New Measures Project Assistant
<amyh@arl.org>

Martha Kyrillidou
Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement
<martha@arl.org>

Jonathan Sousa
Technical Applications Development Manager
<jonathan@arl.org>

<http://www.arl.org/libqual/>
E-METRICS

First known as the e-Usage project (Usage Measures for Electronic Resources), the ARL E-Metrics project is an effort led by Sherrie Schmidt (Arizona State) and Rush Miller (University of Pittsburgh) to explore the feasibility of collecting data on the usage of electronic resources. Goals of the project are to (a) develop, test, and refine selected statistics and performance measures to describe electronic services and resources in ARL libraries; (b) engage in a collaborative effort with selected database vendors to establish an ongoing means to produce selected descriptive statistics on database use, users, and services; and (c) develop a proposal for external funding to maintain the development and refinement of networked statistics and performance measures.

The formal, funded project was completed in 2002 and the project investigators’ report was accepted. The next phase of the project began in the summer of 2002 with a call for participation to all ARL member libraries to continue the work of the project and test the proposed measures during 2002-03. This includes examining the deliverables from the project; collecting data totals for FY02 with an eye to compilation needs, data analysis, distribution of the data, and discussion of the data-gathering and analysis process; and identification of best practices for the work processes needed to gather the data using either the recommendations as presented in the E-metrics reports or locally developed by participating libraries.

ARL is also continuing its work with the vendor community, primarily by supporting COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of NeTworked Electronic Resources), a multi-agency project developing a single, internationally accepted code of practice that will allow the usage of online information to be measured more effectively. ARL also monitors developments within the national and international standards communities as draft standards regarding data collection for electronic resources are finalized.

Priorities for 2003 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

- Continue testing of the proposed measures by project participants to determine the level of effort needed for collection and to determine if there is enough consistency of results to extend the collection effort to the whole ARL community.

- Work with Gordon Fretwell, University of Massachusetts, who is serving as a Visiting Program Officer, to compile and analyze reported data.

- Support and promote the work of COUNTER to develop an achievable and widely supported common code of practice for vendor-based online usage statistics.
• Continue to work with the project’s Task Force on Statistics from Vendor-Based Database Products to identify a core set of data that vendors can provide to libraries with consistency.

• Publicize the project’s work in the ARL and academic library community.

**Developmental Priorities**

• Develop a communication strategy for e-metrics among participating libraries and the larger community interested in Web metrics and analytics, including digital library development projects.

• Explore with a small group of libraries the value of digital resources; in particular, identify, if possible, methods for measuring the value and outcomes that are realized when library patrons use electronic resources.

• Develop a small demonstration project involving a few libraries and a couple of vendors/publishers to test the scalability of harvesting use measures from vendor-supplied data.

• Develop a workshop on e-metrics best practices, data mining, data warehousing, and Web usability issues.

• Identify other groups with which ARL can work to provide substantive guidance to further refine digital collection measures.

• Plan for the next phase of the project, which is to link electronic measures to institutional goals and objectives. Work with specific institutions that want to do further work in this area.

**Financial Strategy for 2003**

E-Metrics was a self-funded project with 24 libraries participating, each paying $10,000. In 2002, the project covered expenses of $136,000, including .25 salary of program staff. Project activities under contract with the Information Use Management and Policy Institute at Florida State University led by Charles McClure, Wonsik “Jeff” Shim, and John Carlo Bertot are completed. Additional data collection from the original 24 participating libraries will be supported by Gordon Fretwell, University of Massachusetts, as a Visiting Program Officer. Additional libraries participating in the next phase of the project are being charged a modest participation fee of $2,000. Sherrie Schmidt and Rush Miller also continue to support ARL’s involvement in the U.K. Publishing and Library Solutions Committee and related agencies. In 2003, the project has budgeted for expenditures of $42,513, including .10 FTE of program staff salary.

**Staff Contact**

Martha Kyrillidou  
Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement  
<martha@arl.org>
<http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/emetries/>
NSDL DIGITAL LIBRARY ASSESSMENT PROJECT

ARL is collaborating with the Texas A&M University Libraries to adapt the LIBQUAL+™ instrument for use in the science, math, engineering, and technology education digital library community. The NSDL Digital Library Assessment project goals include: (a) define the dimensions of digital library service quality from the users’ perspectives; (b) develop a tool for measuring user perceptions and expectations of digital library service quality across NSDL digital library contexts; (c) identify digital library best practices that permit generalizations across operations and development platforms; (d) enhance student learning by effectively managing student perceptions and expectations of digital library services; (e) establish a digital library assessment program within the larger library service quality assessment program at ARL; and (f) institutionalize continuous digital library product and process evaluation efforts directed towards innovative and timely management of outcomes. The principal investigators are Duane Webster (ARL) and Fred Heath, Colleen Cook, Yvonna Lincoln, and Bruce Thompson (Texas A&M University).

Priorities for 2003 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

- Implement interviews with users of various NSDL collections.
- Modify the LIBQUAL+™ protocol by incorporating relevant experience from the various ARL New Measures projects to advance the goals of the NSDL LIBQUAL+™ project.

Developmental Priorities

- Collaboratively engage the strategic goals, governance structure, and digital library development projects that are part of the NSF/NSDL context.
- Collaborate and participate in evaluation activities and meetings of the NSDL Evaluation Working Group.

Financial Strategy for 2003

The National Science Foundation (NSF) awarded a $245,737 grant to ARL and Texas A&M for a three-year period (October 2001–September 2004) to assess service quality in digital libraries. In 2003, ARL will contribute 10% of the project director’s salary to the project. NSF funds will be used to cover project expenses of $104,200, including salaries for .65 FTE program staff.

Staff Contact

Martha Kyrillidou
Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement
<martha@arl.org>
ASSESSING ILL/DD SERVICES

The Assessing ILL/DD Services project aims to obtain current data on the performance of mediated and user-initiated (unmediated) interlibrary loan (ILL)/document delivery (DD) operations in research and academic libraries. It updates, replicates, and expands the 1995–97 ARL ILL/DD Performance Measures Study.

The 1995–97 study provided 1996 baseline data to enable librarians to identify and understand local performance of mediated ILL/DD operations and compare the performance of their operations to other participants’ operations. That study tracked borrowing and lending unit costs, borrowing and lending fill rates, borrowing turnaround times, and borrowing user satisfaction for 97 research and 22 college libraries. The findings were published and distributed at 12 ARL-sponsored workshops and more than a dozen other workshops and speeches. The methodology was adapted for use in studies in Australia and the Nordic countries. Libraries of all types and sizes have incorporated many of the characteristics of high-performing borrowing and lending operations identified in the study.

This new study will track the effect of those changes for the libraries that participated in the earlier study, collect new data on user-initiated ILL/DD services, and analyze the performance of the mediated and unmediated models for providing ILL/DD services. An invitation to participate in the study was issued during the summer of 2002 and 75 research and academic libraries responded. In late 2002, a small group of libraries tested the revised instruments.

Priorities for 2003 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

• Distribute the final instrument for mediated ILL in February and the instruments for user-initiated and turnaround time in the spring.

• Analyze and disseminate results to each participant for their review in June.

• Prepare final report and publicize findings to the community in the fall of 2003.

Financial Strategy

Project expenses are paid for by participant fees of $1,838 per ILL department.

Staff Contact

Mary Jackson
Senior Program Officer for Access Services
<mary@arl.org>
SAILS

SAILS, Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills, is a project developed at Kent State University to create a tool for measuring information literacy and assessing its impact on student learning. The tool will be standardized, easily administered, valid, and reliable. It will be based on the outcomes defined by the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education and will be administrable at any type of institution to provide data for both internal and external benchmarking. Information on SAILS can be found at <http://sails.lms.kent.edu/>.

The ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee endorsed SAILS as part of the New Measures Initiative and placed it on the agenda of the committee’s Learning Outcomes Working Group, which is addressing issues of higher education outcomes. Kent State University received a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services to continue development of SAILS. The principal investigators are Carolyn Radcliffe, Lisa O’Connor, and Julie Gedeon (Kent State). The grant includes testing with other institutions across three phases:

- Phase I: Implementation at 10 institutions, spring 2003
- Phase II: Implementation at 30 institutions, fall 2003 & spring 2004
- Phase III: Implementation at 100 institutions, fall 2004 & spring 2005

ARL entered into an agreement with Kent State University Library to coordinate and manage the process of participation for all institutions whether they are ARL members or not. This includes calls for participation; making arrangements for planning meetings, training workshops, and follow-up meetings; and marketing and public relations for the project.

Priorities for 2003 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

- Launch the SAILS project with Kent State University.
- Offer necessary training to all participating libraries.
- Administer the SAILS instrument via the Web at 10 libraries.
- Provide data and analysis to spring 2003 participating institutions.
- Disseminate information about the project to the academic library community via professional conferences and publications.
- Work with Kent State University to develop the project’s Web site.
- Use information from the management of Phase I of the SAILS Project to provide cost data to determine needed ARL staff support.
• Assist the SAILS Advisory Council with refinements to the instrument.
• Issue call for participation and manage first half of Phase II of the project.

**Developmental Priorities**

• Begin development of a business plan with Kent State University for long-term support for the SAILS Project.
• Collaboratively engage other interested organizations in SAILS.
• Develop a strategy for ongoing modification of the SAILS instrument.
• Begin planning for long-term technology needs of the project.

**Financial Strategy for 2003**

Kent State University has received a three-year grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services for $252,000 to continue development of SAILS. As with other New Measures projects, an administrative fee paid by participating libraries will cover the costs of producing the deliverables and managing the project. The cost to participate in Phase I is $2,500 per library; costs per institution for subsequent phases are expected to be less. The project plans to make the tool and service self-supporting in the long run.

**Staff Contact**

Julia Blixrud  
Director of Information Services  
<jblix@arl.org>
141st ARL Membership Meeting
ARL Committee on Statistics and Measurement
Wednesday, October 16, 2002
8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
New York Room, Mayflower Hotel,
Washington, DC
Minutes of the Meeting

Committee Members present:
Don Bosseau, Miami
Brinley Franklin, Connecticut
Joan Gotwals, Emory
Eileen Hitchingham, Virginia Tech
Diane Perushek, Hawaii
Carolynne Presser, Manitoba
Sherrie Schmidt, Arizona State
Paul Wiens, Queen's
Sandra Yee, Wayne State
Jennifer Younger, Notre Dame
Carla Stoffle, Chair, Arizona
Julia Blixrud, ARL
Martha Kyrillidou, ARL

Guests:
Consuella Askew, ARL
Deb Carver, Oregon
Jean-Pierre Coté, Montreal
Deb de Bruijn, Canadian National Site Licensing Project
Fred Heath, Texas A&M
Ellen Hoffman, York (retired)
Nancy John, Illinois at Chicago
Lisa O'Connor, Kent State
Sarah Pritchard, California - Santa Barbara
Carolyn Radcliffe, Kent State
Hannelore Rader, Louisville
Brian Schottlaender, California - San Diego
Peter Shepherd, Project COUNTER
Jonathan Sousa, ARL
Helen Spalding, ACRL
Mark Weber, Kent State
Duane Webster, ARL
Jerome Yavarkovsky, Boston College
Peter Young, National Agricultural Library
Carla Stoffle, chair of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee, convened the meeting. The activities report was reviewed and supported. Jennifer Younger moved acceptance of the minutes and Sherrie Schmidt seconded the motion. The minutes of the May 2002 meeting were approved with editorial corrections submitted by Diane Perushek.

**SAILS Project.** Lisa O’Connor and Mark Weber provided an overview of the project and outlined the relationship that is being established between Kent State University (KSU), ARL and the SAILS project team. The project is currently funded by a three-year development grant from IMLS, with a project coordinator and external consultants hired to support the primary investigators (Julie Gedeon from Information Services and Lisa O'Connor and Carolyn Radcliff, librarians, from Libraries and Media Services).

Elements being addressed through this project include test format, delivery mechanisms, item development, testing via the web with Oregon State, and report formats. SAILS is being developed for college students, but the model can be applied to K-12 students. The relationship with ARL will use some of the LibQUAL+™ model, but since the IMLS grant is to Kent State and not joint with ARL, some SAILS arrangements will be different. The KSU team is primarily responsible for item development and ARL will be responsible for the administration of the SAILS instrument and the delivery of the products. The goal is to establish a program that will be available for libraries beyond the duration of the grant. Duane Webster indicated that ARL would like to be a full partner in planning and development and sees its role beyond simply an administrative and marketing operation. ARL and Kent State will need to work jointly (similar to the Online Lyceum and the LibQUAL+™ efforts) to determine how we can best achieve the desired outcomes. Both partners need to be active for the success of the program. The initial testing will start with 10 institutions; Helen Spalding indicated that ARL and ACRL can move the instrument to a much larger community since ACRL has a very strong information literacy service component. Lisa O’Connor indicated that the design development is still at the early stages and can be strengthened with input from other partners but their intent is to manage the design tightly and professionally. Brinley Franklin indicated that this is a logical progression similar to other new measures work where projects are developed locally and gradually and then are extended to larger groups; this is a multi-year progression and we need to be careful how the application broadens. Next steps include the development of a Memorandum of Understanding that phases in the ARL management role. Members of the Learning Outcomes Working Group continue to serve as an informal advisory group on the project, and the method of self-financing needs to be developed. The self-financing model has been successful and it is a good strategy for making new tools available to the broader library community.

**Learning Outcomes Working Group.** This group is looking into options for obtaining College Student Engagements Questionnaire (CSEQ) data for further analysis and exploring the options for adding specific library questions in this national survey. As part of the activities for this working group, Sheila Young (Arizona State) is drafting a white paper on learning outcomes.
Fred Heath provided an update regarding the LibQUAL+™ project indicating that the success of the project relies on the effective blending of the technical, marketing, and research expertise, and the effective collaboration between ARL staff and faculty at Texas A&M. He believes LibQUAL+™ has reached a model of sustainability and the instrumentation has reached the standard for reliability and validity the faculty at Texas A&M would like it to have. The technology is proving sufficient and robust. Participating institutions see deficits and address deficits that make a difference in user perceptions and by measuring service perceptions they can show staff members that library administration cares about the service they provide, and as a result staff can change their attitudes towards service. In the coming year the project is implementing a French translation as well as a British version. Fred pointed out that it takes a village to nurture and sustain an effort such as LibQUAL+™ and the ability to engage a wide range of expertise and have willing collaborators. He added that the NSF NSDL grant will allow project staff to explore how the instrument can be modified and applied to digital libraries.

E-Metrics. Sherrie Schmidt provided an update regarding the E-Metrics project. An extensive report is available through the ARL publications program but all the documents are also available online on the web. The E-Metrics project is continuing this year with 35 participating institutions utilizing the definitions defined through the project. Gordon Fretwell offered to coordinate the 2001203 activities on a volunteer basis and facilitate the data collection. While some non-ARL libraries expressed interest in participating, it was decided to limit participation this round to ARL and consider opening it up to other libraries at a later date. As part of the E-Metrics project, ARL also sponsors an international effort known as Project COUNTER. Peter Shepherd briefed the committee on the work of Project COUNTER and described progress to date. Project COUNTER is an important effort that tries to develop a Code of Practice for uniform reporting of vendor and publisher online usage statistics. His powerpoint presentation to the committee is available at:

<http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/emetrics/COUNTER_1002.htm>

Brinley Franklin provided a brief update regarding the networked electronic services usage patterns study that he and Terry Plum have applied across four academic health sciences libraries. The purpose of the study is to explore the demographics of online users and the purpose of their use of electronic resources. This study tries to extend the methodological assumptions applied in in-house use studies that determine the indirect cost that libraries should receive and is looking to develop a model for web use studies. As libraries are asked to provide more and more services, funders of research grants make the assumption that the home institution will provide the resources. Overhead studies have demonstrated that researchers involved in sponsored projects make greater use of the library materials. The issue now is how to demonstrate this relationship in the digital world. Several Committee members and guests were interested in developing this activity into another new measures project. Volunteers included Diane Perushek, Hannelore Rader, Joan Gotwals, Carolynne Presser, Nancy John, Sandra Yee, Eileen Hitchingham, and Sarah Pritchard.
ILL/DD Performance Measures Study. A total of 73 libraries have agreed to participate in the Assessing ILL/DD Services Project. This activity will update, replicate, and expand the 1997 ARL ILL/DD Performance Measures Study to obtain current data on the performance of mediated and user-initiated (unmediated) interlibrary loan (ILL)/document delivery (DD) operations in research and academic libraries. Participants include:

14 non-ARL (university, college, and special)
11 ARL first time participants (including 3 branch libraries)
27 ARL participants in both earlier studies
16 ARL participants in 1997 study (but not 1993)
5 ARL participants in 1993 study (but not 1997)
4 Canadian ARLs

Tom Delaney (Colorado State University), Bruce Kingma (Syracuse University), and Mary Jackson (ARL) are in the processing of revising the instrument. For further information, see the project web site <http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/ill-dd.html>.

Cost effectiveness. There are currently two different studies looking into these issues. TCA DecisionBase has been developed from a series of technical services cost studies led by Dilys Morris. It provides a new software package that provides cost-accounting information for technical services and other library service areas will soon be available to ARL and other libraries. It was developed by the Chronus Group and recently released under the brand name TCA DecisionBase1.0. Some libraries felt that this detailed time recording activities may burden library staff and more work needs to be done to understand how people can use the measured activities in decision making. The need to explore the applicability of comprehensive cost accounting frameworks is also being explored with a model originally developed and currently being refined by Eileen Hitchingham (Virginia Tech). The latter model is a little too general. Committee members wondered whether a happy medium between the two methodologies could be developed. Committee members also indicated that workflow issues are important in this process and understanding how to map the work process is another aspect to be incorporated into these time and cost models. What is more important to know: time or cost? Eileen Hitchingham proposed the idea of trying to utilize these models in relation to time rather than costs.

Service Quality Evaluation Academy. Consuella Askew reported that ARL sponsored a Service Quality Evaluation Academy, an intensive five-day workshop emphasizing basic concepts and skills in measurement and data analysis that are applicable to service quality evaluations (27-31 May 2002). The Academy curriculum focused on qualitative and quantitative methods for collecting and analyzing library service quality data and time was devoted to relevant software skills, including the use of SPSS for quantitative data analysis and the use of ATLAS.ti to analyze the content of interviews or responses to open-ended survey questions. The event was successful according to the participants and will be offered again.

Statistics Subcommitte. A subcommittee (Brinley Franklin, Sarah Pritchard, Jennifer Younger, and Sandra Yee) has been established to address a variety of questions that
have arisen regarding major variables in ARL's descriptive statistics. A first question came from ARL members regarding better guidance on how data are gathered and reported for the five variables that make up the ARL membership criteria index. A second issue surrounds the counting of e-books within the volume count. And third, a Center for Research Libraries proposal for distributing print holdings and the use of joint storage facilities also raised questions about whether strategies to rationalize space are compromised by ARL statistical practices that appear to encourage libraries to retain high volume counts. The subcommittee will review the history of ARL's statistics and suggest scenarios for the future. The committee indicated that the scope of the subcommittee is becoming very complex and they are concerned about "scope creep", and although originally charged to address unexplained movement in the ARL membership criteria index data, issues related to the holdings stored in remote storage facilities seem to be a more important to the members. The subcommittee was encouraged to look into ways to count the volumes stored in remote facilities in a positive way that would create incentives for libraries to manage their local collections in a better way without penalizing libraries and creating major public relations issues in relation to the ARL membership criteria rankings.

**ARL Salary Survey.** A lengthy discussion has been held on a Personnel e-list regarding the type of professionals ARL members include in the staff data (Part II) of the annual ARL Salary Survey. There is a range of assumptions that could lead to confusion regarding data comparability or non-comparability. The Functional Specialist category is especially broadly interpreted, possibly as libraries add more and more staff (with or without MLS) that seem to fall into that category. Several personnel officers suggested raising this topic at the ARL HR Symposium and others are recommending that more specific categories be developed. The personnel administrators are interested in bringing forward a proposal to the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee for revising the job categories in the salary survey.

**Descriptive Surveys.** The issue of whether the Committee needs to consider modification to the annual statistical surveys was briefly discussed and the members were divided as to whether this is desirable. One concern is that it will divert energy from new measures work. On the other hand, new measures work needs to start informing the annual statistical compilations. Have we learned enough to propose some changes to the annual statistical surveys? Are some of the e-metrics data elements collected in the ARL Supplementary Statistics mature enough to be moved to the ARL Statistics? It was decided that the committee should examine this issue carefully in the upcoming May 2003 committee meeting.

**Special Collections.** The ARL Special Collections Task Force is considering establishing a survey for special collections – it will be similar to the model used for other new measures where interested members will sponsor and support the effort. The ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee encouraged this Task Force to think in terms of outputs and outcomes in relation to the use of special collections as they develop their survey.
Carla Stoffle indicated that this was her last meeting as a chair of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee. She expressed her feeling that this has been a very satisfactory meeting and probably the hardest working committee at this conference. She thanked the committee members for the productive meeting and the hard work that has taken place in the various New Measures Projects over the last years.
DRAFT
Proposed Changes to the ARL Data Collection Activities

Informed by lessons learned from the New Measures work that have taken place so far and with the understanding that these experiments need to continue to inform our practices

May 2003

Background

A subcommittee comprised of Brinley Franklin, Sarah Pritchard, Sandra Yee and Jennifer Younger has been established from the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee to address a variety of questions that have arisen regarding major variables in ARL’s descriptive statistics with the task of examining the history of these variables in the ARL Statistics and brainstorming on what the future of them might look like. The work of the subcommittee is being informed by developments in the various New Measures Projects and addressed the following issues:

Issues:

A. Measuring “Volumes Held”

As libraries are moving into more collaborative frameworks the question was raised whether the ARL Statistics create negative incentives for participation in national or regional book repositories. The subcommittee discussed how ARL might best neutralize the disincentives and encourage good management practices regarding these shared collections.

Proposal:

Modify the way the ARL Statistics collects and reports “volumes held” to: i) volumes held on-campus, ii) volumes transferred or deaccessioned and preserved through a shared facility, but have depository access through a shared facility, iii) volumes collectively owned or electively contributed from the outset. The subcommittee is uncertain of how the change could affect the ARL Membership Criteria Index but proposes collecting the data to make more informed decisions about if and how this could in the future be a recommendation for a change in the ARL Membership Criteria Index.

B. From Testbed to ARL Statistics

The ARL Supplementary Statistics questionnaire serves as a testbed to collect information on new measures and has yielded information on public services and government documents in the past that have been moved to the ARL Statistics. Currently, it collects the data elements listed in Table 1 below that mostly focus on
expenditures for electronic resources. Questions are either finalized and moved into the main statistics questionnaire, or determined not to be of value and removed from consideration. The variables listed in Table 1 have been collected since 1994 and most of them document the increasing amounts of money libraries spent on electronic resources.

Proposal:

Consider moving all items except questions 2a, 2b, and 8 into the ARL Statistics. The expenditures items have been tested and collected thoroughly for over a decade and they document important trends that need to be included in the main ARL Statistics. Many libraries are pointing to the increasing amount of investments they are making in electronic resources to demonstrate their effectiveness in the emerging environment and the data have been gaining in credibility and usefulness to warrant considering moving them to the ARL Statistics.

Questions 2a and 2b are still not reported by the majority of the libraries; they can continue to reside in the ARL Supplementary Statistics. Question 8 (In-house Use) is documenting another aspect of the declining in-person services libraries are providing and is not adding any additional information compared to the other service questions we collect in the ARL Statistics (circulation, reference transactions, presentations to groups).

C. Testing More Emetrics

The ARL Emetrics project has been growing and maturing with more than 35 libraries trying to collect the proposed 17 data elements that describe cost, use and extensiveness of e-resources. Discussions are ongoing regarding clarification of definitions as well as adjustments to existing data elements. The subcommittee believes it is time to operationalize this experiment and recommends moving the data elements into the ARL Supplementary Statistics.

Proposal:

Make ARL Emetrics data elements recorded in Table 2 that are not currently part of the ARL Supplementary Statistics a regular supplementary data collection (Supplementary Statistics: Testing Emetrics).

D. Publishing the ARL Membership Criteria Index

In the past, ARL was discouraged from including the ARL Membership Criteria Index in the ARL Statistics publication because of a concern that it would be misinterpreted as a measure of quality. However, the Chronicle of Higher Education continues to request the data and publicize the Index annually, making it widely available. In addition ARL makes the Index available through its website as well as through the interactive edition supported by the University of Virginia.

Proposal:
At this point, the subcommittee recommends including the ARL Membership Criteria Index in the ARL Statistics along with an explanation of what it does and does not represent. In this scenario it would be one of 19 rank order tables in the publication.

Planning and timing of the proposed changes will be determined pending on the outcomes of the ARL Statistics and Measurement discussion.

**# Libraries TABLE 1. ARL Supplementary Statistics Variables Reporting**

**EXPENDITURES**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1. Computer Files (one-time/monographic purchase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>2. Electronic Serials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2a. Electronic indexes and reference tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2b. Electronic full text periodicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>3. Bibliographic Utilities, Networks, and Consortia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3a. Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3b. External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>4. Computer Hardware and Software:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>5. Document Delivery/Interlibrary Loan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELECTRONIC ACCESS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>6. Number of records of locally owned materials in local online catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>7. Percentage of cataloged library holdings represented by OPAC records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IN-HOUSE USE**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>8. Number of in-house uses of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure based on sampling? Yes.No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SERVICES HOURS AND STAFFED SERVICES POINTS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>9. Number of staffed library service points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>10. Number of weekly public service hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Summary of Data Elements to be reported by participating libraries

**Patron Accessible Electronic Resources**
- R1 Number of Electronic Full-Text Journals
- R2 Percentage of electronic journals to serials subscriptions (added later)
- R3 Number of Electronic Reference Sources
- R4 Number of Electronic Books

**Use of Networked Resources and Related Infrastructure**
- U1 Number of electronic reference transactions
- U2 Number of logins (sessions) to electronic databases
- U3 Number of queries (searches) in electronic databases
- U4 Items requested in electronic databases
- U5 Virtual visits to library's website and catalog
- U6 Select list of electronic dbs based on cost (separate spreadsheet in development)
- U7 Web count hits (suggested by Eric Lease Morgan, Notre Dame)

**Expenditures for Networked Resources and Related Infrastructure**
- C1 Cost of electronic full-text journals
- C2 Cost of electronic reference sources
- C3 Cost of electronic books
  - **C4 Library expenditures for bibliographic utilities, networks and consortia**
  - **C5 External expenditures for bibliographic utilities, networks and consortia**

**Library Digitization Activities**
- D1 Size of library digital collection
- D2 Use of library digital collection
- D3 Cost of digital collection construction & management

**Additional Proposed Performance Measures**
- P1 Percentage of electronic reference transactions to total reference
- P2 Percentage of virtual visits of all library visits (N/A)
- P3 Percentage of electronic books to all monographs
Current Section on Volumes held from the ARL Statistics:

COLLECTIONS

Volumes in Library: (See instruction Q1-4.)

   (Exclude microforms, uncataloged govt. docs., maps, a/v material.  
   Record figure reported last year or footnote adjusted figure on p. 4.)  

2. Volumes added during year -- Gross.  (See instruction Q2.)  
   (Exclude microforms, uncataloged govt. docs., maps, a/v material.)  

2a. Volumes withdrawn during year.  
   (Exclude microforms, uncataloged govt. docs., maps, a/v material.)  

3. Volumes added during year -- Net.  (Subtract line 2a from line 2.)  

1. Volumes held June 30, 2002.  (Add line 1a to line 3.)
Brinley/Martha,

The ACRL Personnel Administrators and Staff Development Officers Discussion Group agreed at ALA Mid-winter 2003 to look at the Functional Specialist category and then submit its recommendations to the ARL Statistics and Measurements Committee for discussion. Over the past several months, a small group worked to identify the problem and to collect data. Input was gathered from ARL Salary Survey Coordinators, and Personnel Administrators and Staff Development Officers. Our recommendations are below.

Problem:
The ARL Salary Survey data is used to compare salary information, set salaries and request institution monies to increase salaries. Because of current trends in library staffing, new professional positions are being added that increase the number of Functional Specialists, leading to the possibility of including non-comparable data in the survey. We believe that gathering the data at a "near" title level will prove useful to further analysis that relates to the changing nature of work and positions in ARL libraries.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. The Functional Specialist category should include the following group of subcodes:

ARCH - Archivists/Curators
BUSI - Budget/Fiscal/Business Manager/Facilities
HUMRES - Human Resources/Training/Staff Development
ITS - Information Technology Systems
ITW - Information Technology Web Development
ITP - Information Technology Programming/Applications Development
MEDIA - Media/Multimedia Specialists (including graphics)
PRES - Preservation/Conservation
(The ability to provide longitudinal analysis will not be jeopardized with this approach, as long as these codes are understood to be part of the Functional Specialist category. We had several discussions about the proposed placement of BUS and HUMRES into this category. Some thought that the logical place for these positions was in the ADMIN category, but our brief survey of Salary Survey Coordinators showed that MOST include these positions here.)

2. Clarify the ADMIN category to reflect inclusion of positions such as Public Relations/Communications, Development/Fundraising, and other Administrative Services and/or professional positions which do not have a logical home elsewhere.

3. Many institutions expressed the desired to be able to compare MLS to non-MLS salaries, and to compare salaries among those with the MLS. This issue will require further investigation.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue and feel free to contact me if you have questions or need clarification.

Deborah Stansbury Sunday
Director, Library Administrative Services and the Regional Campus Libraries
369 Fairfield Ave., U-1005
Storrs, CT 06268
860.486.4481
Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services – A Survey Methodology for Research Libraries

Brinley Franklin, Director of Libraries, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT
Terry Plum, Assistant Professor, Simmons Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Boston, MA

This paper is a summary of an article by the authors, appearing in *Performance Measurement and Metrics* 2002. 3(3): 123-133.

Introduction

The authors surveyed patron use of electronic services at four academic health sciences libraries in the United States between 1999 and 2002. More than 9,000 library users participated in the assessment of networked electronic services.

The principal fields of inquiry were:

- What is a reliable methodology for examining the use of electronic services, which captures in-library and remote web usage in a sound representative sample?

- What are the demographic differences between in-house library users as compared to remote library users by status of user (e.g., faculty member, staff member, graduate/professional student; and undergraduate student)?

- What are the users’ purposes for accessing electronic services (e.g., sponsored (funded) research, instruction/education/non-sponsored research, patient care and other activities)?

- What are the differences in usage of electronic resources based upon the location of users (i.e., in the library; on-campus, but not in the library; or off-campus)?

- What information technology service should libraries implement to make such studies of patron usage of networked electronic resources routine, robust, and integrated into the decision-making process?

Survey Methodology

The authors were presented with the challenge of measuring to what extent networked electronic services supported sponsored research at four academic health sciences libraries. These four libraries serve: the University of Arizona Health Sciences Center; the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center; the University of Connecticut Health Center; and the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston. At each library, this task was part of a more comprehensive cost analysis study that assigned all library costs to their host institutions’ primary functional missions: sponsored (funded) research, instruction/education/non-sponsored research, patient care, and other institutional activities. In the past, paper surveys had been distributed in the library. This study
continued to distribute paper surveys, but also simultaneously administered web delivered surveys.

Further, for this study, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Division of Cost Analysis required that all usage data for indirect cost allocation in library cost studies must be based upon actual library users and actual library usage, and not upon predicted, perceived, or anticipated usage. The authors’ sampling plan is based on the random moments sampling technique. Once a representative sample size was calculated and the number of survey hours determined, survey periods were randomly selected from the entire population of library hours available for surveying, stratified monthly.

Each participating library consequently sampled approximately forty-eight hours during a twelve-month period. In addition, for reasons of convenience and logistics, two of the libraries ran their electronic services surveys for roughly 24 hours on days designated for two-hour samples. The authors have used the larger data set (n=9020) for aggregated data totals (e.g., Table 1), but have restricted any comparison between libraries to the smaller, more statistically comparable data set of 5830 respondents (e.g., Table 2).

Concurrent with an in-house paper survey, remote users were surveyed during the randomly selected two-hour survey periods as they accessed networked electronic services purchased by the library. Both in-library and remote networked services users were presented with a brief survey screen when they selected one of the electronic databases or full-text products offered by the library (see Figure 1). Each user was asked to identify:

- Status (e.g., medical student, faculty member, etc.);
- Affiliation (e.g., School of Medicine, School of Nursing, etc.);
- Location (e.g., In the Library; On-Campus, but not in the Library, Off-Campus)
- Purpose for Using Online Resources (e.g., Sponsored Research, Instruction, Patient Care)

Precise and consistent definitions of such terms as “Sponsored (funded) Research” or “Instruction” were provided through web links to text definitions.
Networked Electronic Services
Library User Survey

This survey is being conducted by the University in order to assess usage of the Library’s electronic services.

All responses are anonymous.

After completing the survey, you will be connected to the service you selected. Thank you for your help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patron Status:</th>
<th>Select Patron Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation:</td>
<td>Select Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Select Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>A. Sponsored (Funded) Research -- Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Instruction/Education/Departmental Research--Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Patient Care-- Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources:</td>
<td>D. All Other Activities -- Definition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please fill out Status, Affiliation, Location, and Purpose Fields.

Submit Response

Figure 1

Survey Design Considerations
Some of the issues the authors attempted to address in the web-based portion of the data collection were:

1. In an institution, networked electronic resources are accessible from many different web pages and web servers, especially if the authentication method is by Internet Protocol (IP) address.
2. Patrons may bookmark networked electronic resources locally on their own workstations, skipping local web page organizational schemes altogether.
3. The survey data must be collected and be commensurable for all networked electronic resources, including e-journals, e-books, online databases or traditional library request services offered in the online environment, such as Interlibrary Loan.

4. For the purposes of this survey, digital or networked library usage had to be comparable with traditional or in-person library usage, to paint the most complete picture of patron activity. The sampling of the in-person library usage and the online library usage were similar; the questions asked on the print and web survey were the same, although obviously displayed in a different manner, and the results are comparable to each other.

5. The survey had to be meaningful for networked electronic resources, no matter how they were implemented; either locally initiated, provided by remote vendors, or outsourced to other institutions (for example, web-based ILL might be outsourced).

6. Different authentication methods had to be accommodated, whether the institution used IP, password, referring URL, or in what turned out to be the preferred method for the purposes of this survey, an authentication and access gateway.

7. Filling out the web survey had to be required for all sampled patrons, and mandatory fields were identified within the survey, typically all of questions.

8. The survey could not be posted for inordinately long periods of time, due to patron irritation resulting in suspect data and the possibility of measuring the same patron several times.

9. The survey had to be based on actual usage, not upon predicted or representative usage.

10. The survey had to be genuinely random, not just an optional survey or a sample of opportunity.

11. The survey design and methodology had to be statistically sound to withstand a potential audit by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which would be evaluating the methodology and results for integrity and potential bias.

Survey Results
The networked electronic services usage survey results were analyzed by the authors for patterns of use of potential interest to library administrators and researchers.

Demographic Differences Between In-house Library Users and Remote Library Users of Networked Electronic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total as a %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Four Libraries (n=9,020)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Medical/Professional Students</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff/Research Fellows</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Users</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Electronic Services Users, in the Library</strong></td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>19.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Medical/Professional Students</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>25.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff/Research Fellows</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>47.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are approximately four remote networked electronic users for every in-house user (7,278 remote users versus 1,742 in-house users equates to a ratio of 4.18 to 1).

This 4-1 ratio is even higher for faculty/staff/research fellows at academic health sciences libraries. There were more than five remote users for every in-house user in this classification category (4,306 remote versus 807 in-house users). Faculty/Staff/Research Fellows represent 59.16% of usage from outside the library but only 46.33% from inside the library. Remote users are demographically different from in-library users.

Each user classification (i.e., faculty/staff; graduate/medical/professional students; undergraduate students; and other users) used more networked electronic services remotely than in the library.

The users who use networked electronic resources remotely are different from those patrons who use networked electronic resources within the library. Remote users are more likely to be faculty/staff/research fellows than those who come into the library.

Contrasting Purpose of Use by In-house and Remote Users of Networked Electronic Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Four Libraries (n=5,830)</th>
<th>Sponsored Research</th>
<th>Instruction/Education/Non-sponsored Research</th>
<th>Patient Care</th>
<th>All Other Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the Library</td>
<td>307(5.26%)</td>
<td>1058(18.15%)</td>
<td>165(2.83%)</td>
<td>341(5.84%)</td>
<td>1871(32.08%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in the Library</td>
<td>1568(26.90%)</td>
<td>1440(24.70%)</td>
<td>660(11.32%)</td>
<td>291(5.00%)</td>
<td>3959(67.92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Electronic Services Use</td>
<td>1875(32.16%)</td>
<td>2498(42.85%)</td>
<td>825(14.15%)</td>
<td>632(10.84%)</td>
<td>5830(100.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Sponsored research accounts for roughly 32% of the networked electronic resources activity. Instruction/Education/Non-sponsored research accounts for about 43% of use, whereas patient care accounts for roughly 14% of networked electronic resources use.

Table 2 illustrates that sponsored researchers use networked electronic services most intensively from on-campus, but not from in the library. Sponsored researchers account for 16.41% of usage from within the library, but 39.61% of usage from outside of the
library. The data also demonstrates that users employing networked electronic resources for instruction/education/non-sponsored research are more likely to be in the library than people who use networked electronic resources for sponsored research, patient care, or any other activity. Purpose of use for remote usage of networked electronic resources is significantly different from in-house usage.

Conclusions
As a result of these pilot studies at four academic health sciences libraries, the authors are encouraged that the web-based survey methodology employed at these four libraries can serve as a model for similar user studies at other libraries. While local computing conditions influenced the technological logistics necessary to mount the survey, a similar survey screen with consistent data elements was presented to users at libraries with significantly different local computing and authorization/authentication schemes.

Libraries that were best prepared to conduct this type of research had implemented a gateway for networked electronic resources. EZProxy, Cold Fusion, or Active Server Pages can serve as the foundation for such a gateway, but there are other possibilities. Gateways are an effective way to collect anonymous data on the usage by patrons, in ways that do not depend upon transaction log analysis nor upon unique patron authentication, some of the more traditional ways of thinking about measurement at the gateway.

The methodology presented in this study might serve as a complement to the E-metrics component of ARL’s “New Measures” initiative. If implemented at a broader range of libraries, a study of this kind could bridge a gap between the current quantitative focus of the E-metrics initiative and the Research Outcomes initiative that is also part of ARL’s “New Measures” program.
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The National Science Digital Library: Developing a User-Based Assessment Protocol

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and the Texas A&M University Libraries are collaborating on a joint project for assessing service quality in digital libraries. The goal of this project, which is funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF), is to adapt the LibQUAL+™ survey instrument for use in the Science, Math, Engineering and Technology Education Digital Library community. LibQUAL+™ is a research and development project undertaken by ARL and Texas A&M to measure library service quality across institutions. The LibQUAL+™ instrument is a web-based survey of library users’ perceptions of service quality; it identifies gaps between desired, perceived, and minimum expectations of service. Some of the goals of the NSDL Digital Library Assessment project include: (a) define the dimensions of digital library service quality from the users’ perspectives; (b) develop a tool for measuring user perceptions and expectations of digital library service quality across NSDL digital library contexts; and (c) identify digital library best practices that permit generalizations across operations and development platforms. The first step in this assessment project is to re-ground the survey for the digital library environment. This will be done by analyzing the qualitative data and conducting focus groups at places like DLESE, Math Forum and Merlot.

**Digital Library for Earth Systems Education** [http://www.dlese.org]

DLESE (Digital Library for Earth System Education) is a grassroots, community-based effort involving teachers, students, and scientists working together to create a library of educational resources and services to support Earth system science education, at all levels, in both formal and informal settings. DLESE resources include electronic materials for both teachers and learners such as lesson plans, maps, images, data sets, visualizations, assessment activities, curriculum, online courses, and more. Sponsored by the National Science Foundation, DLESE is being designed, built, and governed by community members from around the country.

**Math Forum @ Drexel** [http://www.mathforum.org]

From their web site: “The Math Forum is a leading center for mathematics and mathematics education on the Internet. The Math Forum's mission is to provide resources, materials, activities, person-to-person interactions, and educational products and services that enrich and support teaching and learning in an increasingly technological world. Our online community includes teachers, students, researchers, parents, educators, and citizens at all levels who have an interest in math and math education.”

**Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching (MERLOT)** [http://www.merlot.org]

From their web site: “MERLOT is a community of educators in higher education who collaborate to develop and disseminate high quality online resources for faculty to incorporate into their courses. But, MERLOT is not just about online resources, it is also about the people who help create, use and evaluate those resources. MERLOT's members are mainly faculty and instructors, however, many campus administrators, faculty developers, librarians and other members of higher education who are concerned with online learning resources, technology, teaching and learning, and innovation have also joined MERLOT.”
SAILS Status Report

SAILS, Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills, is a project developed at Kent State University to create a tool to measure information literacy and assess its impact on student learning. The project team is developing a tool that is standardized, easily administered, valid, and reliable. The instrument is based on outcomes defined by the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education and is being designed to administer at any type of institution to provide data for both internal and external benchmarking. Information on SAILS can be found at <http://sails.lms.kent.edu/>.

SAILS has been endorsed by the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee as part of a New Measures Initiative and placed on the agenda of the Learning Outcomes Working Group addressing issues of higher education outcomes. Kent State University received a three-year grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services for $252,000 to continue development of SAILS. This includes testing with other institutions across three phases:

Phase I: Implementation at 10 institutions, Spring 2003
Phase II: Implementation at 30 institutions, Fall 2003 & Spring 2004
Phase III: Implementation at 100 institutions, Fall 2004 & Spring 2005

ARL is coordinating and managing the process of participation for all institutions whether or not they are ARL members. This includes calls for participation; making arrangements for planning meetings, training workshops, and follow-up meetings; and marketing and public relations for the project.

Criteria for Participation

The SAILS Team has determined a set of criteria that will enable successful participation in the project:

- A point person for coordinating all SAILS activity at the institution
- Access to a minimum of 200 and up to 500 undergraduate students for testing cohorts in Fall and/or Spring semesters
- Ability to provide Web access for students to take the test
- Ability to administer the test consistently within the institution at various levels of control:
  - Highly monitored - the test-taking is proctored and the procedures consistent across all students. Students check in and check out of a specified testing site, and the proctor is aware of the testing. One variation of this could be students taking the test as a group during class time.
  - Loosely monitored - Students come to a specified testing site, but do not check in or out.
  - Unmonitored - student takes the test anytime, from anywhere. (This method is the least desirable of the three for data analysis, but is acceptable.)
• Technical support for creating a Web page/interface that collects student information and generates a unique institutional identifier to be sent to the SAILS server at Kent State University
• Ability to provide demographic data from the Institutional Research Office about students taking the test insofar as possible (e.g., GPA, gender, ethnic group, class standing)
• Ability to obtain approval from local Institutional Review Board
• Ability to send a point person or representative to a two- to four-hour organizational meeting at ALA Annual conferences (e.g., June 24, 2003, Toronto) and follow-up meeting at ALA Midwinters (e.g., January 2004, San Diego)
• Willingness to allow SAILS to use collected data

Selection Factors

For purposes of participation, the SAILS team will look at the following additional factors for selection of participants:

• Geographical location
• Diversity of student body

Institutions are free to design a testing population that meets their needs – provided that all participating students are undergraduates. The more representative a testing sample is, the easier it will be to generalize results to the overall student population. Most participants in Phase I were interested in testing freshmen.

Instrument Delivery and Analysis

The survey is created at the time it is administered to students. It typically consists of 45 questions randomly drawn from a bank of items. It is delivered through a front-end web page created by each institution to obtain students' consent and to authenticate its students. The institutional web page creates a unique encrypted identifier for each student and that is the only identifier transmitted to Kent State University. At no time can Kent State University identify an individual student. No special hardware or software is required; the survey utilizes standard web browsers. A front-end mock-up, sample survey, processing script and technical instructions are made available to participants. Once testing is complete, the Project Team will compile a list of encrypted unique identifiers for which a completed survey exists. Institutions will use this list to convert the unique identifiers back into their respective student identification numbers – enabling them to pull the demographic data. The data reporting element of the project is still in development. Phase I participants will help determine the content and format at their June meeting. Individual institution raw data from SAILS must be analyzed and interpreted based on Item Response Theory (IRT) to be meaningful. Raw data will be made available for those planning to analyze the data using IRT and appropriate software such as WINSTEPS. SAILS data is not considered confidential and will be contributed to a database for benchmarking and peer-review purposes. Data reports will also contain some kind of comparative reporting. However, an institution's data will not be reported in such a way that the anonymity of
participants will be compromised. Neither will raw data be made available to institutions not participating in the project.

Phase I

Institutions participating in Phase I include:
- Auburn University
- San Jose State University
- University of Arizona
- Virginia Tech
- Washington State University
- Weber State University

Participation in Phase II

As with other ARL New Measures Initiatives, there is an administrative fee to cover the deliverables and the costs of managing and coordinating the project by ARL and Kent State University. The cost to participate in Phase II is $1,800 per library.

Institutions currently confirmed to participate in Phase II include:
- Arizona State University
- Brandon University
- Brenau Trustee Library
- Case Western Reserve University
- Howard University
- Maricopa Community College
- North Carolina State University
- Ohio University
- Roosevelt University
- Rutgers University
- San Jose State University
- University of Alberta
- University of Colorado at Boulder
- University of Connecticut
- University of Idaho
- University of Louisville
- University of Massachusetts, Amherst
- University of Montana
- University of Nebraska
- University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- University of Notre Dame
- University of Texas
- University of Washington
- Virginia Tech
- Washburn University
- Washington State University
A few other institutions are still in the process of deciding on their participation. For further information about participating in Phase II of the SAILS project, an indication of interest, an approximation of the number of students that could be tested, and the name of the contact person should be sent to Julia Blixrud <jblix@arl.org> by May 15, 2003.
Assessing ILL/DD Services Study
Current Status
May 2003

In summer 2002 ARL issued a call to participate in Assessing ILL/DD Services. The self-funded study updates, replicates, and expands the 1997 ARL ILL/DD Performance Measures Study to obtain current data on the performance of mediated and user-initiated (unmediated) interlibrary loan (ILL)/document delivery (DD) operations in research and academic libraries. This project is part of ARL’s New Measures Initiative.

A total of 77 ARL and non-ARL libraries responded. They include:

- 31 that participated in the 1992 and 1997 studies (all but 1 are ARL members)
- 5 ARL members that participated in the 1992 study, but not the 1997
- 17 ARL members that participated in the 1997 study, but not the 1992
- 11 ARL members participating for the first time
- 13 non-ARL libraries participants

Tom Delaney, Head of ILL at Colorado State, and Bruce Kingma, Associate Dean, School of Information Studies, Syracuse University, are assisting Mary Jackson in the study.

Last fall, the instruments were revised and tested by a small number of volunteers. The instruments were also modified to collect data on user-initiated services.

Mediated Services
In February the General Characteristics Questionnaire and Cost Worksheets for the mediated services were distributed with a March 31st deadline. By the end of April 73 participants had responded to questions and submitted revised instruments. Two decided not to participate due to insufficient local data, one never responded, and one was given an extension. Bruce Kingma is in the process of analyzing the data.

We aim to distribute preliminary findings at the ALA conference in mid-June. Individual reports will be sent to participants after we review the user-initiated forms as we are finding some libraries asking to make changes to their mediated forms as they collect data on their user-initiated services.

Turnaround Time
Participants are collecting data using a sample of borrowing and lending requests. Data collection began March 24th and ends May 13th. New is the collection of data on lending turnaround time.

User-initiated Services
The General Characteristics Questionnaire and Cost Worksheets for user-initiated services were distributed to participants at the end of March, with a deadline of May 30th. We have participants collecting data on the INNReach system (OhioLINK and Orbis) and the URSA system (Borrow Direct), as well as Loansome Doc, ILLINET Online, RAPID, user-initiated use of commercial suppliers, and local document delivery services.
Dissemination of Final Results
During the summer the participants will receive individual reports for the applicable user-initiated services. In August ARL expects to distribute the final results for mediated and user-initiated services, with a formal publication following. A series of workshops will disseminate the findings of the study.
Making Informed Decisions:  
The Implications of Assessment

Susan J. Beck, Paul Robeson Library, Rutgers University

The future of libraries and librarianship is intimately associated with outcomes assessment and accountability, as well as competition for diminishing resources. In every day language, the library must be able effectively to tell real stories about its accomplishments without solely resorting to anecdote. Just as important, if libraries do not assess themselves — the university administration will do it, with limited understanding and lacking perspective.

With these premises in mind, this paper reports the initial analysis of data from research conducted on the impact of assessment on library management decision-making and the degree to which assessment data has influenced change. Nine Association of Research Libraries’ public universities in the United States and Canada were studied. University library directors from each institution were interviewed concerning the impact of assessment on decision-making in their organizations. Focus groups were conducted with “Cabinet level” administrators regarding the impact of assessment on decision-making within their purviews.

At the conclusion of each session, two brief surveys were administered to subjects. The first survey assessed each individual’s beliefs regarding their institution’s development of a culture of assessment using Amos Lakos, Betsy Wilson & Shelly Phipps’ Do You Have A Culture of Assessment? The second survey used Beck’s Factors in Decision Making. Variables investigated include: university-wide accountability, governance issues, institutional assessment goals, integration of assessment activities into the planning process, costs of assessment, time spent on assessment activities, assessment impact on decisions, data driven decisions, assessment impact on customer needs, change implementation, barriers to change, technological impact on assessment process and need for new data measures.

In the fall of 2000, the Rutgers’ University Library Assessment Committee (LAC) articulated one of its goals for the year would be to better educate ourselves about assessment techniques and practices. As part of that process, we had an educational lunch meeting with Janice Ballou, then the director of the Center for Public Interest Polling at Rutgers University’s Eagleton Institute of Politics who was sharing her experiences with designing surveys.¹

¹ Since that time she has joined Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., as vice president and deputy director in the Surveys and Information Services Division. http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/Press%20Releases/ballou.htm
One of my colleagues questioned her about the results of the surveys and asked: What happens after the survey? Do the people really find the information they were looking for? How do they respond to the information they received? She really had no answer. Her specialty was survey design. Her responsibility ended with the design and administration of the survey itself. Once that was completed she moved on to the next project.

Following this luncheon, I discovered I was intrigued with survey outcomes. Soon after, I discovered that sabbatical proposals for the next academic year were due. I had been thinking it was time to take a sabbatical, but I hadn’t selected a project. I found myself considering this topic. I finally committed to studying assessment outcomes.

In my sabbatical proposal, I planned to develop my knowledge of library assessment techniques by upgrading both my qualitative and quantitative skills. I did not want to merely read a lot of library literature on assessment. Although I was looking forward to educational opportunities, I did not want to only attend workshops and conferences on assessment.

I wanted to see assessment in action. I wanted to talk with people. I wanted to know how they were using information from their assessment activities. How were librarians evaluating their services? I wanted to find out how librarians were using assessment data. Were they making data driven decisions? If not, what was informing their decisions? How were libraries using this data in their decisions? How were libraries changing? How did librarians respond to their users?

My sabbatical proposal had two components. First, there was a focus on educational activities that involved attending conferences and participating in workshops. These activities would help me develop my assessment skills. The second focus was on visiting academic libraries and interviewing library administrators and staff about their assessment experiences. I was granted a sabbatical leave for July 1, 2001-June 30, 2002.

I attended three major conferences:


---

2 You might recall that there was a publication by Grace Anne De Candido a few years ago that asked that a similar question in regard to library surveys. DeCandido, Grace Anne A. *Issues and innovations in after the user survey, what then?* Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Services, 1997.
I participated in 7 workshops. My first workshop was actually at the last ACRL Conference in Denver where I attended a pre-conference on Survey Research: A Crash Course. I also participated in ARL’s Measuring Library Service Quality Online Lyceum. I was a proud participant in the first ARL Library Service Quality Academy, a five-day intensive workshop focusing on qualitative and quantitative methods for collecting and analyzing library service quality data. Other workshops included developing listening, facilitation, and project planning skills. I was also fortunate to take a private workshop on conducting focus groups from the staff of the Rutgers Center for Organizational Development and Leadership.

The Northumbria Conference had the biggest impact on the future direction of my sabbatical project. That conference provided me with opportunities not only to learn about library assessment activities around the world, but to meet and know other library professionals who were concerned with assessment, on the cutting edge of the issues relating to assessment in libraries.

I had high aspirations. I wanted to visit libraries! I wanted to visit libraries all over the world! When finally selecting libraries to visit, I realized I needed to limit my scope of travel. My first criterion for selection was that I would limit my visits to English speaking countries. As a next step in narrowing down which libraries to visit, I decided to limit the libraries to public institutional members of ARL, thus reflecting my own background and experience. A third criterion I used was if the library had ever participated in Libqual+. Participation in Libqual+ was considered to be a positive indicator of the institution’s interest and commitment to assessment activities.

After the Northumbria Conference, I selected a couple of the libraries based on the presentations that were given there. Instinctively, I wanted to visit the University of Virginia, the University of Washington, the University of Connecticut,
and the University of Arizona (preferably in February or March). My list of libraries would change over time. I felt very strongly about visiting Canadian libraries. I was certain that visiting another country would add interesting dimensions to my study.

My final lists of libraries to visit were:

The University of Virginia
Virginia Tech
The University of Washington
The University of Arizona
Arizona State University
University of Texas
University of Connecticut
University of Toronto
York University

After selecting the libraries, I contacted the library administrator. I described my project and requested permission to visit their institution to conduct my research. I interviewed two different segments of administrators. First, I would interview the director or dean about their assessment activities. I then would interview the cabinet level administrators. Each institution has their own unique titles for the deans, or directors, or university librarians and cabinets or leadership councils. For ease of discussion, however, I have assigned these individuals into two categories: The Directors and The Cabinet

To develop my questions for the interviews, I e-mailed friends and colleagues, seeking their input about what they thought were the most important questions I could ask about assessment. My colleague’s responses trickled in, from Rutgers, the Library of Congress, Northern State University (S.D.), a library headhunter firm, the Association of Research Libraries, and a colleague from University of South Africa [whom I had met at the Northumbria Conference]. Each person suggested approaches and questions about assessment in libraries.

In developing the final list of questions, I was concerned whether I should ask different questions of the two groups of people. Ultimately, I did vary the questions slightly between the two groups, but the basic line of inquiry remained the same. I was asking: How do librarians evaluate services; do librarians make data driven decisions; and how do librarians respond to the needs of their users? See the list of questions in Table 1 and Table 2.
While I was in my question development phase, I emailed Martha Kyrillidou, [Senior Program Officer, at the Association of Research Libraries whom I kept running into at various assessment conferences] seeking interview questions. She suggested some, and also suggested that I become an ARL Visiting Program Officer assigned to the New Measures Initiatives. This would open some doors for me in my research.
I interviewed 59 librarians on 9 different university campuses across the United States and Canada. This number also includes interviewing several individuals outside of my categories, but with significant assessment responsibilities at their institutions.

Although I personally visited each institution, I was unable to interview some directors. One director, for example, was called away at the last minute. In such cases, I added director’s questions to my interview with the Cabinet level administrators. A vacationing library director volunteered to participate in a telephone interview. I interviewed the rest of the directors in their offices, with one exception, when I interviewed one director at a conference. All interviews were tape recorded and transcribed.

Working full time and trying to analyze research does not always lend itself to a speedy analysis. Originally I hoped to present my preliminary results for both directors and cabinet level administrators. However, due to time constraints; this presentation will focus only on the interviews with the Director’s.
University Wide Accountability

My first question to Library Directors was about university wide accountability. What do university administrators ask library directors about the operations of the library? Do they ask library directors about the library at all? Does the university have specific accountability requirements? Does the state government have mandated accountability requirements?

The principal responses, as might be expected were financial:

• The University expects us to make sound use of the monies that we are budgeted.

• I think they are interested that we keep track of our money; that we can talk about materials' budget; that we can talk about what happens with the materials' budget.

Other responses concerned the institution's mission and traditional library values:

• The expectation is that we will deliver the services, the resources, [and] the collections that are appropriate to a major research institution.

• I think their expectation is that we meet the needs of the students and the faculty.

Libraries in Texas, Arizona, and Washington have state mandated requirements for accountability. The University of Texas Library has a university wide accountability program, a compliance evaluation program and participates in annual performance reviews. The University of Connecticut Library also has university required performance assessments.

One director stated:

“This University expects me to create strategic movement that is consistent with the University’s articulated strategic directions or strategic movement that is consistent with the movement that is within the professions with which I deal. It expects me to be where it needs me to be and they expect that I will be there in ways that are consistent with our peers, especially in areas that require coordination standards, commonality of approach.”
Governance Issues

If I was going to investigate how assessment impacted decisions, I also needed to discover how decision-making occurred in each library. Governance structures varied across all libraries, ranging from a strong centralized model to a decentralized participatory model.

Library Directors characterize their decision-making processes like this:

- Strong Leadership with input
- Matrix team management
- Leadership Council
- Library Services Council
- Working groups
- Teams

One library director commented that: “It is my hope that we get the people involved in decision-making who have information to bring to the decision.”

I suspect my favorite response was: “I hate to say it because it sounds so bossy, strong leadership, with input.”

Evaluation of Services

Libraries survey different user groups, as one method of evaluating services. For example, some libraries will survey undergraduates, graduate/professional students, and faculty as three distinct groups. Other libraries conduct annual user surveys; some libraries alternate surveying different user groups cyclically. Library services at York University are evaluated as part of regularly scheduled graduate and undergraduate program reviews.

When multiple user groups are combined, graduate/professional students are often combined either with undergraduates or with faculty. When combined with undergraduates they are viewed as a category of students. When combined with faculty, they are viewed as having similar research agendas and use patterns.

Campus-wide web-based surveys are becoming more common as expertise grows with web technologies. The University of Connecticut conducted their first campus-wide web-based survey in the Fall of 2001. This survey focused on use, satisfaction, and importance of the library’s services, collections, facilities and equipment to their work. Users were also asked to rank their top three priorities for collections, services, facilities, and equipment.³

³ DeFranco, Francine M. Library users tell us what they think UCONNLibraries 8 (2): 1+ April/May 2002.)
Facing future space demands, The University of Connecticut Library (Spring 2002) surveyed faculty and graduate students to determine if a library shelving facility was a priority. More than 72% felt that it should be a university priority, even if it meant something else would not get built in its place. In the same survey, users responded negatively to the idea of sending library materials to an offsite storage facility.4

The University of Washington Library conducts separate surveys for each of its three users groups (Faculty, Graduate/Professional Students and Undergraduates) triennially. These surveys focus on library use and satisfaction as well as user needs and library priorities.5

The University of Virginia Library also uses a three-year cycle. In the first year, they survey faculty and then the next year, students. The third year is spent evaluating and planning for the next round of surveys. See University of Virginia’s Management and Information Services page on their Library Surveys6 In addition to their user surveys, the University of Virginia also uses the Balanced Scorecard technique as a means to track performance measurement indicators.7

Some libraries rely on using a combination of their own surveys and participation in Libqual+ to evaluate their services. Directors indicated that their Libqual+ results often validate what they anecdotally know about their services and collections. One director commented: "I think if you just had Libqual+, you would really need more, I don't think it's a stand-alone tool". The Libqual+ surveys are also used to complement other evaluations. Steve Hiller, Assessment Coordinator at the University of Washington, compares University of Washington’s experience using both types of surveys in a Library Trends article.8

Some libraries are discontinuing their own expensive user surveys, to rely on Libqual+ to provide general information about user satisfaction with library services and collections. Often these libraries also conduct specific issue surveys to provide useful information for establishing planning priorities. Arizona State University conducted use surveys in their map library in preparation for a possible merger with government documents.

---

5 See their web pages on assessment at: UW Libraries Assessment http://www.lib.washington.edu/surveys/
6 http://www.lib.virginia.edu/mis/reports/index.html
7 http://www.lib.virginia.edu/bsc/
Communicating Results

It is important to share the results with the users and stakeholders. Highlight what you know about your users and communicate how and when the library intends to respond to the findings. Directors indicated they used these methods to communicate results to their users:

- State of the Library Address
- Student Newspaper
- Library Newsletter
- Library Web Page
- Faculty & Staff Newsletters
- Faculty Liaison Program
- Presentation To University Stakeholders
- Conference presentations sharing methodological issues and results

Assessment Impact on Decisions

When asked to give examples of data-driven decisions, Director’s described changing library hours, justifying building or renovation needs, improving services, and identifying staffing trends. Data was used to develop new service policies for primary and secondary borrowers and establish a fee-based service for non-affiliated users. Survey data motivated one library to purchase all new photocopiers, and led to improving, interlibrary loan and audio-visual services. One library used circulation and reference data to close a branch library. Collections budgets were increased based on electronic use statistics. Data is used to explore staffing trends and needs.

One director said:

“We evaluate services based on the reaction of our customer base. We do a lot of active surveying; we take the results of those surveys and turn them back into major portions of action plans, either for improving services or building new services.”

Decision Factors: If Data Is Not Informing Decisions, What Is?

When decision-making data is not available, Directors are guided by:

- Benefits
- Economics
- Emotions
- Experience
- Institutional Goals
- Professional Goals
• Qualitative Data
• Strategic Directions
• Technology
• Time
• Values

**Assessment Process Goals**

When Directors talked about assessment process goals they spoke to the following types of issues:

- How do you manage assessment?
- What do you want to learn from assessment?
- What you want to accomplish once you understand the assessment data?
- How will you use your data in your planning process to establish priorities?
- Will creating a data farm support decision-making?
- How do you establish collaborative partnerships with campus units in the development of instrument design and administration, data analysis, data validity and reliability issues?

**Planning Process**

Directors cited the following information as being important for planning purposes:

- Use patterns on how people are getting to information
- Electronic services usage
- Disciplinary pockets of readiness with teaching and technology
- Examine the impact of external influences such as the Information Technology unit, which have operational impacts on your operations
- Recognize that key people in the organization are barriers at critical path points in planning
- All performance assessments are measured against the library-wide, area-wide and individual plans
- Gate and occupancy counts by time of day
- Distribution of students by discipline
Library directors found the collection of these traditional library measures meaningless for their planning purposes:

- Volume holdings
- Items holdings
- Processing statistics
- Serials added
- Volumes added
- Government documents
- Serial volumes

**Time Spent on Assessment**

Information, about time expended on assessment activities, varied across institutions. How this information was reported in the interviews also varied. Some Directors reported fte’s, while one Director reported staff spent at least 42 days annually. Other Directors indicated they had no idea.

When you think about time spent on assessment activities, you must include many variables. It is not only the time it takes to develop, administer and analyze data related to a survey or a focus group. How much time do personnel spend? How many people are involved in the cumulative processes? How much time does it take to design the survey? Some committees spend months devising questions. How long does it take to administer the survey? How long to analyze the data? How much time to present the data? Some libraries present findings to various university constituencies. Some libraries do follow-up focus groups to drill down further in the data.

When you think about assessment activities, it is not just a library focusing on one specific survey. There are daily assessment activities that go on in all institutions, which reflect the work of the library. There are university assessment requirements; there are state assessment mandates. There are also those demands placed on libraries by membership in professional organizations such as the Association of Research Libraries, and the Canadian Association of Research Libraries. Participation in Libqual+ also takes time. I suspect the Directors, who responded that they did not really know how much time they spent on assessment activities, are closer to reality.
Assessment Costs

Directors cited the following costs associated with assessment:

- Personnel (Salary)
- Programming Time
- Time
- Survey design
- Survey administration
- Follow up focus groups
- Participation Incentives
- Data Presentation
- Web Development
- Printing Costs
- Tabulating Data

Needed: New Data Measures

Directors believe the most important thing we need to do today is learn how to measure our impact.

- How do we document that we are making a difference?
- How can we demonstrate what is effective?
- What is the value of investing millions of dollars on university libraries?
- What impact does the library have on research?
- What impact does the library budget have on research?
- What is the impact of our resources and what is the value of this investment?
- How do we figure out and describe what we're doing in the building that's important?
- How do you evaluate the impact of our teaching?
- How will we find new ways of characterizing what we do in libraries so that when we are called upon we can describe how what we do is changing?

What we want to learn about our users:

- How can we start understanding what the users need?
- What do our students know about using information?
- How do we impact learning?
- How do scholars do research today, what do they value?
- How are the needs of today’s researchers changing?
How can we improve our services and collections?

- How will we determine our local responsibilities for digitization?
- What will you digitize and make available outside of the institution?
- How will you balance your digitization priorities with your acquisition of new materials and continue to purchase special collections and acquire primary research material that is archival in nature?
- How will we develop more informative reference measures?

Preliminary Conclusions

Assessment data provides evidence that documents needs and guides the implementation of change in research libraries. Specific examples of the successful use of assessment data are described. Libraries that have created, nurtured, and integrated a culture of assessment into their everyday processes are models for other institutions.

The degree to which assessment influences decisions in ARL Libraries is variable from library to library and within individual libraries. Readiness to incorporate assessment data into decision-making processes appears to be a function of leadership, need for information, interest in assessment as a decision making tool, organizational culture, as well as institutional pressures.

Library directors believe the most important thing we need to do today is learn how to measure our impact. Assessment is about measuring our impact and then telling that story. Assessment often validates instincts. We need to learn how to tell our story effectively. One Library Director told me that she was able to inform the administration that on one busy day, over 11,000 people used the library. This is a good story. Another library was able to save over $70,000 in personnel costs and give back two positions to the university because they improved their book shelving processes. This is a good story.

As one director told me: “…you are better off; it seems to me, making decisions from information than no information.”

The Next Steps

This paper reports the preliminary analysis of my data. I intend to use Atlas/Ti, a content analysis program to further analyze the transcribed interviews for both the directors and the cabinet level administrators. I will also tabulate and analyze the two surveys that my respondents completed.