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Carol Pitts Diedrichs, University of Kentucky
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FROM: Brinley Franklin, University of Connecticut
Julia Blixrud, Assistant Executive Director, External Relations, ARL
Martha Kyrillidou, Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement, ARL

Enclosed are the agenda and supporting documents for the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee meeting that will take place from 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 12, 2004, in the Sabino room of the Loews Ventana Canyon Hotel, Tuscon, Arizona.

The meeting will focus on (a) proposed changes for the annual statistical surveys, (b) a review of the proposed charge for the ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group and plans for a related workshop at ALA presented by the current chair of the Working Group, Karen Williams, (c) a presentation by Jennifer Younger on the status of a pilot project, and (d) a review of the major New Measures work and how it may relate to some of the longer term strategic initiatives.

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**. We are welcoming one new committee member, Carol Pitts Diedrichs. One member was renewed for 2004-2006: Jennifer Younger (5 minutes)

   Attachment 1: ARL Statistics and Measurement Program Plan 2004

   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 2003 (forthcoming)

   Outcome: Approval of minutes

3. **Review of the upcoming changes to the annual data-collection activities** (50 minutes)

   Attachment 3a: ARL Statistics 2003-04 Survey
   Attachment 3b: ARL Supplementary Statistics (E-Metrics)
   Attachment 3d: Duane Webster’s email regarding Atkinson’s article

Issue 1: Concerns have been expressed to the Chair of the committee and to Program staff about the new proposed item, Volumes Held Collectively, and whether adding it to the survey really reflects a short term view of what can be done. The issue of whether we need to develop a white paper on how we should describe and count collections has surfaced in these discussions. The Statistics were developed to serve a world of print collections that no longer exists. We can modify our definitions, but ultimately we're
going to have to take a fresh look at what constitutes meaningful statistics in a changing world.

Issue 2: Concerns have been expressed about the ability of some libraries to count under Current Serials Received those electronic serials that libraries have access to through consortial arrangements. The way the instructions read now allows libraries to count duplicate serial subscriptions. Because libraries often belong to a variety of consortia, the duplicate counts can increase the number of serial subscriptions dramatically. Libraries that do not actively participate in consortia are disadvantaged.

Issue 3: Is the distinction between electronic full-text journals and electronic full-text article databases meaningful at this point when accounting for these journals in the ARL Statistics? Should we count all journals available through full-text article aggregator databases? (See also ARL Supplementary Statistics – E-Metrics for a breakdown of these categories in Questions 1 and 2.)

Outcome: Advise on the issues raised regarding the annual surveys.

4. **ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group.** (30 minutes). The committee will review the proposed charge of the ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group and their ALA planning session.

Attachment 4a: Learning Outcomes Working Group Charge

Outcome: Endorsement

5. **Time allocation study at Notre Dame and Vanderbilt.** (15 minutes). Jennifer Younger will provide a brief overview on the status of a pilot time-allocation study across library functional areas using software produced by Chronus Inc.

Outcome: Understanding of current developments

(15 minute break)

6. **New Measures Review.** In the context of the various New Measures projects, the Committee will discuss strategic issues related to the program and the ways these issues may relate to the Association-wide strategic planning process that is currently underway. A special issue of the *ARL Bimonthly Report* (October/December 2003) summarized developments in New Measures. New Measures has proven a useful vehicle for experimentation and development of new tools. In addition, various New Measures projects support training activities for staff in the areas of learning outcomes, service quality, qualitative and quantitative analysis, etc. What is the future direction the committee wants to chart for the program? In what areas does the Committee want to focus the program and inform the larger Association-wide strategic process in terms of where this program needs to go over the next five years?

Attachment 6a: ARL Assessment and Evaluation Events at ALA
Attachment 6b: Upcoming ARL Learning Events

*LibQUAL+™:* More than 200 institutions will have collected over 110,000 responses by the end of May. The survey closing date was extended by one week due to the impact of the Sasser virus on the network. This year, results notebooks and Excel datafiles are being distributed electronically in PDF format soon after institutions close their survey, enabling a faster turnaround of results to participants. The first group of 2004 results notebooks was distributed at the end of April and weekly batches of institutional notebooks will be produced until the survey closes. Group notebooks are also being prepared. Results meeting will be held in both the U.S. and the U.K. A volume of articles edited by Fred Heath, Martha Kyrillidou, and Consuella Askew should be available in the coming weeks. The University of Texas, under the leadership of Fred Heath, is expanding the use of the Library Summit concept as a follow-up activity to conducting the survey; a brochure has been prepared by Clemson University staff describing the Summit concept (copies of the brochure will be available at the meeting).

*MINES:* The Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL) is participating in an online survey of electronic resources through the MINES protocol. An adaptation of the original indirect cost study methodology, the MINES protocol is an online transaction based survey that collects data on the purpose of use and demographics of electronic resource users. As libraries implement access to electronic resources through various collaborative and consortial arrangements, the MINES protocol offers a convenient way of collecting information about users in an environment where they no longer must enter a library building to access resources. The MINES protocol requires users to fill in the survey at random intervals – the required nature of the MINES protocol presented an initial challenge at some institutions as they were going through the human subjects review process. Through OCUL, 16 libraries will collect data at random intervals during a one-year period. The data will be analyzed by ARL and findings will be reported through institutional reports and in the literature.

*PROJECT SAILS:* Project SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) 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 has established this project as one of the ARL New Measures Initiatives. Nearly 50 libraries have signed up for the next phase (copies of an update will be available at the meeting).

*NSDL LibQUAL+™ (e-QUAL):* Qualitative analysis of the focus group data collected at the MERLOT and DLESE conferences in August 2003 is currently underway. Preliminary analysis resulted in a model that will be presented at the upcoming MERLOT meeting in August by Yvonna Lincoln. Questions are currently being development for instrumentation purposes from the focus group transcripts and along the lines of the preliminary model developed.

*E-Metrics:*

(a) A password-protected web site was created for libraries to share their vendor/database usage statistics; concerns have been raised regarding whether this
information can be made publicly available. Jim Self (Virginia) and Fern Brody (Pittsburgh) agreed to make a presentation at the Survey Coordinators and SPEC Liaisons meeting in Orlando regarding the E-Metrics data collection.

(b) Qualitative analysis of the feedback from participating libraries by Martha Kyrillidou and Sarah Giersch is underway. This analysis has informed the revision process of the Supplementary Statistics: E-Metrics instrument. Further analysis will also be published as an article in a special issue of *Library Quarterly*, edited by Charles McClure.

(c) A white paper on “Strategies for Benchmarking Usage of Electronic Resources across Publishers and Vendors” will be developed this summer by Wonsik “Jeff” Shim, Martha Kyrillidou, and Lynn Connaway. The white paper will: (i) describe current developments underway in standardization of usage statistics; (ii) explore and evaluate existing strategies, tools, and approaches for standardizing the collection of usage statistics; (iii) develop recommendations for next steps that will improve the ability of publishers and vendors to report consistent data across products; and (iv) develop recommendations for next steps that will improve libraries’ ability to collect usage statistics for benchmarking usage of electronic content. This work is a follow up to discussions held with the Information Use Management and Policy Institute at Florida State and the OCLC Office of Research.

(d) Project COUNTER currently has 114 members and is soliciting membership to reach its target of 150-200 organizations. Project COUNTER held its annual meeting on March 30, 2004 and a director’s report on the company’s activity is also available. Brinley Franklin attended the Project COUNTER annual meeting representing ARL.

**Assessing ILL/DD:** A total of 77 libraries participated 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. Mary Jackson (ARL) is managing this project. A publication is expected to be available in June and workshops will be conducted in the coming year. Preliminary results are reported in the ARL Bimonthly Report article [http://www.arl.org/newsltr/230/illdd.html](http://www.arl.org/newsltr/230/illdd.html).

**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 (17-21 May 2004) for the third year in a row. Colleen Cook and Bruce Thompson are serving as the academy faculty focusing on qualitative and quantitative methods respectively for collecting and analyzing library service quality data. Time is 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.
6. Information Items

A. **Academic Libraries Advisory Committee/NCES.** The Advisory Committee meets in conjunction with ALA had been chaired by Mary Jo Lynch, Director of the ALA Office of Research. Mary Jo Lynch retired recently and a job search is underway. Brinley Franklin and Martha Kyrillidou are members of this Committee.

B. **ACRL Library Statistics.** Data collection for 2002-2003 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, revised in 1983 and 1995, and now currently being voted as a completely new standard. ARL has applied to become the maintenance agency for this NISO Standard. Sherrie Schmidt serves on the revision committee.

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

E. **IFLA Statistics Committee.** Brinley Franklin, Colleen Cook and Sherrie Schmidt are the U.S. representatives on this committee. Frances Groen offered to serve as link between Performance Measures and the Universities Libraries section of IFLA.
ARL’s performance measures objective is served by the Statistics and Measurement program, which describes and measures the performance of research libraries and manages projects that create new tools and services for libraries to use to demonstrate their contribution to teaching, research, scholarship, and community service and to improve their library service effectiveness, diversity, and leadership.

Statistics and Measurement

The Statistics and Measurement program produces publications and reports about the operations of research libraries. Strategies include collecting, analyzing, and publishing qualitative and quantitative information about library collections, personnel, and expenditures, as well as indicators about the nature of research institutions. In addition to print publication efforts, the program continues to have a strong presence in electronic publishing activities. Because of ARL’s interest and expertise in library performance measurement, program staff and ARL representatives serve as liaisons or experts with other national and international groups.

Priorities for 2004 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

Respond to Important Changes in Library Data Measurement

- Incorporate successful data elements from the ARL Supplementary Statistics into the annual ARL Statistics.

- Establish Supplementary Statistics (E-Metrics) as an annual data collection activity.

- Add a new data element to the ARL Statistics for “Volumes Held Collectively” to account for volumes withdrawn from local collections because they are held in a shared remote storage facility or through a shared collaborative arrangement.

Advance the New Measures Agenda

- Support the work of the ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group.

- Demonstrate the use and value of digital resources by working with the Ontario Council of University Libraries to employ the MINES (Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services) methodology developed by Brinley Franklin (Connecticut) and Terry Plum (Simmons).

- Monitor the applicability of the technical services cost study developed by Dilys Morris (Chronus Inc.) to a methodology for allocating staff time across library service areas.

- Pursue the opportunity to become the Maintenance Agency for the NISO standard Z39.7 Information Services and Use: Metrics & Statistics for Libraries and Information Providers – Data Dictionary.
Produce Statistical Publications and Customized Reports

- Enable on-schedule and error-free production of statistical publications by communicating with survey coordinators through biannual meetings and electronic means to ensure timely and accurate data submission.
- Provide custom reports from the suite of data services: ARL Annual Salary Survey, ARL Statistics, and LibQUAL+™.
- Examine trends in electronic resource investment, demographics, and compensation in ARL libraries.
- Work with OLMS to coordinate data collection and analysis for SPEC Kits.
- Offer workshops for library staff to develop measurement and evaluation skills, working with OLMS as appropriate.
- Present and publish papers to increase the understanding and value of ARL data.

Developmental Priorities

- Identify new descriptive data elements for research libraries as the environment changes from one of input measures to one of outcome measures.
- In collaboration with OLMS, develop a consulting services program for performance measures.
- Develop measures for cost effectiveness by examining high-impact library functions that are susceptible to cost savings and performance enhancement.

Member Guidance and Staff Contact

The program receives guidance from the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee (page 72).

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

<http://www.arl.org/stats/>

LibQUAL+™

LibQUAL+™ measures user perceptions of, and satisfaction with, library services. It emerged from a pilot spearheaded by Fred Heath (Texas at Austin) and Colleen Cook (Texas A&M University). Project goals include the development of Web-based tools for evaluating library service quality, identification of best practices in library service, and the establishment of a service quality assessment program at ARL.
Priorities for 2004 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

• Administer the LibQUAL+™ survey via the Web at 200+ libraries.
• Provide LibQUAL+™ survey data and analysis to spring 2004 participants.
• Conduct analysis to establish the stability of the LibQUAL+™ norms.
• Train project participants in service quality issues and project activities.
• Conduct an outcomes-based evaluation of the project.
• Disseminate information about the project to the library community.

Developmental Priorities

• Market participation to the non-ARL postsecondary library community.
• Collaborate with groups of libraries that want to implement LibQUAL+™.
• Employ Web services and “rich Internet applications” (applications that combine the functionality of desktop software with the broad reach of the Web) to enhance the online analysis and delivery of data, automate administrative functions, and minimize customer-support questions.
• Identify areas for future training and consultation activities.
• Implement a financial plan for LibQUAL+™ to fully recover its costs.
• Explore integrating the annual ARL statistical surveys into the LibQUAL+™ infrastructure and offering the ARL Statistics service to project participants.

Member Guidance and Staff Contact

LibQUAL+™ receives guidance from the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee (page 72).

Amy Hoseth
LibQUAL+™ Communications Coordinator
<amyh@arl.org>

<http://www.libqual.org/>

E-METRICS

The ARL E-Metrics project anticipates regular collection of data on the character, nature, and use of electronic resources. Sherrie Schmidt (Arizona State) and Rush Miller (Pittsburgh) led this project during the early development stages. ARL is continuing this
work with the vendor community, primarily by supporting COUNTER, a multi-agency project developing an international code of practice for measuring the usage of online information.

**Priorities for 2004 and Beyond**

**Operating Priorities**

- Organize libraries to report database-use statistics by assisting them with the collection of data, testing proposed measures in preparation for extending the collection effort to the whole ARL community.

- Develop the survey form and instructions for the 2003-04 ARL Supplementary Statistics (E-Metrics) data collection and related products.

- Support the work of COUNTER to develop an achievable and widely supported common code of practice for vendor-based online usage statistics.

**Developmental Priorities**

- Develop a communication strategy for E-Metrics among participating libraries and the larger community interested in Web metrics, including digital library development projects. Identify other groups with which ARL can work to further refine digital collection measures.

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

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

- Work with specific institutions that want to link electronic measures to institutional goals and objectives.

**Member Guidance and Staff Contact**

E-Metrics receives guidance from the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee (page 72).

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

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

**E-QUAL**

ARL is adapting the LIBQUAL+™ instrument for use in the NSF National Science Digital Library (NSDL) community. The e-QUAL project is intended to: (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 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), Fred Heath (Texas at Austin), Colleen Cook (TAMU), Yvonna Lincoln (TAMU), and Bruce Thompson (TAMU); the project manager is Martha Kyrillidou (ARL).

Priorities for 2004 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

• Conduct interviews with users of various NSDL collections.

• Modify the LIBQUAL+™ protocol by incorporating NSDL user interview data and relevant experience from the various ARL New Measures projects to advance the goals of e-QUAL.

Developmental Priorities

• Collaboratively engage the strategic goals, governance structure, and digital library development projects that are part of the NSF NSDL.

• Collaborate and participate in evaluation activities and meetings of the NSDL Evaluation Working Group.

Member Guidance and Staff Contact

The e-QUAL project receives guidance from the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee (page 72).

Kaylyn Hipps
Editorial and Research Associate
<kaylyn@arl.org>

<http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/emetrics/nsdl.html>

ASSESSING ILL/DD SERVICES

The Assessing ILL/DD Services Study collected data on the 2001-02 performance of mediated and user-initiated (unmediated) interlibrary loan (ILL)/document delivery (DD) operations in 72 research, academic, and special libraries. This is the third ARL study to measure the performance of ILL/DD operations in North American libraries. The study collected new data on user-initiated ILL/DD services and confirmed
informal, institution-specific studies and speculations that user-initiated services provide better service to users than mediated ILL. Overall, user-initiated services have lower unit costs, higher fill rates, and faster turnaround times than mediated ILL.

**Priorities for 2004**

**Operating Priorities**

- Complete the analysis and publish the final report, which will include an analysis of the change in performance for the 44 libraries that also participated in the 1996 ARL ILL/DD Performance Measures Study.

- Publicize the findings and conduct workshops and seminars to showcase good practices of the high-performing libraries.

**Member Guidance and Staff Contact**

This project receives guidance from the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee (page 72) and the ARL Collections & Access Issues Committee (page 67).
PROJECT SAILS

Project SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) is being developed at Kent State University in partnership with ARL to measure information literacy at the programmatic level and assess its impact on student learning.

Priorities for 2004 and Beyond

Operating Priorities

- Administer the SAILS instrument for participants in Phase II (Spring 2004) and Phase III (Fall 2004) and provide resulting data and reports.
- 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.
- Assist the SAILS Advisory Council with refinements to the instrument.

Developmental Priorities

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

Member Guidance and Staff Contact

Project SAILS receives guidance from the ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group (page 76) and the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee (page 72).

Julia Blixrud
Assistant Executive Director, External Relations
<jblix@arl.org>

<http://sails.lms.kent.edu/>
ARL STATISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE, 2003-04

Please do not leave any lines blank. If an exact figure is unavailable, use “-1” (that is, “U/A”). If the appropriate answer is zero or none, use “0.” For non-university libraries, if a question is not applicable in your library, use “-2” (that is, “N/A”). University libraries should not use –2.

Definitions of the statistical categories used in this questionnaire can be found in Library Statistics, ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995. (Bethesda, MD: NISO Press, 1997.) Also, see: <http://www.techstreet.com/cgi-bin/pdf/free/152592/z39-7.pdf>. However, ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995 does not address issues related to electronic resources. ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995 has undergone a recent revision and NISO Z39.7-2002 Draft Standard for Trial Use is now available <http://www.niso.org/emetrics/>. ARL has gradually modified the interpretation of the standard definitions to accommodate electronic resources based on conventions described in the ARL Statistics Q&A at <http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/arlstatqa.html>. These conventions have been established through discussions within the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee and with the ARL Survey Coordinators who fill in these surveys on an annual basis.

Reporting Institution ___________________________ Date Returned to ARL _______________
Report Prepared by (name) _____________________________________________________________________________
Title _______________________________________________________________________________________________
Email address ______________________________________ Phone number ____________________
Contact person (if different) ____________________________________________________________________________
Title _______________________________________________________________________________________________
Email address ______________________________________ Phone number ____________________

PAGE ONE – VOLUMES

(See instructions, Q1-4.)

1a. Volumes held June 30, 2003. (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 instructions, 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, 2004. (Add line 1a to line 3.)
Volumes held collectively as of June 30, 2004.

4. Number of monographic volumes purchased. (See instruction Q4.)
(Volumes for which expenditures are reported on line 16. Footnote if titles.)
PAGE TWO – OTHER COLLECTIONS

Serials:
(See instruction Q5-7.)

5. Number of current serials, including periodicals, purchased. _____________

6. Number of current serials, including periodicals, received but not purchased, (exchanges, gifts, deposits, etc.). (See instruction Q6.) _____________

7. Total number of current serials received. (Add line 5 to line 6.) _____________

Other Library Materials:
(Record total number of pieces held June 30, 2004.)

8. Microform units. (See instruction Q8.) _________________

9. Government documents not counted elsewhere. (See instruction Q9.) _________________

10. Computer files. (See instruction Q10.) _________________

11. Manuscripts and archives. (linear ft.) (See instruction Q11.) _________________

Audiovisual materials:

12. Cartographic. (See instruction Q12.) _________________

13. Graphic. (See instruction Q13.) _________________

14. Audio. (See instruction Q14.) _________________

15. Film and Video. (See instruction Q15.) _________________
Are the below figures reported in Canadian dollars?  _____ Yes  _____ No

Library Materials:

16. Monographs. (Expenditures for volumes reported on line 4.)  (See instruction Q16.)

17. Current serials including periodicals.  (See instruction Q17.)

18. Other library materials (e.g., microforms, a/v, etc.).  (See instruction Q18.)

19. Miscellaneous. (All materials fund expenditures not included above.)  (See instruction Q19.)

20. Total library materials  (Add lines 16, 17, 18, 19.)

21. Contract binding:  (See instruction Q21; also report figure on 2003-04 ARL Preservation Survey)

Salaries and Wages:  (See instruction Q22-25.)

22. Professional staff.

23. Support staff.

24. Student assistants.  (See instruction Q24-25.)

25. Total salaries and wages.  (Add lines 22, 23, 24.)

26. Other operating expenditures:  (See instruction Q26.)

27. Total library expenditures:  (Add lines 20, 21, 25, 26.)

Electronic Materials Expenditures:  (See instructions, Q28-Q32. Round figures to nearest whole number.)

28. Computer files (one-time/monographic purchases).  (See instructions, Q28.)

29. Electronic serials.  (See instructions, Q29.)

30. Bibliographic Utilities, Networks, and Consortia.  (See instructions, Q30.)

   30a. From internal library sources.

   30b. From external sources.

31. Computer hardware and software.  (See instructions, Q31.)

32. Document Delivery/Interlibrary Loan.  (See instructions, Q31.)
PAGE FOUR – PERSONNEL AND PUBLIC SERVICES

Personnel: (See instructions, Q33-36. Round figures to nearest whole number.)

33. Professional staff, FTE. (See instruction Q33.)

34. Support staff, FTE.

35. Student assistants, FTE. (See instruction Q35.)

36. Total FTE staff. (Add lines 33, 34, 35.)

Staffed Service Points and Hours:

37. Number of staffed library service points. (See instructions, Q37.)

38. Number of weekly public service hours. (See instructions, Q38.)

Instruction: (See instructions, Q39-40.)

39. Number of library presentations to groups (See instructions, Q39.)

39a. Figure based on sampling? ______ Yes ______ No

40. Number of total participants in group presentations reported on line 39. (See instructions, Q40.)

40a. Figure based on sampling? ______ Yes ______ No

Reference: (See instructions, Q41.)

41. Number of reference transactions.

41a. Figure based on sampling? ______ Yes ______ No

Circulation: (See instructions, Q42-43.)

42. Number of initial circulations (excluding reserves).

43. Total circulations (initial and renewals, excluding reserves).

Interlibrary Loans: (See instructions, Q44-45.)

44. Total number of filled requests for materials provided to other libraries.

45. Total number of filled requests for materials received from other libraries or providers.
PAGE FIVE – LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

Ph.D. Degrees and Faculty:

46. Number of Ph.D.s awarded in FY2003-04. *(See instructions, Q46.)*

47. Number of fields in which Ph.D.s can be awarded. *(See instructions, Q47.)*

48. Number of full-time instructional faculty in FY2003-04. *(See instructions, Q48.)*

Enrollment – Fall 2003 (totals):
*(See instructions, Q49-52; line numbers refer to IPEDS survey form.)*

49. Full-time students, undergraduate and graduate. *(Add line 8, columns 15 & 16, and line 14, columns 15 & 16.)*

50. Part-time students, undergraduate and graduate. *(Add line 22, columns 15 & 16, and line 28, columns 15 & 16.)*

51. Full-time graduate students. *(Line 14, columns 15 & 16.)*

52. Part-time graduate students. *(Line 28, columns 15 & 16.)*

Attributes:

53. Basis of volume count is: _____ Physical. _____ Bibliographic. *(See instructions, Q53.)*

54. Government documents are included in count of Current Serials. _____ Yes. _____ No.

55. Fringe benefits are included in expenditures for salaries and wages. _____ Yes. _____ No.

56. Law Library statistics are included. _____ Yes. _____ No. _____ We do not have a Law Library.

57. Medical Library statistics are included. _____ Yes. _____ No. _____ We do not have a Medical Library.

58. Other main campus libraries included: [list in "Footnotes”]

59. Branch Campus Libraries. *(See paragraph six of the General Instructions.)*

Figures include branch CAMPUS libraries:
_____ Yes. _____ No. _____ We have only one campus.

If branch campus libraries are included, please specify which campuses in "Footnotes.”
If branch campus libraries are not included, please specify which campuses in "Footnotes.”

FOOTNOTES *(See instructions, Q60.)*

60. A copy of your library’s footnotes as they appeared in the published ARL Statistics 2002-03 appears on your library's survey form on the World Wide Web at <http://lrc.lis.uiuc.edu/ARL/survey.cgi/>. Please make revisions, additions, and deletions as appropriate. If any footnotes published last year are unchanged, please leave them unchanged to indicate that they are still valid.

Submit the completed questionnaire on the web
<http://lrc.lis.uiuc.edu/ARL/survey.cgi/>

Please contact Martha Kyrillidou <martha@arl.org> or Mark Young <stats-ra@arl.org> or at (202) 296-2296 for assistance.
ARL STATISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE, 2003-04

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

General Instructions

Please enter your data on the ARL Statistics Website (access via <http://www.arl.org/stats/coordinator.html>) or provide a paper copy to use for data verification. ARL no longer requires the submission of both a paper form and a web form.

Definitions of the statistical categories used in this questionnaire can be found in Library Statistics, ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995. (Bethesda, MD: NISO Press, 1997.) Also, see: <http://www.techstreet.com/cgi-bin/pdf/free/152592/z39-7.pdf>. ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995 does not address issues related to electronic resources. ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995 has undergone a recent revision and NISO Z39.7-2002 Draft Standard for Trial Use is now available <http://www.niso.org/emetrics/>. ARL has gradually modified the interpretation of the standard definitions to accommodate electronic resources based on conventions described in the ARL Statistics Q&A at <http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/arlstatqa.html>. These conventions have been established through discussions within the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee and with the ARL Survey Coordinators who fill in these surveys on an annual basis. For example, for definitions relating to electronic serials, see a discussion document prepared by Julia Blixrud <http://www.arl.org/stats/counting.html>.

The questionnaire assumes a fiscal year ending June 30, 2004. If your fiscal year is different, please provide a footnote in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire.

Please do not use decimals. All figures should be rounded to the nearest whole number.

Please do not leave any lines blank. If an exact figure is unavailable, use -1, i.e., “U/A.” If the appropriate answer is zero or none, use 0. For non-university libraries, if a question is not applicable to your library, use -2, i.e., “N/A.” (Academic libraries should never use –2 or N/A.)

In a university that includes both main and branch campuses, an effort should be made to report figures for the main campus only. (The U.S. National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) defines a branch institution as “a campus or site of an educational institution that is not temporary, is located in a community beyond a reasonable commuting distance from its parent institution, and offers organized programs of study, not just courses.”) If figures for libraries located at branch campuses are reported, please provide an explanation in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire.

A branch library is defined as an auxiliary library service outlet with quarters separate from the central library of an institution, which has a basic collection of books and other materials, a regular staffing level, and an established schedule. A branch library is administered either by the central library or (as in the case of some law and medical libraries) through the administrative structure of other units within the university. Departmental study/reading rooms are not included.

Specific Instructions

Questions 1-4. Volumes in Library. Use the ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995 definition for volume as follows:

a single physical unit of any printed, typewritten, handwritten, mimeographed, or processed work, distinguished from other units by a separate binding, encasement, portfolio, or other clear distinction, which has been cataloged, classified, and made ready for use, and which is typically the unit used to charge circulation transactions.

Include duplicates and bound volumes of periodicals. For purposes of this questionnaire, unclassified bound serials arranged in alphabetical order are considered classified. Exclude microforms, maps, nonprint materials, and uncataloged items. If any of these items cannot be excluded, please provide an explanatory footnote in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire.

Include government document volumes that are accessible through the library’s catalogs regardless of whether they are separately shelved. “Classified” includes documents arranged by Superintendent of Documents, CODOC, or similar numbers. “Cataloged” includes documents for which records are provided by the library or downloaded from other sources into the library’s card or online catalogs. Documents should, to the extent possible, be counted as they would if they were in bound volumes (e.g., 12 issues of an annual serial would be one or two volumes). Title and piece counts should not be considered the same as volume counts. If a volume count has not been kept, it may be estimated through sampling a
representative group of title records and determining the corresponding number of volumes, then extrapolating to the rest of the collection. As an alternative, an estimate may be made using the following formulae:

- 52 documents pieces per foot
- 10 “traditional” volumes per foot
- 5.2 documents pieces per volume

If either formulas or sampling are used for deriving your count, please indicate in a footnote.

**Question 2. Volumes Added.** Include only volumes cataloged, classified, and made ready for use. Include government documents if they have been included in the count of volumes on line 1a. Do not include as part of Volumes Added Gross any government documents or other collections (such as large gift collections) that were added to the collection as the result of a one time download or addition to the OPAC. Include these items in Volumes Held of the previous year (Line 1a) and provide a footnote explaining the revision of Line 1a.

**Volumes held collectively.** The defining criterion is that the library has devoted financial resources for the purchase of these items and is taking responsibility for their availability through participation in a cooperative that supports shared ownership. The library demonstrates commitment to the shared storage facility by supporting the consortium financially. Include here (a) volumes held and withdrawn from the local collection because they are held in a "shared" remote storage facility and (b) volumes withdrawn from the local collection because they are part of other collaborative arrangements.

**Question 4. Monographic Volumes Purchased.** Report number of volumes purchased. Include all volumes for which an expenditure was made during 2003-04, including volumes paid for in advance but not received during the fiscal year. Include monographs in series and continuations. If only number of titles purchased can be reported, please report the data and provide an explanatory footnote in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire. **Note:** This question is concerned with volumes purchased rather than volumes received or cataloged. Question 16 requests the expenditure for the volumes counted here.

**Questions 5-7. Serials.** Report the total number of subscriptions, not titles. Include duplicate subscriptions and, to the extent possible, all government document serials even if housed in a separate documents collection. Verify the inclusion or exclusion of document serials in Question 54 of the questionnaire. Exclude unnumbered monographic and publishers’ series. Electronic serials acquired as part of an aggregated package (e.g., Project MUSE, Academic IDEAL) should be counted by title. A serial is

- a publication in any medium issued in successive parts bearing numerical or chronological designations and intended to be continued indefinitely. This definition includes periodicals, newspapers, and annuals (reports, yearbooks, etc.); the journals, memoirs, proceedings, transactions, etc. of societies; and numbered monographic series.

**Question 6. Serials: Not Purchased.** If separate counts of nonpurchased and purchased serials are not available, report only the total number of current serials received on line 7, and report -1, i.e., “U/A,” for lines 5 and 6.

**Question 8. Microforms.** Report the total number of physical units: reels of microfilm, microcards, and microprint and microfiche sheets. Include all government documents in microform; provide a footnote in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire if documents are excluded.

**Question 9. Government documents.** Report the total number of physical units (pieces) of government documents in paper format that have not been counted elsewhere. Include local, state, national, and international documents; include documents purchased from a commercial source if shelved with separate documents collections and not counted above. Include serials and monographs. To estimate pieces from a measurement of linear feet, use the formula 1 foot = 52 pieces and indicate in a footnote that the count is based on this estimate. Exclude microforms and nonprint formats such as maps or CD-ROMs. Adjust line 1a, i.e., last year’s Volumes Held, and provide a footnote if you are adding records to the OPAC for government documents previously held but not counted as part of Volumes Held (line 1a).

**Question 10. Computer files.** Include the number of pieces of computer-readable disks, tapes, CD-ROMs, and similar machine-readable files comprising data or programs that are locally held as part of the library’s collections available to library clients. Examples are U.S. Census data tapes, sample research software, locally-mounted databases, and reference tools on CD-ROM, tape or disk. Exclude bibliographic records used to manage the collection (i.e., the library’s own catalog in machine-readable form), library system software, and microcomputer software used only by the library staff.

**Question 11. Manuscripts and archives.** Include both manuscripts and archives measured in linear feet.
Question 12. Cartographic materials. Include the numbers of pieces of two- and three-dimensional maps and globes. Include satellite and aerial photographs and images.

Question 13. Graphic materials. Include the number of pieces of prints, pictures, photographs, postcards, slides, transparencies, film strips, and the like.

Question 14. Audio materials. Include the number of pieces of audiocassettes, phonodiscs, audio compact discs, reel-to-reel tapes, and other sound recordings.

Question 15. Film and video materials. Include the number of pieces of motion pictures, videocassettes, video laser discs, and similar visual materials.

Questions 16-27. Expenditures. Report all expenditures of funds that come to the library from the regular institutional budget, and from sources such as research grants, special projects, gifts and endowments, and fees for service. (For question 25, include non-library funds; see instruction Q24-25.) Do not report encumbrances of funds that have not yet been expended. Canadian libraries should report expenditures in Canadian dollars. (To determine figures in U.S. dollars, divide Canadian dollar amounts by XXXXXX, the average monthly noon exchange rate published in the Bank of Canada Review for the period July 2003-June 2004.) Please round figures to the nearest dollar.


Question 18. Other library materials. Include expenditures for all materials not reported in Questions 16 and 17, e.g., backfiles of serials, charts and maps, audiovisual materials, manuscripts, etc. If expenditures for these materials are included in lines 16 and/or 17 and cannot be disaggregated, please report -1, i.e., “U/A,” and provide a footnote in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire. Do not include encumbrances.

Question 19. Miscellaneous expenditures. Include any other materials funds expenditures not included in questions 16-18, e.g., expenditures for bibliographic utilities, literature searching, security devices, memberships for the purposes of publications, etc. Please list categories, with amounts, in a footnote in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire. Note: If your library does not use materials funds for non-materials expenditures—i.e., such expenditures are included in “Other Operating Expenditures”—report 0, not -1, i.e., “U/A,” on line 19.

Question 21. Contract Binding. Include only contract expenditures for binding done outside the library. If all binding is done in-house, state this fact and give in-house expenditures in a footnote in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire; do not include personnel expenditures. (This figure should also be reported in the 2003-04 ARL Preservation Survey, question 7b.)

Questions 22-25. Salaries and wages. Exclude fringe benefits. If professional and support staff salaries cannot be separated, enter -1, i.e., “U/A,” on lines 22 and 23 and enter total staff on line 25.

Questions 24-25. Salaries and wages: Student Assistants. Report 100% of student wages regardless of budgetary source of funds. Include federal and local funds for work study students.


Questions 28-32. Electronic materials expenditures. These items are intended to indicate what portion of your institution’s total library expenditures are dedicated to electronic resources and services. Please use the Footnotes to indicate any electronic materials expenditures you believe not to be covered by these questions. All expenditures recorded in these questions should have been included in Question 27, total library expenditures.

Question 28. Computer files. Report expenditures that are not current serials (i.e. are non-subscription, one-time, or monographic in nature) for software and machine-readable materials considered part of the collections. Examples include periodical backfiles, literature collections, one-time costs for JSTOR membership, etc. Expenditures reported here may be derived from any of the following categories: Monographs (Q16), Other Library Materials (Q18), Miscellaneous (Q19), or Other Operating Expenditures (Q26).

Question 29. Electronic Serials. Report subscription expenditures (or those which are expected to be ongoing commitments) for serial publications whose primary format is electronic and for online searches of remote databases such as...
OCLC FirstSearch, DIALOG, Lexis-Nexis, etc. Examples include paid subscriptions for electronic journals and indexes/abstracts available via the Internet, CD-ROM serials, and annual access fees for resources purchased on a “one-time” basis, such as literature collections, JSTOR membership, etc. Not all items whose expenditures are counted here will be included in Total Current Serials (Questions 5-7) or Current Serial Expenditures (Question 17).

**Q30a-b. Bibliographic Utilities, Networks, and Consortia.** Because it is increasingly common for ARL Libraries to enter into consortial arrangements to purchase access to electronic resources, both “Library” and “External” expenditure blanks and instructions are provided. Please use the Footnotes to describe expenditures that you believe are not covered by the question, or situations that do not seem to fit the instructions.

**Q30a. From internal library sources.** Report expenditures paid by the Library for services provided by national, regional, and local bibliographic utilities, networks, and consortia, such as OCLC and RLG, unless for user database access and subscriptions, which should be reported in Questions 1 or 2. Include only expenditures that are part of Other Operating Expenditures (Q26).

**Q30b. From external sources.** If your library receives access to computer files, electronic serials or search services through one or more centrally-funded system or consortial arrangements for which it does not pay fully and/or directly (for example, funding is provided by the state on behalf of all members), enter the amount paid by external bodies on its behalf. If the specific dollar amount is not known, but the total student FTE for the consortium and amount spent for the academic members are known, divide the overall amount spent by your institution’s share of the total student FTE.

**Q31. Computer hardware and software.** Report expenditures from the library budget for computer hardware and software used to support library operations, whether purchased or leased, mainframe or microcomputer, and whether for staff or public use. Include expenditures for: maintenance; equipment used to run information service products when those expenditures can be separated from the price of the product; telecommunications infrastructure costs, such as wiring, hubs, routers, etc. Include only expenditures that are part of Other Operating Expenditures (Q26).

**Q32. Document Delivery/Interlibrary Loan.** Report expenditures for document delivery and interlibrary loan services (both borrowing and lending). Include fees paid for photocopies, costs of telefacsimile transmission, royalties and access fees paid to provide document delivery or interlibrary loan. Include fees paid to bibliographic utilities if the portion paid for interlibrary loan can be separately counted. Include only expenditures that are part of Miscellaneous Materials Expenditures (Q19) or Other Operating Expenditures (Q26), and only for those ILL/DD programs whose data are recorded in Questions 44-45.

**Questions 33-36. Personnel.** Report the number of staff in filled positions, or positions that are only temporarily vacant. ARL defines temporarily vacant positions as positions that were vacated during the fiscal year for which ARL data were submitted, for which there is a firm intent to refill, and for which there are expenditures for salaries reported on lines 22-25. Include cost recovery positions and staff hired for special projects and grants, but provide an explanatory footnote indicating the number of such staff. If such staff cannot be included, provide a footnote in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire. To compute full-time equivalents of part-time employees and student assistants, take the total number of hours worked by part-time employees in each category and divide it by the number of hours considered by the reporting library to be a full-time work week (or year). **Round figures to the nearest whole numbers.**

**Question 33. Professional Staff.** Since the criteria for determining professional status vary among libraries, there is no attempt to define the term “professional.” Each library should report those staff members it considers professional, including, when appropriate, staff who are not librarians in the strict sense of the term, for example computer experts, systems analysts, or budget officers.

**Question 35. Student Assistants.** Report the total FTE (see instruction Q33-36) of student assistants employed on an hourly basis whose wages are paid from funds under library control or from a budget other than the library’s, including federal work-study programs. Exclude maintenance and custodial staff.

**Question 37. Number of staffed library service points.** Count the number of staffed public service points in the main library and in all branch libraries reported in this inventory, including reference desks, information desks, circulation, current periodicals, reserve rooms, reprographic services (if staffed as a public facility), etc. Report the number of designated locations, not the number of staff.

**Question 38. Number of weekly public service hours.** Report an unduplicated count of the total public service hours per typical full-service week (i.e., no holidays or other special accommodations) across both main library and branches using the
following method (corresponds to IPEDS): If a library is open from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, it should report 40 hours per week. If several of its branches are also open during these hours, the figure remains 40 hours per week. Should Branch A also be open one evening from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., the total hours during which users can find service somewhere within the system becomes 42 hours per week. If Branch B is open the same hours on the same evening, the count is still 42, but if Branch B is open two hours on another evening, or remains open two hours later, the total is then 44 hours per week. **Exclude 24-hour unstaffed reserve or similar reading rooms.** The maximum total is 168 (i.e., a staffed reading room open 7 days per week, 24 hours per day).

**Questions 39-40. Instruction.** Sampling based on a typical week may be used to extrapolate TO A FULL YEAR for Questions 39 and 40. Please indicate if responses are based on sampling.

**Question 39. Presentations to Groups.** Report the total number of sessions during the year of presentations made as part of formal bibliographic instruction programs and through other planned class presentations, orientation sessions, and tours. If the library sponsors multi-session or credit courses that meet several times over the course of a semester, each session should be counted. Presentations to groups may be for either bibliographic instruction, cultural, recreational, or educational purposes. Presentations both on and off the premises should be included as long as they are sponsored by the library. Do not include meetings sponsored by other groups using library meeting rooms. Please indicate if the figure is based on sampling.

**Question 40. Participants in Group Presentations.** Report the total number of participants in the presentations reported on line 39. For multi-session classes with a constant enrollment, count each person only once. Personal, one-to-one instruction in the use of sources should be counted as reference transactions on line 41. Please indicate if the figure is based on sampling. Use the “Footnotes” section to describe any special situations.

**Question 41. Reference Transactions.** Report the total number of reference transactions. **A reference transaction is an information contact that involves the knowledge, use, recommendations, interpretation, or instruction in the use of one or more information sources by a member of the library staff. The term includes information and referral service. Information sources include (a) printed and nonprinted material; (b) machine-readable databases (including computer-assisted instruction); (c) the library’s own catalogs and other holdings records; (d) other libraries and institutions through communication or referral; and (e) persons both inside and outside the library. When a staff member uses information gained from previous use of information sources to answer a question, the transaction is reported as a reference transaction even if the source is not consulted again.**

If a contact includes both reference and directional services, it should be reported as one reference transaction. Duration should not be an element in determining whether a transaction is a reference transaction. **Sampling based on a typical week may be used to extrapolate TO A FULL YEAR for Question 41.** Please indicate if the figure is based on sampling.

EXCLUDE SIMPLE DIRECTIONAL QUESTIONS. A directional transaction is an information contact that facilitates the logistical use of the library and that does not involve the knowledge, use, recommendations, interpretation, or instruction in the use of any information sources other than those that describe the library, such as schedules, floor plans, and handbooks.

**Questions 42-43. Circulation.** For Question 35, count the number of initial circulations during the fiscal year from the general collection for use usually (although not always) outside the library. **Do not count renewals.** Include circulations to and from remote storage facilities for library users (i.e., do not include transactions reflecting transfers or stages of technical processing). Count the total number of items lent, not the number of borrowers. For Question 43, report total circulation for the fiscal year including initial transactions reported on line 42 and renewal transactions. Exclude reserve circulations; these are no longer reported.

**Questions 44-45. Interlibrary Loans.** Report the number of requests for material (both returnables and non-returnables) provided to other libraries on line 44 and the number of filled requests for material received from libraries or other providers on line 45. On both lines, include originals, photocopies, and materials sent by telefacsimile or other forms of electronic transmission. Include patron-initiated transactions. Do not include transactions between libraries covered by this questionnaire.

**Questions 46. Ph.D. Degrees.** Report the number awarded during the 2003-04 fiscal year. Please note that only the number of Ph.D. degrees are to be counted. Statistics on all other advanced degrees (e.g., D.Ed., D.P.A., M.D., J.D.) should not be reported in this survey. If you are unable to provide a figure for Ph.D.s only, please add a footnote in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire.
Question 47. Ph.D. Fields. For the purposes of this report, Ph.D. fields are defined as the specific discipline specialties enumerated in the U.S. Department of Education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) “Completions” Survey. Although the IPEDS form requests figures for all doctoral degrees, only fields in which Ph.D.s are awarded should be reported on the ARL questionnaire. Any exceptions should be footnoted in the “Footnotes” section of the questionnaire.

Question 48. Instructional Faculty. Instructional faculty are defined by the U.S. Dept. of Education as

> those members of the instruction/research staff who are employed full-time as defined by the institution, including faculty with released time for research and faculty on sabbatical leave.

Full-time counts generally exclude faculty who are employed to teach fewer than two semesters, three quarters, two trimesters, or two four-month sessions; replacements for faculty on sabbatical leave or leave without pay; faculty for preclinical and clinical medicine; faculty who are donating their services; faculty who are members of military organizations and paid on a different pay scale from civilian employees; academic officers, whose primary duties are administrative; and graduate students who assist in the instruction of courses. Please be sure the number reported, and the basis for counting, are consistent with those for 2002-03 (unless in previous years faculty were counted who should have been excluded according to the above definition). Please footnote any discrepancies.

Questions 49-52. Enrollment. U.S. libraries should use the Fall 2003 enrollment figures reported to the Department of Education on the form entitled “Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Fall Enrollment 2003.” The line and column numbers on the IPEDS form for each category are noted on the questionnaire. Please check these figures against the enrollment figures reported to ARL last year to ensure consistency and accuracy. **Note:** In the past, the number of part-time students reported was FTE; the number now reported to IPEDS is a head count of part-time students. Canadian libraries should note that the category “graduate students” as reported here includes all post-baccalaureate students.

Question 53: Basis of Volume Count. A physical count is a piece count; a bibliographic count is a catalog record count.

Question 60. Footnotes. Explanatory footnotes will be included with the published statistics. Reporting libraries are urged to record in the footnote section any information that would clarify the figures submitted, e.g., the inclusion of branch campus libraries (see paragraph six of the "General Instructions" for definition of branch campus libraries). For the first time, the footnotes from the previous year will be presented in the web form. Please update, delete, or leave them unchanged if they remain valid. Note that the number in parentheses refers to the appropriate column on the Library Data Tables in the published ARL Statistics, as well as to the corresponding line number on the questionnaire. Please make an effort to word your footnotes in a manner consistent with notes appearing in the published report, so that the ARL Office can interpret your footnotes correctly.

Submit the completed questionnaire on the web
<http://lrc.lis.uiuc.edu/ARL/survey.cgi/>

Please contact Martha Kyrillidou <martha@arl.org> or Mark Young <stats-ra@arl.org> or at (202) 296-2296 for assistance.
ARL Supplementary Statistics 2003-04 (E-Metrics)

Reporting Institution ____________________________ Date Returned to ARL________
Report Prepared by (name) __________________________________________________
Title____________________________________________________________________
Email address__________________________________  Phone number______________
Contact person (if different) _________________________________________________
Title____________________________________________________________________
Email address__________________________________  Phone number______________

General Instructions
Please enter your data on the ARL Statistics Website (access via: <URL TBD>). Be sure to read
these instructions before beginning to input data.

Definitions of the statistical categories used in this questionnaire can be found in Information
Services and Use: Metrics & statistics for libraries and information providers--Data Dictionary,
NISO Z39.7-200X Draft (http://www.niso.org/emetrics/current/index.html). ARL has gradually
modified the interpretation of the standard definitions to accommodate electronic resources based
on conventions, which will be described in an E-Metrics Q&A. These conventions have been
established through discussions within the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee and with
the ARL Survey Coordinators who fill in those surveys on an annual basis.

Complete this form by December 1, 2004, and retain a copy of the worksheet for your records. If
you have problems with this form or have questions about the procedure to be followed in
completing the survey, contact the ARL office.

Please read all instructions carefully before you answer the questionnaire. Make sure your
responses are as complete and accurate as possible. Give estimates when you must, but please do
not make wild guesses. Use the FOOTNOTES section to expand upon or clarify your responses.

All questions assume a fiscal year ending June 30, 2004. If your library’s fiscal year is different,
please use the FOOTNOTES section to explain.

Please complete all entries. If your library does not perform a given function or had no activity
for this function or if the appropriate answer is zero or none, use 0. If an exact figure is
unavailable, use –1, i.e., “U/A.” Please do not leave any lines blank.

Please do not use decimals. All figures should be rounded to the nearest whole number.

In a university that includes both main and branch campuses, an effort should be made to report
figures for the main campus only. (The U.S. National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated
Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) defines a branch institution as “a campus or site
of an educational institution that is not temporary, is located in a community beyond a reasonable
commuting distance from its parent institution, and offers organized programs of study, not just
courses.”) If figures for libraries located at branch campuses are reported, please provide an
explanation in the FOOTNOTES section of the questionnaire.
A **branch library** is defined as an auxiliary library service outlet with quarters separate from the central library of an institution, which has a basic collection of books and other materials, a regular staffing level, and an established schedule. A branch library is administered **either** by the central library **or** (as in the case of some law and medical libraries) through administrative structure of other units within the university. Departmental study/reading rooms are not included. If figures for branch libraries are reported, please provide an explanation in the FOOTNOTES section of the questionnaire.

**Number of Networked Electronic Resources**

1. **Number of electronic journals purchased.** __________

   Number of electronic journal subscriptions that the library provides to users and for which the library pays some fee for access either through an individual institutional licensing contract with the provider of journals or through other arrangements (e.g., library-funded consortia, centrally-funded consortia or through state or national purchasing plans).

   Include journal article databases that do not provide browsing capability, such as Expanded Academic ASAP in INFOTRAC. *Consider omitting this statement. – TBD based on Statistics Committee meeting and calls with participants.*

2. **Number of electronic “full-text” journals purchased.** __________

   (This is a subset of #1. **Number electronic journals purchased.**)  

   Full-text journals should provide both search and browse capabilities by title and issue. *Consider omitting this statement. – TBD based on Statistics Committee meeting and calls with participants.* Include electronic full-text journals offered by established scholarly journal publishing houses (e.g., Elsevier’s ScienceDirect), scholarly societies (e.g., American Chemical Society journals and American Institute of Physics Online), and services which aggregate content from smaller publishers or from those publishers that prefer to use an external delivery platform (BioOne, EbscoOnline, Highwire, and OCLC ECO).

   Exclude journal article databases that do not provide browsing capability, such as Expanded Academic ASAP in INFOTRAC. *Consider omitting this statement. – TBD based on Statistics Committee meeting and calls with participants.*

3. **Number of electronic journals not purchased.** __________

   Number of unique free electronic journals located on the Internet for which the library has taken responsibility for providing access either through cataloging in its OPAC or other forms of organization (web site, databases, etc.). Include journals that are free through centrally-funded consortia.
4. Number of electronic reference sources. ____________

This includes licensed citation indexes and abstracts; full-text reference sources (e.g., encyclopedias, almanacs, biographical and statistical sources, and other quick fact-finding sources); full-text journal and periodical article collection services (e.g., EBSCOhost, ProQuest, Academic Universe, and INFOTRAC OneFile); dissertation and conference proceedings databases; and, those databases that institutions mount locally. Include databases which contain journals that were reported in #1. Please describe in the Footnotes, if ebooks are included in this count.

5. Number of electronic books. ____________

Number of electronic full-text monographs that the library offers to its users and for which the library pays some fee for access either through an individual institutional licensing contract with the provider of journals or through other arrangements (e.g., library-funded consortia, centrally-funded consortia or through state or national purchasing plans).

This includes electronic books purchased through vendors, such as netLibrary and Books24x7, and electronic books that come as part of aggregate services. Include sets of ebooks that are counted as individual reference sources reported in #4. It excludes locally digitized electronic books, electronic theses and dissertations, locally created digital archival collections, and other special collections. It does not include machine-readable books distributed on CD-ROM, or accompanied by print books.

Expenditures for Networked Electronic Resources

6. Expenditures for current electronic journals purchased. ____________

Include membership fees (such as JSTOR) as well as annual access and service fees paid directly or through consortia arrangements. Include initial purchase cost only for items purchased this fiscal year. Expenditures reported here are for journals reported in #1.

7. Expenditures for electronic “full-text” journals. ____________

Include membership fees (such as JSTOR) as well as annual access and service fees paid directly or through consortia arrangements. Include initial purchase cost only for items purchased this fiscal year. Expenditures here are for journals reported in #2.

8. Expenditures for electronic reference sources. ____________

Include annual access and service fees paid directly or through consortia arrangements. Include initial purchase cost only for items purchased this fiscal year. Expenditures here are for the reference sources reported in #4.
9. **Expenditures for electronic books.**

Include annual access and service fees paid directly or through consortia arrangements. Include initial purchase cost only for items purchased this fiscal year. Expenditures here are for the electronic books report in #5.

**Use of Networked Electronic Resources and Services**

10. **Number of virtual reference transactions.**

Virtual reference transactions are conducted via email, a library’s website, or other network communications mechanisms designed to support electronic reference. A virtual reference transaction must include a question either received electronically (e.g., via e-mail, WWW form, etc.) or responded to electronically. Those transactions that are both received and responded to electronically are counted as one transaction. Exclude phone and fax traffic unless either the question or answer transaction occurs via the manner described above. Include counts accrued from participation in any local and national projects, such as DigiRef and the Library of Congress’s CDRS (Collaborative Digital Reference Service).

A reference transaction is an information contact, which involves the knowledge, use, recommendations, interpretation, or instruction in the use of one or more information sources by any member of the library staff (e.g., circulation, technical or reference services).

11. **Does your library offer federated searching across networked electronic resources?** Yes / No

12. **Number of logins (sessions) to networked electronic resources.**

12a. **Number of resources for which you are reporting.**

A session or login is one cycle of user activities that typically starts when a user connects to a database and ends with explicit termination of activities (by leaving the database through logout or exit) or implicit termination (time out due to user inactivity). Licensed electronic resources also include those databases that institutions mount locally.

13. **Number of queries (searches) in networked electronic resources.**

13a. **Number of resources for which you are reporting.**

A search is intended to represent a unique intellectual inquiry. Typically, a search is recorded each time a search request is sent/submitted to the server.

14. **Number of items requested in networked electronic resources.**

14a. **Number of resources for which you are reporting.**
These resources may include journal articles, e-books, reference materials, and non-textual resources that are provided to the library’s users through licensing and contractual agreements. The user requests may include viewing, downloading, emailing, and printing to the extent the activity can be recorded and controlled by the server rather than browser. The items reported depend on the type of content. Examples include citations, abstracts, tables of contents, and full-text articles (ASCII, HTML, PDF, or PS).

15. **Number of virtual visits.**

15a. **Number of virtual visits to library’s website.**

15b. **Number of virtual visits to library’s catalog.**

15c. **Excludes virtual visits from inside the library.** Yes / No

Virtual visits include a user’s request of the library web site or catalog from outside the library building excluding the number of pages or gratuitous elements (images, style sheets) viewed. Exclude, if possible, virtual visits from within the library, from robot or spider crawls and from page reblogs.

A visit is usually determined by a user’s IP address, which can be misleading due to Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and Firewalls or Proxy Servers. Thus, this measure is actually an estimate of the visits.

### Library Digitization Activities

16. **Number and Size of Library Digital Collections.**

16a. **Number of Collections.**

16b. **Size (in megabytes).**

16c. **Items.**

Library digital collections can include born digital materials or those created in or converted from different formats (e.g., paper, microfilm, tapes, etc.) by the library and made available to users electronically. This includes locally held digital materials that are not purchased or acquired through other arrangements (e.g., vendor, individual or consortia licensing agreements). Born digital collections can include materials self-archived in an institutional repository. Created or converted digital collections can include electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs); special collections materials; maps; sound recordings; and, films.

For each type of collection (e.g., text, image, multimedia), include the size (in megabytes) and, if possible, the number of items (e.g. unique files) in each collection. Exclude back up copies or mirror sites since items should be counted only once. Exclude e-reserves and ETDs provided by
ProQuest or other vendors. In the footnote, provide a paragraph describing the general nature of library digital collections and, if possible, provide the URL where collections are listed.

17. Use of Library Digital Collections.

17a. Number of times items accessed. ____________
17b. Number of queries conducted. ____________

Number of times library digital collection items (unique files) were accessed and the number of searches (queries) conducted (if there is such a capability) during the reporting period.

18. Direct cost of digital collections construction and management.

18a. Direct cost of personnel ____________
18b. Direct cost of equipment, software or contracted services. ____________

Annual direct costs (personnel, equipment, software, contracted services and similar items) spent to create digital materials (texts, images, and multimedia) or to convert existing materials into digital form for the purpose of making them electronically available to users. Include expenditures related to digitization, OCR, editorial, creation of markup texts, and preparation of metadata for access to digitized materials, data storage, and copyright clearance. Exclude expenditures for information resources purchased or acquired from outside the institution through individual or consortia licensing agreements.

Footnotes

Submit the completed questionnaire on the web.
Due date: December 1, 2004

Please contact Martha Kyrillidou <martha@arl.org> or Mark Young <stats-ra@arl.org> at (202) 296-2296 for assistance.
In the November 3rd edition of ACADEME TODAY: The Chronicle of Higher Education's Daily Report for subscribers, readers are directed to an important and high profile article by Richard C. Atkinson, the recently-retired president of the University of California. In his analysis of "A New World of Scholarly Communication," Atkinson urges attention to the future of libraries. "The ballooning costs of academic publications are preventing faculty members and researchers from gaining access to the world's scholarship and knowledge." He urges university leaders to support strategies for:

+ developing and supporting new models of scholarly communication that cut the costs of distributing and retrieving information;
+ giving faculty members the necessary tools to make their publications more accessible;
+ recognizing and rewarding colleagues who choose alternative ways to disseminate research, including consideration in peer review;
+ helping libraries pool their collection efforts; and
+ clarifying with faculty members the economic and educational advantages of alternate forms of scholarly publishing.

In addition to the many positive suggestions that Atkinson makes in encouraging university leaders to support alternative models of scholarly publishing, he also criticizes the role the ARL membership criteria index is allowed to play in hampering libraries' ability to cooperate fully. Atkinson laments the "homage" that is paid to the index because it does not give "credit for building shared collections and effectively applying technology to their delivery."

While we hope your local discussions will focus on the many positive suggestions in Atkinson's article, it is likely that questions will arise about the index and shared collections. Some points to consider...
in answering such questions include: (1) ARL and its member libraries share Atkinson's concerns about how the membership index is sometimes misunderstood or misused. (2) Contrary to the misperceptions conveyed in the article and widely believed, the ARL membership criteria index DOES incorporate electronic and print journals including those acquired via a consortia (as serial subscriptions received). (3) The index also includes (under volumes held) the number of electronic books locally held and collectively purchased. (4) The index is not a measure of quality; it is a summary measure of what is common among ARL members. Its sole purpose is to serve as membership criterion for those institutions. (5) To further account for the positive impact of collaboration among libraries, the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program is currently planning to add a new category to the ARL Statistics, "volumes held collectively," to allow members to continue to count volumes that are deduped or deaccessioned as a result of collaboration in a shared storage facility. This and other changes to the ARL statistics were summarized in Duane Webster's letter of June 16, 2003, available at: <http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/changes.html>.

ARL will send a letter to Dr. Atkinson, and the CHE, to thank him for his strong support for positive change in scholarly communication and the future of libraries. Your feedback from local discussions, especially on suggestions of strategies that university leadership should consider to create a new model of scholarly communication, will be helpful to us as we develop this letter.


Duane Webster
Executive Director
Association of Research Libraries
21 Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
v: (202) 296-2296
fax: (202) 872-0884
cell: (202) 251-4431
e-mail: duane@arl.org
Note to Statistics and Measurement Committee

Although the Working Group began its efforts in 2001, this charge was compiled in the spring of 2004. New members have joined the group since its inception and we agreed that an articulation of purpose and intended outcomes was in order.

The charge document is based on conversations (with the Working group, Carla Stoffle, Brinley Franklin, Julia Blixrud, and Martha Kyrillidou), and existing ARL documents (the "Leaning Outcomes Update", the "Invitation to Participate" and "Mainstreaming New Measures"). The first two documents reside on the Group’s web site at: http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/outcomes/workgroup.html The third document can be found at: http://www.arl.org/newsltr/230/mainstreaming.html

Please note that we eliminated three items from the original list of actions. These are:

- Identification of offerings that libraries can develop to meet the outcomes identified
- Establishment of a plan for how to take the development of offerings to the next stage with faculty in a select group of institutions
- Explore the collaboration of ACRL in offering training on information literacy skills within the ARL community

The purpose of this group is understood to be assessment / evaluation. These three items involve the development of learning materials and the provision of staff development or training activities. We believe that the remaining evaluation activities will occupy our time for the foreseeable future.

Karen Williams, Chair
May 2004
Purpose
The ARL Statistics and Measurement Program is defining a course of action for libraries to engage on campus in promoting and evaluating libraries’ contributions to student learning outcomes. Library contributions are broadly defined in this context to mean all library services and products and are not limited to library instruction or information literacy efforts. The emphasis will be on evaluating at the institutional programmatic level, not at the classroom or individual student level. Operating within the ARL New Measures Initiative framework, the Learning Outcomes Working Group will engage in a number of actions designed to document and describe any current activity that shows library contributions to student learning outcomes; develop model questions and frameworks for conducting program evaluation; identify appropriate campus market segments that ARL libraries can work with; determine mechanisms for broadening library contributions to student learning outcomes; and suggest ways in which libraries can work collaboratively with other higher education organizations on this issue.

Primary Issues / Problems
In early 1999, Carla Stoffle (University of Arizona) and Paul Kobulnicky (University of Connecticut), chairs of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee and the Research Library Leadership and Management Committee, called a retreat in Tucson, Arizona to discuss how to develop strategies that would address the development of new measures. One of the eight areas identified at this retreat was library impact on teaching and learning.

Subsequently, at the October 1999 Membership Meeting, the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee and the ARL Research Library Leadership and Management Committee initiated the ARL New Measures Initiative in response to the following two needs:

- Increasing demand for libraries to demonstrate outcomes/impacts in areas important to the institution.
- Increasing pressure to maximize use of resources - benchmark best practices to save or reallocate resources.

For many institutions, the accreditation process has provided the strongest impetus for a shifting campus emphasis on institutional outcomes. Declining budgets for higher education have also caused many institutions to critically examine existing programs and strategies. The descriptive and input data traditionally collected by ARL, while useful for some purposes, fall short of meeting institutional accountability needs, and fail to provide any indication of impact on teaching or student learning.
Context / Opportunities
The retreat participants recognized that some of the more difficult measures to develop would identify how a library contributes to the teaching and learning process. In order to address this issue, several ARL members provided funds to contract with Eller Distinguished Service Professor Kenneth Smith (University of Arizona) to prepare a white paper, "New Roles and Responsibilities for the University Library: Advancing Student Learning through Outcomes Assessment." Smith's paper encourages libraries to develop strategies for becoming involved in campus assessment activities. He encouraged libraries to:

- Move from a content view (books, subject knowledge) to a competency view (what students are able to do)
- Understand learning outcomes of academic degree programs
- Develop curriculum segments or "offerings" through which the library achieves learning outcomes.

Suggested Activities
- Survey accreditation agencies to identify institutions doing a good job of learning outcomes identification (and evaluation if available)
- Contact professional associations -- academic and learning assessment people -- to see what we can learn from them about what learning is valued and how they measure it
- Review learning outcomes being used by ARL Institutions' academic departments and general education requirements if those exist. Look for commonality.
- Develop a framework which institutions can apply locally to define and measure library contributions to student learning outcomes
- If appropriate based on the results of the previous activity, define or create generalized evaluation measures

Products / Outcomes
- Prepare a background paper that summarizes the literature on learning outcomes in higher education.
  - Progress: Background paper is done and will be distributed to Statistics and Measurement Committee, May 2004. The paper will also be added to our web site.
- Depending on what the group learns from surveying accrediting agencies and contacting professional associations, create and/or share a list of best practices that could further inform the work of this Group and of all ARL libraries.
  - Progress: The Working Group determined that recordings of best practices have been limited to smaller institutions--none are of the size and complexity of large research organizations. National organizations have not yet agreed on a standard definition of learning outcomes.
• If enough commonality in learning outcomes is found among ARL institutions, create a list that can serve as a basis for evaluation efforts.
  - **Progress:** A survey form was created and members of the Working Group looked for learning outcomes requirements at their own institutions. From this, it was determined that compilation of a common list of learning outcomes from ARL members is not yet possible. Instead, the Group will create a document that lists potential outcomes often used in undergraduate education. We will use this as the basis for our working session with consultant Jeanne Hubelbank in June 2004.

• A framework which institutions can apply locally to define and measure library impacts on student learning outcomes.
  - **Progress:** A one day working session has been scheduled for Thursday, June 24, 2004. Jeanne Hubelbank will serve as consultant to the Group. We will use this day to:
    ▪ Articulate why we want to evaluate the library's contribution (e.g., for accountability, to improve programs, services, etc.) and how you would use the results of an evaluation; identify stakeholders
    ▪ Define common intended learning outcomes (institutional) among ARL institutions
    ▪ Link ways in which the library and its staff contribute to or promote these learning outcomes (e.g., services, activities, programs, collaboration) -- being as specific, concrete, and measurable as possible
    ▪ Write evaluation questions for learning outcomes and identify the information needed to answer the questions; determine which assessments would give the best information.

• A set of generalized evaluation measures.
  - **Progress:** ARL is partnering with Kent State University on Project SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills), which has received partial funding from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) to develop an instrument for programmatic-level assessment of information literacy skills. SAILS is based on outcomes defined by the ACRL *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*.

**Resources**
ARL staff support is available, especially from Julia Blixrud, Judith Matz and Martha Kyrillidou. Some limited funding is available to support learning opportunities for working group members. Individuals will be responsible for their own travel costs to attend meetings at ALA Midwinter and Annual conferences. The establishment of any other budget will depend on the Working Group’s plans. A web site is maintained for the Working Group at

Reporting and Communication Relationships
The Working Group is a part of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program and is advisory to this program. Julia Blixrud is the official ARL liaison. The Working Group should seek the advice of the Statistics and Measurement Committee on any significant initiatives. The Group should post meeting minutes on the web site, and compile and post an ongoing progress report.

Skills and Knowledge Required on this Team
- General knowledge of learning outcomes assessment
- General knowledge of program evaluation
- Commitment to and enthusiasm for new measures of library performance and evaluation
- Excellent communication skills
- Able to set and meet deadlines
- Able to work well independently and within a group
- Able to attend meetings regularly or participate effectively through e-mail or conference calls

Membership
An invitation to participate in the Working Group was extended to a number of ARL libraries that indicated an interest in the topic in [month / year]. Sixteen institutions appointed individuals to the Working Group. Karen Williams, University of Arizona Library is currently chair. The Working Group may seek additional members if there are not enough people to complete the work in a timely way, or if there is a need to expand the knowledge base.

Charge Review
The Statistics and Measurement Committee will review this charge in May 2004. The Working Group should complete all activities and produce the products listed by May 2006.