ARL Committee on Statistics and Measurement

Agenda

Wednesday, October 19, 1994
8:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Sherwood Room, The Washington Vista Hotel, Washington, DC

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. Schedule and agenda for the meeting. (5 minutes)

Plans call for a full-day meeting with coffee and lunch breaks. The afternoon session is scheduled to finish at 3:00 p.m. After a half hour break we will reconvene at 3:30 p.m. for a presentation and discussion of the electronic publication of the ARL Statistics on the Web, to which all the directors have been invited. Maureen Sullivan has been invited to facilitate the discussion on the "Strategic Directions Document" during the morning session. Kaylyn Hipps, the research assistant to the program, will be joining us for the afternoon session later in the day.

2. Review of minutes from the meeting of the ARL Committee on Statistics and Measurement during the 124th ARL Membership Meeting. (5 minutes)

- (Attachment) Committee Meeting Minutes.
- (Outcome expected) Approval of Minutes.

3. Comments on the Activity Report for the Statistics and Measurement Program. (10 minutes)

- (Attachment) ARL Activity Reports, Section 4.4 and 4.4.1.
- (Outcome expected) Feedback on the Program.

4. Review of the Draft Strategy Document (detailed discussion on specific parts of the document as outlined below will take approximately 3 hours).

- (Attachment) Strategic Directions Document.
- (Outcome expected) Reviewing the document, clarifying points, setting priorities; Agreement to present this draft to the Board for feedback and to release a draft document to members for comments.

The strategy document articulates goals for the program and is organized into two major parts. Detailed sections for different parts of the discussion are listed below.

Part A: Identify Indicators Of Emerging [Research?] Library Models

Part A.1

5. Members of the Committee will discuss and present their view of the emerging research library model and identify different components that are important in a digital library. What is a digital library vs. a digital research library? Are there characteristics of a digital library that are unique to research libraries? Or are all digital libraries research libraries?

What are the contextual characteristics of a digital (research?) library? The AAU/ARL report identifies 14 functions of the system of scientific and scholarly communication on page 79:

1. Information Generation and Creation,
2. Authoring,
3. Informal Peer Communication,
4. Editorial and Validation,
5. Ownership/Privacy and Security,
6. Distribution,
7. Acquisition and Access,
8. Storage,
9. Preservation and Archiving,
10. Information Management,
11. Location and Delivery,
12. Recognition,
13. Diffusion, and
14. Utilization Of Information.

What are the critical aspects of these functions that we need to start describing and measuring?

A component in describing a digital library is the technological development in a specific institution, that is, what kind of network connectivity exists in the library and in the institution in general. What are the different types of network connectivity? Examples of network connectivity: ethernet, and fast ethernet for digital technology; modem connections, 56Kb, T1, T3 for analog technology. What are the technological characteristics that would describe the network connectivity to characterize digital (research) libraries? (15 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) Discuss and try to define attributes of digital libraries. Define a list of characteristics (assign responsibility from among committee members).

6. An inventory or a list of library facilities, equipment, and services is provided by the Access Inventory that may be revised and used to collect information about the technological capabilities of ARL libraries next year, i.e., 1995. (5 minutes)

- (Attachment) Access Inventory
  - (Outcome expected) Assign responsibilities to members to review the Access Inventory

7. Resource sharing and cooperation: what types of relevant consortia and on-line services are there at the inter institutional level, at the intra-state/province level, at the inter-state/province level, and at the international level. Identify a list of library consortia and on-line services. For example: CICnet, ILLINET, MINITEX, OCLC, RLG, etc. Try to analyze the nature of participation in the different consortia, e.g. what functions are affected by participation in which consortia. (10 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) Discuss and list the different consortia available; identify different types of consortia; Assign responsibility for drafting a typology and a list of consortia.

8. Penetration of technological services: how many users have direct internet connections, number of users having dial access, number of accounts administered by library, computer centers, departmental computers, etc. Probable measures for measuring a systems effectiveness: uptime, transactions per second, etc. (10 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) Examine the possibility of measuring the technological penetration of computer systems employed in the library and on campus in general. Determine next steps.

9. Create an inventory of special electronic collections, services, and other related resources. For example, identify whether a library has an e-text center, a data analysis center, multimedia labs, teleconference centers, etc. (10 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) List services available that support a digital library environment. Consider adding such a list to the Access inventory. Assign responsibility among members to develop a list.

Part A.2

10. The inventory information of Part A.1 can be used as indicators to create a taxonomy of libraries based on the level of development of electronic resources at different institutions. Currently, CAUSE collects information about different institutions. That survey may be another way to identify different groups of institutions and describe their level of development. (10 minutes)

- (Attachment) CAUSE annual survey. Announcement of project by McClure
  - (Outcome expected) Review CAUSE survey; determine if a similar survey should be developed by ARL.

Part A.3

11. Discuss how we can start measuring the provision of electronic information to users. ARL libraries have approached us with questions about electronic serials and how they should be counted. A number of issues have been raised, for example, do you count a microform set or a CD that contains many serials as one subscription or as multiple subscriptions? Under what
circumstances do you count an Internet serial as a local title? If you bring it into your own campus system and store it there for your users, and make a bibliographic record for it? What if you don't bring it into your own system but provide remote access to it (say it is held in a good e-archive at NC State and your patrons can gopher to it) and you provide a record for it? What if the serials is a TOC service and the user still has to go get the articles remotely? Does not-for-a-fee or paid make a difference in counting? In other words, how much of an investment should be made in order for the title to be counted? How much user support on the library's side is involved? What are the ways of counting accesses to serials you don't hold? Under what circumstances would you want to count them? These questions were posted on the SERIALST by Ann Okerson, and a variety of responses were solicited but no consensus seemed to emerge.

IPEDS is drafting a new section on electronic resources to be added to the Academic Libraries survey in 1986.

There were some discussions on measuring electronic resources and services during the LITA Research Committee at ALA. (15 minutes)

- (Attachments) E-mail messages from SERIALST, IPEDS additional section. Technology checklist (mentioned at the LITA Research Comm)
- (Outcome expected) Identify which elements are most useful. Assign responsibility to members to draft definitions of electronic serials and the conditions that are necessary for counting them as part of a library's collection.

Part A.4

12. Discuss the role of libraries in making bibliographic databases and knowledge-management systems available. Identify institutions and projects that contribute to the development of knowledge management systems. Who are the users of such systems and how do they transform the scholarly process? Examine to what extent institutions have implemented models of user access to distributed resources, user training and educational opportunities, information literacy courses, development of navigational tools and user interfaces, etc. The recently funded projects on digital libraries are examples of such projects. (10 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) Develop a list of projects that aim at developing digital libraries and examine the feasibility of developing measures that can assess their effectiveness; some crude measures can be the extent to which institutions contribute to the national bibliographic, and full-text databases, as well as the extent to which an institution is involved in developing knowledge-management systems. Assign responsibility to draft a summary of these projects and keep up with developments.

Part B. Research Library Effectiveness

Part B.1

13. Inputs: Currently, the ARL Statistics collects what are primarily input measures. The Committee discussed at its last meeting in Austin the need to collect additional information on inputs, especially in the area of deployment of staff. (15 minutes)

If libraries are gradually shifting investment from collection resources to services, measuring staff activities and investment of time becomes increasingly important. The Committee also expressed the possible need to examine the deployment of support staff activities. Currently, the salary dataset is limited to professional staff. A short term solution to measure deployment of staff may be to use the position descriptions as a proxy for "activities." In the short term it may be desirable to continue using the more refined list of job titles and attempt to continue improving it.

Also, we may want to create an additional dataset for support staff and identify the job title of the person to whom they report to or develop activities-related job descriptions, perhaps as a proxy for measuring deployment of support staff.

It may also be desirable to add an additional column in the salary dataset, where the actual salary received by an employee during a year (vs. the annual salary) will be recorded. This way the information on the deployment of staff can be used in combination with budget information and identify which activities tend to employ a larger portion of staff resources.

Last, assigning a unique identification number (either a unique number or a Social Security Number) to every library employee would permit tracing internal shifts in duties and deployment (within an institution or across institutions).

All the above ideas are basically short term approaches in identifying patterns of staff deployment.

In the long run, is it important to identify the dimensions of important activities and try to measure one or two of these dimension? For example, "communication" may be an important dimension. If communication improves the quality of service provided, it may be important to identify what
percent of an employee's time is spent on (a) internal communication, i.e., communicating with other employees in the library, (b) external communication within the university community, and (c) external communication outside the university community. Another dimension of activities that maybe important could be the extend to which employee activities support different academic disciplinary areas. In that case one would have to identify the disciplinary areas of interest and identify the extent of employee time spend on these activities. Is this too specific to be collected at the North American level?

In the call for participation in a study examining deployment of staff, the following libraries expressed an interest in participating: U. of Kansas, U. of Washington, U. of Manitoba, U. of Notre Dame (preferably in the second phase), and possibly U. of Virginia, and U. of York. Charles Chamberlin from the U. of Washington expressed an interest in assisting us in developing this project.

- (Outcome expected) Identify whether changes in the salary survey could serve as a short term substitute to a full deployment study, if such a study is to be done. Define the next steps about conducting a pilot study on the deployment of staff, identifying the dimensions that might be studied in this pilot study.

14. Processes: (10 minutes) Identify structural changes in libraries that have outsourced some functions and report which functions they have outsourced. Also, examine cases of consolidating service points in ARL libraries, and identify the functions that are centralized.

- (Outcome expected) Identify institutions and functions that have been outsourced or centralized. Assign responsibility among members.

15. Outputs: (15 minutes) In trying to describe and measure the quality of library services the "output measures movement" has had great impact on library management operations during the last decade.

The AAU/ARL report identifies the following performance attributes (p. 80) in the system of scientific and scholarly communication:

- **Ease of Use:** How easily and effectively does the system make information accessible to known users and potential users?
- **Timeliness:** How long does it take for the information to become available?
- **Responsiveness:** How quickly can needed information be identified and accessed?
- **Accuracy:** How error-free is the information at each stage in its life-cycle (through mechanical or system transmission)?
- **Authenticity:** How much does the information get distorted or changed as it moves through the system (through human processes)?
- **Predictability:** How reliable and consistent is the system in maintaining levels of quality and availability?
- **Adaptability:** How flexible is the system in providing new approaches to information or providing access for unanticipated users?
- **Relevance:** How well does the system provide mechanisms such as filtering and assessment of information?
- **Eligibility:** Who has access to information in the system?
- **Cost:** What are the system and unit costs, and to whom?
- **Recovery:** How well is the system able to avert or recover from error (caused by mismanagement or lack of resources to make the system work)?
- **Innovation:** How well does the system perform research and development to provide system innovation?
- **Extensability:** How well does the system integrate between media? Between disciplines? What is the system's ability to build and extend itself without a total restructuring?

Prior research in output measures includes the ARL published manual entitled *Objective Performance Measures for Academic and Research Libraries*, by Paul Kantor (1984). In that manual the following measures are described:

- Materials availability measures - acquisitions component
- catalog component
- circulation component
- shelving component
- user component

Materials accessibility measures - at catalog
- to get books
- to checkout
- through checkout

Materials delay analysis - accessibility of interlibrary loan:
- to be searched
- to be typed
- waiting for response
- user to be notified
- to be picked up

Another similar approach to measuring library outputs is described by Nancy Van House et al. in the Academic Library Performance: a Practical Approach (1991). This manual incorporates some subjective measures, e.g., user surveys. The following components are identified and measured:

General Satisfaction Survey
Materials availability and use - circulation
- in-library materials use
- total materials use
- materials availability
- requested materials delay
Facilities and Library Uses - attendance
- remote uses
- total uses
- facilities use rate
- service point use
- building use
Information Services - reference transactions
- reference satisfaction survey
- on-line search evaluation

• (Outcome expected) Are there any components here that ARL should actively encourage its members to examine and for which we should promote data gathering?

16. More recent attempts to define a framework of measures for library quality are influenced by the need for self-assessment. As accreditation agencies are placing more emphasis on outputs and outcomes, it may be desirable for ARL to establish regular data collection activities examining outputs and outcomes. (10 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) Determining what tools would be necessary for self-assessment. List those aspects of library operations that might be guided by self-assessment efforts and how the ARL program might help members define self-assessment processes.

17. At the same time, work is under way with the Access Committee to develop and ILL/DD performance evaluation study. Attach page with possible performance measures for ILL/DD services. Note that the Access and the Statistics Committee have jointly organized the 10:45 Thursday Program Session entitled "Performance Measures as Incentives for Redesigning Access and Delivery Services." William Crowe will speak on the future directions for the Program in that session. (10 minutes)

- (Attachment) List of possible measures from the Access Committee
- (Outcome expected) Inform the committee on the status of the current cooperative efforts between the Statistics & Measurement program and the Access Committee.

Part B.3: USAGE

18. Objective data on usage can be gathered from the automated systems available in the library. In particular, usage data as they relate to circulation may be useful to some members. Possible circulation data of interest in assessing library's circulating collection are: percent of patrons who have checked out material from the library vs. those who have not; number of books borrowed by faculty, graduate and undergraduate students; examine the distribution of items borrowed in specific subject areas of interest to identify which subject areas are more heavily used (possibly relate that to measures of teaching and research effectiveness in a department). Circulation data obviously are affected by variations in loan periods, which may suggest that it is more important to collect that information comparing a specific library's performance from year to year rather than comparing circulation patterns across libraries. (10 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) Determine what kinds of circulation data, if any, could be used to derive useful measures.

19. More subjective measures of usage tend to be obtained by various user surveys. Despite the limitations of user surveys, it may be desirable for ARL to choose a limited number of survey questions and distribute user survey instruments to ARL libraries to determine if such an approach could be useful. Accreditation teams oftentimes require that user surveys be conducted, and having a battery of questions suggested by ARL could offer an additional opportunity to the institution to expand that survey and incorporate questions that would be more useful on the local level. (10 minutes)

- (Attachment) User Surveys
- (Outcome expected) Identify questions that may be of interest to ARL libraries; determine the feasibility of conducting a user survey across ARL libraries; comment on the desirability of testing the survey by Robert Pernick

Part B.4

20. Outcomes: Measuring the contribution of libraries to teaching and research. Approach the National Research Council for a study in this area. (10 minutes)

- (Attachment) Statement of research interest by S. Pritchard
- (Outcome expected) Discussion on next steps for such a project

End of Discussion on Strategic Document

- (Outcome expected) Present brief report and draft document to the Board and work on revisions

21. Present information about different analytical techniques using the existing ARL statistics and consider their potential usefulness (part of this discussion will also be carried out during the presentation of the ARL Statistics on the Wed). (10 minutes) Examples of different types of analysis will be discussed during the meeting. For example, use of regression analysis in evaluating growth, profiling libraries based on the deployment of staff patterns, library materials patterns, collection format patterns.

- (Outcome expected) Identify usefulness of different analytical techniques.

22. The program of Statistics and Measurement will need to develop additional mechanisms to collect data. Possible models that could be used in gathering information are: (a) cooperative model, i.e. coordinating efforts with other ARL committees; (b) informational model, i.e. developing instruments that can be used occasionally to gather information; (c) supplementary statistics model, i.e. add questions to the main survey by testing them in the supplementary survey;
self-assessment model, i.e. solicit members' cooperation on a voluntary basis to participate in different projects. (5 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) Discuss alternative strategies for soliciting information and cooperation from member libraries

23. Prepare a publication (print and electronic) describing the new program and its directions, as well as, services offered, building on the strategic directions document. (5 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) Discussion on the content and purpose of such a publication

24. The Program on Statistics and Measurement invests considerable effort in consulting with IPEDS in the interest of making the ARL and the IPEDS Academic Libraries survey more comparable and in making the publication of the biannual IPEDS statistics more timely. However, from extensive discussions held with different parties involved in the production of the IPEDS survey, it seems that it is extremely difficult to produce these statistics in a timely fashion. ARL could offer access to its services to non ARL libraries for a fee. Also, the publication of non-ARL library statistics can be a stream of revenue for the program. (10 minutes)

- (Outcome expected) Discuss the pros and cons of collecting and publishing data, like the ARL Statistics, for non-ARL libraries. Explore the possibility of cooperation between ARL and ACRL in publishing Academic Library Statistics annually for non-ARL members. Explore the possibility of a subscription model according to which non-ARL libraries could participate in ALL of the ARL surveys (Salary survey, E&G expenditures survey, Access Inventory, User surveys, etc.)

25. Ongoing projects: Status report on the following surveys (5 minutes)

Salary Survey
- status report on the 1994 survey
- Gender and Minority Status distribution prepared by Gordon Fretwell (attachment)
- report on the status of the project by the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education
- report on the analysis of the additional variables by Stanley Wilder (attachment to be distributed at the meeting)

Statistics - status report.
Supplementary Statistics - status report; discussion on revising questions, especially questions asking for the number of databases (need to distinguish between local mounting and FirstSearch-like services). Comments on the desirability of adding questions about fringe benefits and building maintenance.

- (Outcome expected) Assign responsibility for revising supplementary statistics survey

Law and Medical Statistics - status report; discussion on conducting annual surveys for law and medical libraries in the same way we perform them for the general library. Some institutions will not be able to give us separate statistics for the law and medical library. For these institutions that can it will be easier collecting the data from the institutions themselves than trying to elicit them from existing data compilations.

- (Outcome expected) Act on proposal to collect separately annual statistics on law and medical libraries, whenever possible.

26. Other items (5 minutes)

There is a possibility of creating a forum where personnel involved in completing the ARL surveys will get together to meet each other and present ways in which they use data in their local institutions. The University of Pennsylvania in cooperation with ARL's Program on Statistics and Measurement may be interested in organizing such an event during the ALA Midwinter in Philadelphia.

OCLC: William Crowe established a contact between the Program on Statistics and Measurement and OCLC. We will receive some data on a regular basis for ARL libraries that belong to OCLC. For example, the Committee on Collections of Library Materials needs annual data on foreign acquisitions. The Access Committee needs annual data on interlibrary loan activities. Also, OCLC offered FirstSearch to ARL for a two-month trial basis, starting November 1.

The Association of Institutional Research has received a contract from NCES to publish a report using the 1992 IPEDS data. Robert Rossi from AIR has met with Martha Kyrillidou twice and we
provided to him related ARL material and publications. Dr. Robert Rossi will also contact Kendon Stubbs and William Crowe for feedback.

- (Attachment) Working Draft by Robert Rossi (CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT DISTRIBUTE)

NACUBO - Benchmarking: The library part of their survey is becoming secondary, as they are focusing more on process benchmarking and as they reduce the functional areas they originally benchmarked. The NACUBO benchmarking project is to a large extent redundant with the ARL's electronic publication of 2,000 ratios on the Internet. More information will come from K. Stubbs during the Web presentation of ARL Statistics.

- (Attachment) NACUBO report

SUNY- Buffalo is planning a conference on the "economics of information" in the fall of 1995. This conference will be most likely co-sponsored by CLR and ARL.

Dr. Chressanthis, an economist from Mississippi State, has approached ARL and presented us with research he has been conducting on different aspects of libraries. Initial assessment of his work indicates a strong emphasis on theoretical aspects. It may be desirable to solicit evaluations of his work from the consultants to the committee, before considering if there should be any future relationship.

Ohio University has indicated that its index score met the ARL criteria for membership. A Special Committee has been established to examine the special circumstances around Ohio U., which is a system of University Centers in south-east Ohio. William Crowe will represent the Statistics and Measurement Committee. Nancy Cline is the second member, Kent Hendrickson is the Chair of the Special Committee, and Kendon Stubbs will serve as a consultant to it.

AND NOW TAKE A BREAK AND COME BACK TO ENJOY THE ARL STATISTICS ON THE WEB!
ARL Committee On Statistics And Measurement

Minutes

May 18, 1994: 8:30 to 11:30 a.m.
Concho Room, Stouffer Hotel, Austin, TX

Present: Gordon Fretwell, William Highfill, Graham Hill, Ellen Hoffmann, Edward Johnson, Peter Lyman, Sue Martin, Carla Stofle, William Studer, Kendon Stubbs, Chair: William J. Crowe, Staff: Martha Kyrillidou, Nicola Daval

1. Introductions

Bill Crowe introduced Martha Kyrillidou, ARL's new Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement, to the committee. He also thanked Nicola Daval and Patricia Brennan on behalf of the committee for their work during the transition period for the Statistics and Measurement Program.

2. Benchmarking and Preparation for Joint Meeting with Management Committee.

While the idea of performance measures for research libraries is not new, it has re-emerged as a hot topic. There is growing interest in how to measure the effectiveness of research libraries and the quality of service these libraries provide to their users. With groups such as NACUBO engaging in benchmarking projects, often with results that are potentially harmful to or misleading about research libraries, ARL would like to invest more effort in this area to identify how well research libraries are serving their users.

In January, a group including Bill Crowe, Management Committee Chair Kent Hendrickson, Kendon Stubbs, Duane Webster, Martha Kyrillidou, Nicola Daval, and Susan Jurow met with Nancy Kaplan and Jack Siggins, who are currently conducting a benchmarking project for OMS, to discuss how ARL should respond to NACUBO's project and to begin to plan ARL's strategy in the area of benchmarking and performance measures. As a next step, the Statistics and Measurement Committee met with the Management Committee during the Austin meeting to talk more about what ARL's approach(es) in this area should be.

The committees discussed the need to define what we mean by benchmarking and to create further opportunities in order to educate member libraries about process benchmarking.

Discussion continued on benchmarking, and included the following points:

- A similar study of some cataloging operations, looking at costs and processes, was conducted at Ohio State, and may be of some use in these efforts.

- Benchmarking and performance measures look at similar operations and seek similar results, but the perspectives are different. The process of benchmarking comes out of industry, and may not always be applicable to libraries' service orientations.

- NACUBO's Benchmarking Project. For the first few years of the project, the thrust seemed to be more is better, change is better. Mr. Stubbs did a report on the project for ARL directors. He found that the numbers NACUBO has gathered are fairly meaningless, and are often confusing to administrators.

- ARL should be identifying data that is useful in making decisions. As these kind of data are collected, ARL can identify best practices. The data should be information we want, need, and can collect.

- Define what aspect of a function to benchmark, e.g., the OMS project is looking at the cost effectiveness of ILL. Other studies have looked at the timeliness of ILL.

- Isn't benchmarking something an institution would or should do on its own schedule, so that ARL could take an overall perspective rather than trying to gather specific data?

- There is value in looking at outcomes as possible improvement areas. ARL has done this informally in SPEC Kits.
The ILL Cost Study has had a big impact. A similar study in cataloging would be very useful.

Performance measures are most valid at the local level as tools to help describe how an institution is serving its users.

There are two major issues: 1) measuring the value of the institution as a whole, and 2) improving individual functions. This committee must decide its focus. We also must develop a clear definition of what we mean by "access."

3. Membership Issues

Duane Webster joined the committee for a discussion of membership issues, including what new data might be used in the evaluation of potential candidates. A perennial issue for ARL is how potential membership candidates become members of ARL. It is difficult to specify exactly what a research library is, especially in the current evolving environment. The Task Force on Association on Membership Issues, which has been looking at ARL's membership criteria, decided that the question of developing measures of access could, among other things, be used to evaluate potential members. They recommend in their report that the Statistics and Measurement Committee emphasize the development of access measures.

It was noted that the question "What is a research library?" is certainly not new. Isn't the obvious answer that ARL is an organization of comprehensive research libraries in comprehensive research institutions? Mr. Webster replied that the decisions are not always clear for the various ad hoc membership committees, and thus the criteria may be at fault for not allowing more clear-cut decisions.

One idea under discussion is to use the new Carnegie Classifications of Research I and Research II as a departure point for defining which university institutions would be in ARL's scope, i.e., an institution's Carnegie Classification would be one of the major criteria a potential member must meet, along with quantitative assessments (number of Ph.D. fields, ARL membership criteria index) and qualitative evaluation of researchness, primarily through a visiting committee, and institutional contribution to North American research resources.

The advantage of this approach is that it immediately defines who is in and who is out of the scope defined by a reputable organization other than ARL. Also, this would reduce the emphasis on the ARL membership criteria index in determining whether an institution was in or out, and thus quell the notion that the index is a measure of quality. More consideration would be given about how an institution fits into the North American research resources and the evolving environment. There may still be problems, of course. But such an approach would provide a broader perspective for these criteria:

- Carnegie class of parent institution.
- Character and nature of the investment in the library.
- Quality and characteristics of the potential member.

Theoretically, an institution that does not have a high enough index score could still make a case for ARL membership candidacy. There may or may not be institutions that fit a somewhat different profile but still would be appropriate for membership. Discussion continued covering the following points:

- Why use just Research I & II of the Carnegie Classification? Why not Doctoral I and II as well? There are some research libraries, and indeed some members of ARL, that are not Res I or Res II.

- The Board has reviewed ARL's mission statement and objectives, and decided that it wanted a re-examination of the mission statement. Other higher education organizations are doing the same thing, some more aggressively. There will be a more formal membership discussion in the Fall.

- ARL is trying to define a vision of the research library of the future, and whether, for ARL's purposes, there are several models of what that research library should be. ARL should be in a position to influence the forces that will shape this new reality, moving from traditional research libraries to new modes of information storing and distribution. How do we measure service in this environment?

- ARL libraries are changing, but at different rates. And, in the new environment, new functions are being added, but most of the old or traditional functions are not being dropped.

- University administrators may no longer view large collections as relevant.

- The committee agreed that they should have a longer session at the Fall Meeting, to discuss
issues related to "access."

4. Demographic Study of ARL Libraries

Stanley Wilder of Louisiana State University approached ARL about access to some salary data for a study he wanted to conduct on the aging of the professional librarians in ARL libraries. As this fits a possible area of research the committee had discussed at previous meetings, Mr. Wilder was asked to prepare a proposal for his study to be shared with the committee at this meeting. The committee discussed the proposal and made the following points:

- Are there additional questions that should be added?
- Is nursing the right profession for comparisons to librarians?
- Is there support for a Supplemental Salary Survey this year?
- As more libraries downsize, aging of the staff will become more important.
- Experience is a surrogate for age. If ARL libraries stopped hiring new librarians, we would expect the experience figures to go up every year. But we don't know what individuals' retirement plans are.
- Several job categories seem to be more widespread in ARL libraries, e.g., preservation librarians, access services, perhaps development librarians. In the past, a supplemental survey has been used to track this information and decide on additional job categories to be delineated.
- There may be more pressing questions in this area, e.g., What is happening to the staff in our libraries? Downsizing? Outsourcing? In what areas? How ARL libraries arrive at their current situation and what are the prospects for the future. One major problem is that we are not able to track individuals to really understand shifts in personnel within individual libraries and across the ARL community.
- Ms. Martin mentioned that several years ago she constructed a database on career paths for directors in ARL libraries, using publicly available sources such as biographical directories. She included data such as graduation from library school, job codes, years in specific positions and institutions. She intended to study constraints on moving among functions, type of library, and geographical location.

5. Salary Survey

The Committee concurred that a supplemental survey should be conducted to explore additional job titles and other demographic elements.

Mr. Fretwell announced that this will be his last year as compiler of the survey, though he is willing to give help on special analysis and advise in compiling the survey for a few more years.

6. Supplementary Statistics

Preliminary analysis for the 1992-93 Supplementary Statistics was distributed. For 1992-93, questions on formats were transferred to the ARL Statistics. The questions on expenditures in this year's supplement have been one way in which ARL and IPEDS have attempted to address access. IPEDS will include these expenditure questions in the FY94 survey. 75% of ARL libraries were able to provide some data. A preliminary look shows the numbers to be somewhat vague and not very interesting, as the expected relation between expenditures for library utilities and added volumes did not really materialize. The questions on direct services are older, more traditional ways for libraries to measure outputs.

Mr. Stubbs reported that the complete report will have individual library data in all categories, so that libraries can construct their own peer groups. He is working on the analysis and expects to finish the report in June. One piece of information puts into numbers what we already knew -- as card catalogs are converted to OPACs, use goes up. Libraries with a higher percentage of records in the OPAC show higher usage over time.

The committee agreed that linear feet of empty shelves and the % of collection in storage facilities should be added to this year's supplement.

7. Law and Medical Statistics

The production of the Law and Medical Statistics has been delayed for technical problems with the data.

8. E&G data
Walter Sudmont of the University of British Columbia Office of Budget and Planning has offered to work with ARL to try to make Canadian E&G data more compatible with US E&G data. Susan Jurow has suggested John Cooper of Harvard University, as someone who can work on this issue.

The 1992-93 E&G report will be issued in June.

9. Proposed New ARL Objective 8 on Performance Measures

In July, the ARL Board will discuss a revised mission statement and possible changes to the ARL objectives, with the goal of bringing the topic to the membership in the Fall. The Board would like feedback on a proposed Objective 8 on Performance Measures, especially whether it should be a separate objective and advice on wording.

Ms. Stoffle reported that the University of Arizona is on the verge of rejecting the ARL index. It is a traditional basis for looking at research libraries -- we need something new.

As an organization, ARL is dealing more and more with other organizations and communities. We need a current description of "quality." The traditional data were useful when there was new money. Now, with restricted funds, directors are not able to use them as effectively for getting support. Administrators are rejecting the traditional measures in favor of new visions -- where are you going in the next 20 years. Their question is "What are you doing to change traditional measures so that we have ways to understand what a quality library is?"

Quality and centrality are going to be factors to evaluate programs. We need new measures of quality and ways we can assess what we are doing does reflect quality. What do we do today to create great research institutions that will attract faculty and students? What will scholars want in the future?

10. Joint Meeting with the Management Committee

There is increasing pressure from within ARL to begin collecting data that will measure access service. There is also pressure from outside organizations, e.g., NACUBO, that are developing some measures for libraries. This joint meeting is a result of these pressures and the need to define ARL's strategy in this area.

Ms. Jurow gave some background on the OMS Benchmarking Project. The project is focused on benchmarking the process of ILL. They are looking at the process, a certain amount of data is collected, but the primary focus is the process. As a result of the study, libraries can identify aspects that work better in some institutions, to use in helping them improve their own procedures. A question is to what degree can one benchmark beyond process. Can we benchmark other aspects of library effectiveness? And what can numbers contribute to the evaluation of process.

Points raised during the discussion include:

- An important step in determining ARL's strategy is a think tank with a focus on users and university administrators. How do we indicate how well we are doing our job?
- Performance measures are useful inside and can be comparable outside.
- Definition: "Benchmarking is a process that allows us to look at how something is being done & how effectively it is being done so that others can understand that process."
- ARL should develop carefully constructed, accurate tools and user satisfaction surveys for member library use.
- It is important to include non-library institutions and industries in the process of developing benchmarks.
- There are more professional managers in the higher echelons of university administration who want more objective information of this kind.
- Regarding the NACUBO project, ARL must reach out to other departments and operations on campus; many are probably as dissatisfied as libraries are about the results of the survey.
- ARL's traditional data are not as useful as when there is new money. Administrators want to know what we are doing better, how new technologies are being used to solve problems, etc.
- Library directors are being asked to state their vision on campus, and indicate how they plan to address the problems outlined. We must find our allies on campus with similar issues.
- Traditional statistics are not as valuable as they used to be. Data collection within the new...
visions is difficult -- we need shared definitions, models of how to do it.

- In launching a new benchmarking or performance measures project, choose a process that is fairly contained with agreed-upon standards, and then explore what allows some institutions to be more efficient.

- Is there a satisfaction index that is unique to each institution but with common elements?

- A campus user satisfaction survey would help institutions define what quality access and service are in their environment.

- Online systems can produce an array of reports, such as how many books from approval plans have circulated.

- It is important to get to non-library users on campuses, too, when exploring quality of service.

- First, define what we are trying to accomplish -- desired outputs; then, what are we doing or could do to achieve that result.

*Prepared by Nicola Daval.*
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