ARL COMMITTEE ON STATISTICS AND MEASUREMENT

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

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 (5 minutes)

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

Attachment 2a Minutes of the Meeting of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee on May 15, 1996
Attachment 2b Section on ARL Statistics and Measurement from the Activities Report.

Outcome expected: Approval of minutes and feedback provided.


Attachment 3a Workshop agenda

Outcome expected: Advice on next steps

4. Annual projects update and discussion. (25 minutes).

(a) ARL Statistics - (ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics is a survey similar to the ARL Statistics: Any changes in the ARL Statistics will affect the ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics).

1. Discussion as to whether Q. 38 should include ILL lending activity that is done on a cost recovery basis.

1. Clarify that for Q. 34, "Reference Transactions," libraries should report the number of questions and not the number of users.

1. Discuss whether libraries should report one subscription or multiple subscriptions for Q. 5 for full-text of journal articles accessible through databases.

Attachment 4a ARL Statistics 1995-96 survey and instructions

Outcome expected: Advice on changes in the survey

(b) ARL Annual Salary Survey: update and discussion.

1. Should we plan to add job titles related to Electronic Services/Automation? Should we ask for the actual job titles from each library before we revise the job categories, as was done in previous years?

1. Should we add a question on "Years in Library?" This information proved very useful while
Stanley Wilder was carrying out his project on demographics of librarians.

Attachment 4b ARL Annual Salary 1996-97 survey and instructions

Outcome expected Advice on steps to take about adding additional job titles and on adding a question about "years in library."

(c) ARL Preservation Statistics.

Plans call for making this publication primarily available through the WWW and printed copies available only on a cost recovery basis. The ARL Preservation Committee will send one of its members to participate in this discussion.

Attachment 4c ARL Preservation Statistics 1995-96 survey and instructions

Outcome expected Recommendation from the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee to the ARL Preservation Committee and the ARL Board

(d) ARL Supplementary Statistics.

Funding was secured to employ a Visiting program Officer (see items below for extensive discussion on this project during the second part of the meeting). Possible changes on the ARL Supplementary Statistics will be made as part of the recommendations by the VPO. Also, please note that a revised Table 2 for the ARL Supplementary Statistics 1994-95 will be issued because two of the columns reported data where the Canadian dollars were not converted correctly; and they were misplaced out of order.

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

(f) New project: Survey on Innovative Services in Research Libraries.

We expect to publish the results from this survey.

Attachment 4f Survey on Innovative Services 1996 and instructions

(g) Data entry templates on the WWW for ARL Statistics, ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics, ARL Supplementary Statistics, ARL Preservation Statistics. Report on progress and opportunities created by collecting data via the WWW.

Outcome expected Understanding and exploring opportunities created by submission of data on the WWW.

5. SERVQUAL project (10 minutes).

ARL submitted to the Council on Library Resources a proposal prepared by Danuta Nitecki on measuring library service quality. The proposal asks for matching funds to apply SERVQUAL to a group of six ARL libraries. Each library would contribute approximately $3,300 if funding is secured. If funding cannot be secured, ARL is willing to offer this project on a cost-recovery basis (costs are estimated to be approximately $8,000 per library). As of September 26th, we have not heard from CLR.

Outcome expected Inform committee on status of this project.

Advice on offering project on fully cost recovery basis.

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

(a) NCES Postsecondary Cooperative

Attachment 6a1 Summary of November 1995 Council Meeting

Attachment 6a2 Description of NPEC projects (mailed May 15, 1996)

(b) The National Benchmarking Council for Higher Education (NACUBO)

Attachment 6b Minutes of April 10, 1996 meeting (mailed August 26)

(c) IPEDS Academic Libraries Advisory Committee.

Discussions are underway for a teleconference on the general topic of "Data for the 21st century," or "What statistics will be meaningful in the future?"

Outcome expected Define interest on behalf of ARL in such an effort.

ARL has received a request that the Wisconsin-Ohio Reference Evaluation Instrument be used in the evaluation of reference services in research libraries.

Attachment 7a Letter of request, brief description, purpose
Attachment 7b Reviews
Attachment 7c Letters of recommendation

Outcome expected Advice on next steps.

8. CLR grant on the Character and Nature of Investment in Electronic Resources by ARL libraries - Visiting Program Officer: Tim Jewell. (60 minutes)

The Council on Library Resources has awarded ARL $11,800 to study the character and nature of investment in electronic resources. The goal is to develop new definitions that support collection of information about the transformation of research library collections and services. The study will allow secondary analysis of the data collected through the ARL Supplementary Statistics over the last three years. This study will identify inconsistencies in the way data on expenditures for electronic resources have been reported and will propose revisions to the current definitions to increase their usefulness. Carol Mandel (Columbia University) accepted an invitation to serve as consultant to this project. Tim Jewell, Head of the Electronic Information Program at the University of Washington Libraries, has been appointed to serve as a Visiting Program Officer for this project, from September 1996 to July 1997, on a part-time basis.

Attachment 8a Press release for Tim Jewell's appointment as a VPO
Attachment 8b Proposal submitted to CLR
Attachment 8c Action Plan Discussion Outline. Select data from 93 to 95
Attachment 8d ARL Supplementary Statistics revised Table 2 for 1994-95
Attachment 8e ARL Supplementary Statistics Survey 1995-96

Outcome expected Understand what information has been collected via the ARL Supplementary Statistics and what information would be useful to collect in the future.

9. Information items (10 minutes)

(a) Meeting of the ARL survey coordinators, planned for February 13th, during ALA, in Washington DC. The meeting will take place from 4:00 to 6:30pm. Specific location will be announced by January, 1997.

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

(c) ACRL repeated, for 1994-95, the biennial survey for the Research I, II, Doctoral I and II institutions that are not ARL members. They used the ARL instrument. A copy of their publication is available from ALA for $71 (member price) or $79 (nonmember price.)

(d) The Association of SouthEastern Research Libraries (ASERL) also published data for its members using the ARL survey instrument. The ASERL report has been posted on the ARL gopher. ASERL has 31 members, of which 19 are also ARL members.
(e) NISO has established a working group to determine if the NISO standard on criteria for price index standards needs to be revised. This group will meet on November 13, 1996, and in February 1997. The group is comprised of:

- Gay Dannelly, Ohio State University
- Adrian Alexander, Dawson/FAXON
- Steven Bosch, University of Arizona
- Ron Akie, Dawson/FAXON
- Christopher Schneider, Gordon & Breach
- Barbara Meyers, Consultant
- John Tagler, Elsevier
- Martha Kyrillidou, ARL

(f) Stanley Wilder's publication has sold 65 copies as of July 30, 1996. There was an editorial about the book in the September issue of the *Journal of Academic Librarianship* and a book review in the September 1996 issue of *College and Research Libraries*. There will be an article in the *Christian Science Monitor* on the future of librarianship that will refer to this work. Stanley Wilder completed this project while serving as a Visiting Program Officer for ARL in 1995.
From the 1996 ARL Membership Meeting

Minutes of the

ARL STATISTICS AND MEASUREMENT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 15, 1996

Gazebo 1, Pan Pacific Hotel, Vancouver, BC

Present: Ray Metz
Carollyne Presser
Carla Stoffle
William Studer
Don Tolliver
Gloria Werner

Gordon Fretwell, Consultant
Kendon Stubbs, Consultant

Ellen Hoffman, Guest
Paul Kobilnicky, Guest
Amos Lakos, Guest
Tim Mark, Guest
Frank Rodgers, Guest
Laura Rounds, Guest
Maureen Sullivan, Guest

William Crowe, Chair
Martha Kyrillidou, ARL Program Officer

Absent: Jennifer Cargill

Introductions and Overview

William Crowe convened the meeting and welcomed the members of the CARL Task Force on Statistics and the members of the ARL Management Committee who joined the group. (The May 1996 membership meeting was a joint meeting between the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee Meeting and CARL Task Force on Statistics.)

The members of the CARL Task Force on Statistics are:

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

The first part of the meeting included discussion on existing projects and surveys. The second part examined a proposal submitted by Martha Kyrillidou, the Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement, requesting permission to use the last fifteen years of the *ARL Annual Salary Survey* data for her dissertation research. An extensive discussion on the future directions of the program followed and concluded the meeting. This discussion was intended to guide members of the committee, the chair, and ARL staff on the long-term direction for the program and the projects that are under its aegis. Duane Webster joined the meeting during its second phase.

The minutes of the October 18, 1995 meeting were approved with no corrections.

Next, the committee discussed the "User Surveys" initiative. Members of the Statistics and Measurement Committee presented survey instruments that their libraries have used for evaluation of services. Kendon Stubbs reported on current progress, noting that an advisory committee had met in January, comprised of Jinnie Davis (North Carolina State), David Ferriero (MIT), Brinley
Franklin (U of Connecticut), and Maureen Sullivan (ARL/OMS). The committee advised on the content that the user survey initiative should cover and suggested that one of the "deliverables" from the project should be workshops. Following this advice a workshop was planned for July 5th, in New York, in conjunction with ALA. Committee members also suggested that ARL headquarters might serve as a clearinghouse for user surveys in order to provide information to members, as well as to consulting services about how to proceed in doing user surveys in research libraries.

The discussion then focused on the content for the workshop. Committee members advised that the content be a step by step process. Kendon Stubbs pointed out that the workshop will emphasize the distribution of written mailed surveys and not point of contact surveys. Preliminary activities building towards the July 5th workshop were a one-day consulting activity at Ohio State and a mini version of the workshop at the University of Connecticut. The Ohio State visit was more like a consulting assignment--this group was further along in the development of their effort and had decided to use local resources (i.e., the University's Polymetric Lab). The discussion was beneficial not only to library staff at Ohio State but also to the consultants. As a result, the Ohio State survey was issued much sooner than anticipated. The committee suggested that it is possible that an individual consultation service may be as important or even more important than the delivery of workshops.

The event at the University of Connecticut was more general, but there were at least three advantages realized. Paul Kobulinicky, director of that library, indicated that there was: (a) the benefit to have gone through a process of local learning and to have the opportunity to present the institution's framework of expectations and applications; (b) the opportunity to see the enormity of the task; and (c) the instructional experience. Committee members advised that such programs are complex in content and that attendees should come prepared ready to experience a very structured event. At the same time, it was advised that it would be beneficial to have some period(s) during which the participants are actively involved through group exercises or simulated events.

The rest of the discussion on user surveys concentrated on exchange of experiences among different libraries in their efforts to systematically collect information from their user population and through the employment of different techniques.

Next, the committee discussed different issues related to the annual surveys. Clarifications in the instructions regarding "Volumes Held/Volumes Added (Gross)" in the ARL Statistics were recommended. For example, libraries should not report in "Volumes Added (Gross)" any retrospectively cataloged government document collections, but rather they should adjust their base figure of "Volumes Held" to account for these items that appear for the first time in the counting of volumes.

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

These changes in the ARL Statistics will also be reflected in the ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics. No changes were recommended for the ARL Annual Salary Survey or the ARL Preservation Statistics.

The committee then discussed the proposal to attract funding for further research on the questions that are included in the ARL Supplementary Statistics on expenditures for electronic resources. This proposal was submitted to the Council on Library Resources. [Funding was approved later in the summer for this project, and Tim Jewell from the University of Washington is serving as a Visiting Program Officer to carry this project forward.]

Also the committee discussed and approved modifying the instructions in the ARL Supplementary Statistics for the question on the number of databases to include databases accessible via gateways. The committee suggested that the more extensive version of the question, asking separately for bibliographic and numeric databases, be tested soon after the meeting by sending it via email to the member libraries represented in the committee. [These questions were piloted in June, and it was clear that there were problems with them, so the ARL Supplementary Statistics questionnaire was distributed with only one question on the number of databases (with revised instructions to include databases accessed via gateways) and with no separate questions for bibliographic and numeric databases.]

Then the committee members reviewed the new Survey on Emerging Services in Research Libraries and suggested that "emerging" be replaced with "innovative." [The change was made and the revised survey was mailed to ARL libraries in July.]

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

Last, the members were briefed regarding developments in the NCES/IPEDS advisory committee, the National Benchmarking Council for Higher Education (NACUBO), and the National Postsecondary Educational Cooperative.

Duane Webster joined the meeting at this point. Martha Kyrillidou left the room as the committee was discussing her request to use the ARL Annual Salary Survey data for her dissertation.

The committee discussed the issues involved regarding the proposal Martha Kyrillidou prepared asking permission to use the ARL Salary Survey data for her dissertation. Her research focuses on studying the earnings gap(s) between men and women and different racial/ethnic categories during the last fifteen years. The committee decided to grant permission because they thought that the project would be very useful to ARL libraries especially as it relates to the ARL Minority Recruitment and Diversity agenda of ARL. It was thought that the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of Illinois and its faculty can direct and guide this project effectively and adequately.

Last, the committee had a brainstorming session for the future goals of the program. The Committee had developed a planning document in the last two years, but given recent Board discussions and comments from some members it seemed timely to discuss the future of the program and the importance of the different goals and projects for which the program is responsible. Is the ARL Statistics and Measurement program aggressively measuring important aspects of the library’s operations through its surveys? What should be measured? Would libraries still collect the traditional data that ARL collects if ARL did not do it? There was consensus that is still important to collect the information obtained through the ARL Statistics survey and the ARL Annual Salary Survey. Committee members expressed the desire to keep intact the ARL Statistics survey, but not to add any new questions. There were some doubts expressed about the cost benefit of the ARL Preservation Statistics, and the committee advised that the ARL Statistics and Measurement program officer relate to the ARL Preservation program officer the concerns of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee. The suggestion that we may try to outsource certain projects was heard. Should we outsource the collection of the preservation statistics? Is there a preservation librarian who could undertake that effort on behalf of ARL?

Gloria Werner asked Martha Kyrillidou how much effort each project takes. Martha responded that about 20% of her time goes to general program operations (committee, board, membership meetings, communication activities); 20% on ARL Statistics; last year for the first time the ARL Annual Salary Survey was done inhouse, and it accounted for 35% of her time, but this is more realistically about 20% in the future; 15% allocated to Preservation Statistics; and the last 10% to smaller projects such as the ARL Supplementary Statistics and the Library Expenditures as a Percent of E&G, and support for Visiting Program Officers. Next year the Salary Survey will absorb less time, but we are adding the ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics, a special survey on Innovative Services, and a variety of workshops. The program has large opportunities for cost-recovery activities, and its cost-recovery component is increasing steadily during the last two years, which allows us to add new projects especially if we can afford a permanent support staff member.

Returning to the discussion of the value of the current statistical compilations, Ray Metz pointed out that the strength of the ARL Statistics is not that it tries to measure success but that it measures the potential for success. Other activities such as NACUBO’s benchmarking effort are being invented as a reaction to the traditional statistics, but they end up collecting almost the same information that is available in the ARL Statistics. Efforts such as those involving the publication of the ratios are trying to mine the existing data in an effective way without being labeled “benchmarking” efforts.

Summarizing, the committee advised:

(a) sharpen the user survey effort,

(b) improve and minimize delays in the survey response time and effort, and

(c) maximize effort for production of new products with special emphasis on understanding the changing nature of research libraries.

Last, the following information was related to the committee:

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

Four workshops are planned for 1996 by the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program on (a)
User Surveys; (b) Electronic Publishing of Datasets; and (c) the Role of Assessment in Advancing Diversity in Libraries.

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

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

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

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

The American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Salary Survey was published in January 1996. It is the first library related salary survey that includes data on support staff salaries. Martha Kyrillidou summarized the results in an article that appeared in the American Association of Law Libraries Newsletter.

NISO has established a working group to determine if the NISO standard on criteria for price index standards needs to be revised. The working group met in November 1995 and is comprised of:

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