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, October 18, 2000, in the Burlington A room of the Jurys Washington Hotel, Washington DC.

The meeting will focus on (a) the ARL Board request for program and priority review process, (b) an update on new measures agenda projects, and (c) a recommendation that needs to be developed for ways to incorporate ebooks in the ARL Statistics. In relation to the ARL Board request, please bring with you the mailing from Ken Frazier to Directors of ARL libraries regarding the ARL dues recommendation.

In relation to the ARL new measures agenda, Flo Wilson from Vanderbilt University has been invited to discuss in greater detail the implementation and the findings from the technical services cost study methodology developed by Dilys Morris, retired librarian from Iowa State, and currently implemented across five research libraries. Also, a more comprehensive cost accounting framework that was used by Eileen Hitchingham to determine where the human costs are will be discussed.

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.** (5 minutes)

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


   Outcome: Approval of minutes.

3. **Program and Priority Review Process** (15 minutes)

   The ARL Board of Directors requested that ARL committees engage in a more systematic program review process to provide guidance to the Board in shaping the strategic choices facing ARL that have long-term financial implications. In January and February 2001, each program will be asked to identify issues/projects that will impact the Board’s 2002 dues recommendation to be formulated in summer 2001. Next May, this committee will be asked to provide feedback in terms of the top desirable outputs/outcomes for the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program in the context of ARL’s overall priorities. The discussion at this current meeting is to clarify what will be asked of the committee in the next year. Of course, your feedback on current operating priorities is always invited. Please review the mailing from Kenneth Frazier, ARL President to Directors of ARL Libraries (Dated September 13, 2000) regarding 2001 ARL Membership Dues for a more detailed description.

   Attachment 3a: Committee role in a more extensive ARL Program Review Process (also please see/bring pp. 1-3 from the ARL Activities Report)


   Outcome: Understand program review process.

4. **New Measures Update: Higher Education Outcomes (HEO) Research Review** is a white paper [http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/HEOSmith.html](http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/HEOSmith.html) developed by Ken Smith, Eller Distinguished Service Professor of Economics at the University of
Arizona, defining a course of action for ARL libraries to formulate learning outcomes as a group. Ken Smith will be a featured speaker at the ACRL conference in Denver. (10 minutes).

- Currently individual libraries have engaged on their own in defining learning outcomes. Identify whether libraries engaged in defining learning outcomes are interested in following the joined course of action outlined in Ken Smith’s white paper. ARL libraries identified as working in the area of learning outcomes on <http://www.ala.org/acrl/nili/whatis.html> include:

  - Arizona: University of Arizona, The Information Literacy Project (URL: http://dizzy.library.arizona.edu/infolit/)
  - California: University of California -- Berkeley (URL:http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/TeachingLib/)
  - Washington: University of Washington, UWired Program (URL: http://www.washington.edu/uwired)
  - Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin -- Parkside (URL: http://www.uwp.edu/library/)

- ACRL has received related IMLS grant - Education & Training. Association of College and Research Libraries, Chicago, IL, $149,924.00 This two year project will train academic librarians to work with faculty to design, implement, and evaluate tools for assessing student learning outcomes resulting from information literacy courses taught by librarians and faculty. Also, see ACRL’s Institute for Information Literacy (ILL) http://www.ala.org/acrl/nili/nilihp.html web resources

- ACRL has developed a one-page Student's Guide to Evaluating Libraries in Colleges and Universities http://www.ala.org/acrl/evalguide.html in terms of Facilities, Resources and Services.

  Outcome: Increase awareness of related developments and define next steps.

5. New Measures: Technical Services Cost Study (55 minutes). An invitation has been extended to the research team currently implementing the technical services Cost Study methodology and a presentation of this effort will be made at the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee meeting in October. Flo Wilson (Vanderbilt) will present the latest findings at the October Committee meeting and discuss how this methodology can be used to identify best practices across institutions, as well as what might be the future steps ARL can take to support this set of activities. For more information regarding the Technical Services Cost Study, see <http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/tcs_overview.html>.

  Outcome: Understand the methodology and define next steps.

6. New Measures: Investigation of Cost Drivers. (15 minutes) The need to review other comprehensive cost accounting frameworks was mentioned during the May Statistics and Measurement Committee meeting. Committee members mentioned the
methodology Eileen Hitchingham used in identifying staffing costs as a promising framework.

Outcome: Understand the methodology Eileen Hitchingham used.

7. New Measures: E-Metrics: (10 minutes)

Phase I: Knowledge Inventory of ARL Libraries and organizing an ARL Working Group on Database Vendor Statistics (May, 2000 - October, 2000)
Phase II: Development of statistics and performance measures (Nov, 2000 - June, 2001)
Phase III: Institutionalizing Statistics and Performance Measures (July 2001-Dec 2001)

- Newsletter article to appear in December issue; Phase I report forthcoming
- Presentation at CNI Task Force Meeting, San Antonio, TX, Dec 7-8, 2000
- Meeting in conjunction with ALA Midwinter
- Workshop in conjunction with the spring CNI Task Force Meeting

Attachment 7: Progress Report

Outcome: Update committee members on the status of the project

8. New Measures: LibQUAL+ pilot (10 minutes)

Funding secured for a three-year period to continue this project with the ultimate goal of developing an ARL program of service quality assessment.

- Symposium – digital video of symposium segments will be available on website
- Library Trends 2001 Summer issue to publish symposium papers
- Big 12 Plus endorsement for participation in 2001 spring LibQUAL+ activities
- Pilot-participating libraries meeting on Sunday Oct 22

Outcome: Update committee members on the status of the project

9. ARL Statistics – ejournals/ebooks (10 minutes)

The issue of counting e-books in the ARL Statistics was raised. Should e-book titles be treated as volumes? Should these counts be incorporated/folded in the standard counts in a similar way like the e-journal counts?

10. ARL Annual Salary Survey. Human Resources Issues (5 minutes)

Retirement Projections and Age Demographics - In May the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee decided to collect the optional demographic data every five years to reduce and streamline the data collection effort. Discussions continue with Stanley Wilder and demographer consultants for updating the ARL retirement projections once the new data are collected.
Outcome: Update on the ARL Annual Salary Survey and optional data collection

**Information Items:** (10 minutes)

11. Related Workshops/Presentations/Event Calendar

(a) “The New Culture of Assessment: Measuring Service Quality” a symposium organized by ARL, October 20-21, 2000
(b) Measuring Service Quality Online Lyceum workshop to be offered from Nov 13 to Dec 15 developed by Danuta Nitecki and Toni Olshen
(c) “Generational Change in Librarianship” by Stanley Wilder to be presented at the Arizona Library Association and University of California System Librarians conference (November 17, 2000)
(d) E-metrics presentation by Charles McClure, Jeff Shim, Rush Miller and Sherrie Schmidt in conjunction with the CNI Fall Task Force meeting, (December 2001)
(e) ARL survey coordinators meeting (January, 2001, Washington DC)
(f) Building a Culture of Assessment in Libraries led by Shelley Phipps and Amos Lakos to be offered as an ACRL pre-conference (Denver, March 2001)
(g) Ken Smith, featured speaker at ACRL (Denver, March 2001)
(h) LibQUAL+ workshop at the Texas Library Association Meeting by Fred Heath, Colleen Cook, Bruce Thompson (March 28, 2001)
(i) E-metrics Workshop for Project Participants by Charles McClure and associates to be delivered in Spring, 2001 in conjunction with the CNI Spring Task Force meeting, Washington DC (April 2001)
(j) Electronic Publishing of Datasets on the WWW led by Patrick Yott at the University of Virginia [to be renamed and revised and offered in spring 2001]
(k) Julia Blixrud to propose presentation related to LibQUAL+ effort at the NCCI Second National Annual Conference (July 28-30, 2001, New York City, New York Hilton and Towers)
(l) Role of Assessment in Advancing Diversity for Libraries led by DeEtta Jones, Julia Blixrud, and Martha Kyrillidou to be offered in the Fall, 2000 as an Online Lyceum course.
(m) ARL Statistics and Measurement Program presentation by Julia Blixrud and Martha Kyrillidou at IFLA 2001 in Boston
(n) User Survey for Academic Libraries workshop/online lyceum seeking VPO
(o) Research Methods and Statistics workshop/online lyceum seeking VPO
(p) Conducting Focus Groups in Libraries workshop/online lyceum seeking VPO

12. Relations with External Constituencies

(a) Academic Libraries Advisory Committee/NCES: Academic Libraries 1996 was published earlier this year, the 1998 datafile is available on the web, the 2000 data collection is being prepared. NCES plans to offer interactive data analysis capabilities of the Academic Libraries data. The Academic Libraries survey is not
part of the IPEDS set of surveys and is not subject to the IPEDS mandatory requirements any more.

(b) New publication forthcoming from NCES entitled "The Status of Academic Libraries in the United States: Results from the 1996 Academic Library Survey with Historical Comparisons." Martha Kyrillidou served as external reviewer. The NCES publication reports on trend data on the ratio indicators developed by ARL for the universe of academic libraries. The report identifies similar trends as the ARL Statistics introduction but with more pronounced effects in terms of budget constraints for academic libraries outside the Research I and II Carnegie Categories.

(c) An recent article by Mary Jo Lynch on 'new players' in library statistics is located at [http://www.ala.org/alaorg/ors/als_newplayers.html](http://www.ala.org/alaorg/ors/als_newplayers.html) (accessed Sept 1, 2000).

(d) National Postsecondary Education Cooperative ARL’s official term of service to the Cooperative has expired. Information about future activities of the cooperative can be found at [http://www.nces.ed.gov/npec/membership.html](http://www.nces.ed.gov/npec/membership.html).

(e) NISO SDC revision of Library Statistics standard. The U.S. withdrew from the international revision of the library statistics standard but there are plans to rejoin in 2001; it was felt that NISO should focus on the revision of the national library statistics standard; the revision process will be initiated with an invitational workshop in February, 2001.

(f) ACRL Library Statistics data collection is underway.

(g) The 4th Northumbria International Conference on Performance Measures in Libraries will be held on August 12-16, 2001 in Pittsburgh, PA. This international conference is co-sponsored by the ARL, NCLIS, the Oakland Library Consortium, University of Arizona, Arizona State, and Texas A&M. Carla Stoffle is serving on the editorial board for this conference and Martha Kyrillidou (ARL) and Joan Stein (Carnegie Mellon) are involved in the planning committee. A call for papers deadline is January 1, 2001.
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Carla Stoffle, Committee Chair, convened the meeting and welcomed three new committee members, Brinley Franklin (University of Connecticut), Tom Shaughnessy (University of Minnesota) and Paul Wiens (Queen’s University).

Tom Shaughnessy moved to approve the minutes and Sherrie Schmidt provided a second. The minutes were approved by all present. There were no comments on the ARL Program Plan. A correction to the May agenda clarifying that Dilys Morris is a retired librarian from Iowa State and not the University of Iowa was made.

The discussion quickly focused on learning outcomes, and Ken Smith, Eller Distinguished Service Professor of Economics at the University of Arizona, introduced the white paper that ARL commissioned by discussing how the movement of outcomes assessment is affecting all higher education institutions. Ken Smith developed the ARL white paper on New Roles and Responsibilities for the University Library: Advancing Student Learning through Outcomes Assessment <http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/HEOSmith.html> that was previously presented to the ARL membership for discussion during the luncheon that followed the committee meeting. The white paper stems from the original discussions held at Tucson in February 1999 where the need to develop a white paper outlining the library impact on teaching and learning was identified <http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/nmbackground.html>. ACRL has recently reviewed and approved the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education <http://www.ala.org/acrl/ilcomstan.html> too.

Ken Smith pointed out that the expectations for what students need to know when they leave the university are changing; there is a broader view of the requirements for success. What students do after they leave the university not only requires that they have a knowledge base but also the skills for teamwork, communication, technology; students need to have the ability to be creative, have positive attitudes and values; have a sense of personal responsibility, while being able to hold team members accountable. As a result, faculty members are not viewed as knowledge experts any more, and the library is not just viewed as a repository of knowledge. Responsibility is shifting from ownership of resources to access. The library and the professionals working there have a unique opportunity to play a central role in academic programs. Especially by promoting the value of information literacy, libraries can meet the needs of students as learners and enhance their learning and research outcomes. Small pilots can work the best. So, the course of action identified is to engage various academic programs across institutions and create teams of librarians, faculty, and students to work collaboratively. Students can resist and feel outside their comfort zone in this new environment, but the library's role still is to help students understand that the changing expectations will affect their ability to perform and the most important thing is to develop the information literacy skills and the positive attitudes and values that will help become lifelong learners.

Sarah Pritchard pointed out that for ARL libraries it is difficult to focus only on the evaluation of learning outcomes because research outcomes are very important and they define the culture of the parent institution. ARL libraries do not want to give the
impression that they are de-emphasizing research by emphasizing teaching and learning. Ken Smith pointed out that the research enterprise is perceived to be doing well, based on R&D measures and similar indicators; the learning outcomes framework can work well in research universities and for graduate programs, too. For example, graduate programs might want to think in terms of the % of Ph.D. placements at peer or better schools. Research outcomes are very prominent for most faculty and graduate students as they are placed prominently on their resumes - in many ways what we need to do is extend the research outcomes model to the learning enterprise.

Tom Shaughnessy pointed out that the key question is, "How do I demonstrate to my institution the value the library adds to the learning process?" The assumptions have been that the bigger the library, the better the students, the faculty, the learning experience. Providing and experimenting with tools that institutions can apply to change their cultural context is what ARL libraries need. Sarah Pritchard pointed out that experimenting and trying 'new tools' may have some negative local reactions in research institutions where people feel well-established in their roles and not ready to move out of their comfort zone. Cliff Haka expressed a concern that there is a danger for developing measures that do not relate directly to the library but rather try to measure the intangible factors, or the indirect impact of the library, which is very hard to change and outside the immediate sphere of control for most administrators.

Ken Smith said that we can measure more than we think we can, and offered an example from the University of Colorado where a department determined that an important outcome was critical thinking, yet the faculty discovered that they did not have a shared view of critical thinking; it took them a year to define the five dimensions of critical thinking. It was also mentioned that there is a culture change underway, yet things do not change overnight. The discussion concluded by determining that the committee's agenda is to help members assess the impact of the library in the learning process and one way to do that is through stories - success and failure stories. Carolyne Presser offered a story of a prominent faculty member at her institution who recognized the libraries in a recent award she received.

Next Doug Jones was introduced. He will spend his sabbatical in early spring 2001 investigating how we can assess library research outcomes. He will work with John Wilson, chair of the AAU data warehousing initiative. Brinley Franklin mentioned the federal government’s interest in defining better measures regarding how much the library has contributed to the discovery of knowledge from his experience in trying to define library overhead costs for library resources.

Vicki Coleman introduced briefly the Technical Services Cost study and recommended that the committee members might invite one of the five participating libraries to learn more about this project. This is a project that is currently underway across five research libraries and the committee members are interested in identifying whether this methodology can be used across other institutions effectively. It was recommended that ARL should try to bring someone from the study/implementation team to present the study/product at the next meeting. The discussion on cost drivers surfaced a method that
Eileen Hitchingham used in identifying human resource costs, and committee members suggested that her approach be described and discussed in October.

In relation to the e-metrics project, Sherrie Schmidt reported that there is a lot of interest - 20 members had expressed commitment to participate [the final number of participating libraries in the e-metrics project is 24]. A contract had been negotiated with Charles R. McClure from the Information Use Management and Policy Institute at Florida State University and should be signed shortly. This is a critically important area of work with strong member interest.

A report by Fred Heath regarding the SERVQUAL-pilot effort followed. About 4,500 completed surveys were collected from 12 ARL participating libraries. There are massive amounts of data, both quantitative and qualitative. The analysis is underway and results should be reported in October. In July there will be a meeting in conjunction with ALA, where the participating libraries will receive summary results, and presentation of the preliminary results is scheduled at IFLA in Jerusalem in August. ARL is also considering offering a two-day symposium sometime in the fall where the full results of this effort will be reported. The participating institutions have been true leaders and pioneers in experimenting with new ways of assessing research libraries. Fred Heath mentioned that it will take some more experimentation to come up with a good instrument but the pilot showed that web user-based assessment is effective. The sampling frames and response rates are being compared with standard sources to test sample representativeness; issues with browser version compatibility are being addressed; and, with external funding permitting we should be able to continue the development of the instrument over the next three years. Next year the plan calls for about 25 institutions to participate in the 2001 pilot-phase. Participating institutions should be aware that this is a beta situation, i.e., experimenting with process, interface, refining protocols, and be ready to address concerns and comments.

Next the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee considered an external request for data. A request by Deborah Lee to collect additional data and release the ARL Annual Salary Survey data for her dissertation research entitled “Compensating Wage Differentials and Tenure: The Case of Academic Librarianship” was discussed. Committee members pointed out that ARL has made a conscious decision to freeze the annual data collection instruments in making a concerted effort to advance the ARL New Measures Initiative. Members of the committee also felt that collecting data on tenure and faculty status may be perceived as an indicator that ARL has an interest in promoting these concepts. General information collected through the various SPEC Kits indicates that the value of tenure and faculty status within each local context differs from library to library. Also, because of confidentiality reasons raw data cannot be released as that may jeopardize the annual data collection activities. The committee advised ARL staff not to collect any additional data on tenure and faculty status through the ARL Annual Salary Survey nor to release the current data.

In terms of the retirement projections and the additional demographic variables, the optional data collection cycle was moved to every five years (instead of four) starting
with 2000 and no additional data will be collected regarding the exit behavior of the professionals in ARL libraries. Stanley Wilder and the demographer consultants, Dr. Gendell and Dr. Irwin, will work within the constraints of the current demographic data.

An external request for additional data collection by Dr. Lewis G. Liu was considered. Committee members advised that the questionnaire elements are not defined adequately to provide useful information. A cost accounting framework like the one used by Eileen Hitchingham to determine where the human costs of a library’s operation are was viewed as potentially more useful.

The committee meeting concluded by making sure everyone was prepared for the lunch presentation of Ken Smith's ARL white paper, which immediately followed the committee meeting.

MK
Committee role in a more extensive ARL Program Review Process

A Discussion Guide

The ARL Board of Directors in July 2000 decided to implement a more extensive ARL program review process. The purpose of this new process is to better understand the effectiveness of ARL program activities and to enable the ARL Board to direct limited dues resources to the highest priority issues confronting research libraries as they prepare for a challenging future. Parenthetically, the recent dues recommendation for 2001 has prompted some member representatives to underscore the need for and importance of more concerted efforts to manage expectations of members for ARL. As part of this effort, the Board seeks input from ARL Standing Committees.

1. During the October 2000 Committee meeting, each Committee is asked to provide the Board with some feedback on the program review process (see attachment 1). Are there questions about the overall process that the Board needs to clarify?

2. A key step in the proposed process is for each of the eight Standing Committees to agree on a ranking of the top issues being addressed by ARL in its program area and to consider desired outcomes to measure progress on these issues. It is planned that ARL staff will provide each Committee a draft roster of issues at the May 2001 Membership Meeting. This roster of issues will reflect how a program advances ARL overall objectives that are embedded in the annual program plan developed for the year. The Board would like to know, is this assignment doable in the time available at the Committee's May meetings?

3. Eight strategic objectives articulate the scope of ARL's agenda and enable the ARL Board to oversee program development and fund allocation (see attachment 2). ARL's planning framework also includes: developmental objectives and annual operating priorities prepared by the Board. These strategic planning documents give the Committee the overall context for preparing a roster of priority issues for the program they advise. Does the Committee need additional guidance from the Board?

4. What other feedback would you like to provide the ARL Board of Directors at this time?

Staff will make a report on the Committee's feedback to the Board at its meeting on 20 October. Committee chairs are welcome to join the Board meeting and contribute to this discussion (This will be the first item at 8:00 to 8:30 am.)

Attachment 1: ARL Planning Process
Attachment 2: ARL Planning Framework (pp. 1-3 from the ARL Activities Report 2000)
Attachment 1: ARL Program and Priority Review Process

The Board has reviewed program budgets every year for the last decade, approving adjustments in the allocation of funds to recognize shifting priorities. This is a routine annual planning process completed by the staff working with ARL Standing Committees and affirmed by the ARL Board at its February meeting. The Board establishes the annual priorities for the Association as a part of this review.

A. Background

The current approach to program review is tied closely to the schedule needed for the Board to develop the annual dues recommendations, then to secure membership support for this recommendation, and ultimately for staff to prepare the program plans and budgets to implement approved dues levels. Thus the Board considers dues strategy in July, the membership approves dues in October, and staff prepares the program plan and budget for adoption by the Board at the February Board meeting. All of the current program review and development is done within the context of the ARL mission and strategic objectives. The mission and objectives were last reviewed and updated in 1994 and continue as a robust framework for planning and assessment purposes. ARL developmental priorities were discussed at the last three Board meetings and a revised set was adopted by the Board at their July 2000 meeting.

The annual program plan describes developmental and operational priorities. This plan generally builds on the discussions and work of the ARL standing committees and describes work underway and financial resources allocated to support this work. The annual plan is presented to the Board at the February meeting and provides an important opportunity for the Board to look across programs and assess whether the priorities and budgets effectively represent the directions the Association needs to follow.

The discussions of a change in the program review process were embedded in fiscal discussions and reflect the financial constraints facing the organization during a time when there are a growing number of issues competing for ARL resources.

B. Purpose

The Board, at its May 2000 Meeting discussions, focused on the following purposes for reworking the program review process.

- assessing the success of the program in fulfilling its purpose and effectively using resources assigned to it and
- redirecting available resources to areas of highest priority.
The Board approved a motion to develop assessment techniques and identify outcome measures that will help enhance the effectiveness of ARL program activities and direct resources to highest priority activities.

C. Process considerations

In reworking the current process of program review to better achieve the purposes identified above, the following issues need to be considered.

1. Assuring a strategic focus for the Board

It is essential that the strategic focus for the Board is maintained. This role involves creating the mission and objectives framework that guides staff. It also includes identifying annual priorities for ARL, recommending dues and approving the annual ARL budget, monitoring the work of ARL Committees, assessing the overall success of the Association, and conducting the annual performance review of the Executive Director.

2. Engaging the help and advice of standing committees

ARL standing committees will be asked to conduct annually a structured discussion of the program they advise and report to the Board on their conclusions. This discussion will encourage the Committee to identify the changing mix of issues that need attention by ARL. This assignment may serve to underscore the program advisory nature of these committees as well as the Board's role in providing advice and guidance across programs. It will also secure for the governing bodies of the Association, a clear sense of member representatives' interests and readiness to engage certain issues.

3. Thinking through the desirable outputs and outcomes for the dues-funded programs

Identifying program outputs and outcomes will serve to focus committees, staff, and board members on the payoff for critical dues investments. Encouraging the Association to think more in terms of output/outcomes rather than inputs and activities is similar to the challenges facing member organizations. For purposes of this discussion, a program output is a quantifiable characterization of activity and a program outcome is a quantifiable characterization of impact on target group.

4. Helping the ARL senior staff deploy dues revenue in the most effective fashion.

Senior staff will find focused and consistent feedback from committees and board members useful in reworking the constantly changing content of the issue agendas they manage.

5. Securing the data for outputs is easier than getting information on outcomes
The problem is how best to secure a sense of impact without seeking added information from the membership. A survey of members on value and satisfaction with ARL services and policies could be burdensome.

D. Proposal for extending the ARL Program Review Process

1. Staff prepares a list of outputs and outcomes for the top three program issues for discussion with the appropriate committee. This will be done initially as part of the annual program plan development and be revised as needed following the Board's identification of annual priorities in February.

2. Standing Committees review these lists at the May Membership Meeting and provide feedback and ranking for the staff. This will be provided to the Board for consideration at the July Board Meeting for use in consideration of the financial strategy for the next year.

3. Committees and Program Officers explore and agree on what issue(s) should receive lesser priority or be eliminated from the program's agenda. This should also happen at the May Membership Meeting for consideration by the Board at its July Meeting.

4. Board reviews Committee/staff actions and completes a cross-program review that provides a horizontal perspective. This will be done initially at the July meeting and then reviewed at the February meeting. It is expected that this review will result in the Board making strategic choices to align the agenda and issues addressed to reflect resources available.
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*Attachment 2: ARL Planning Framework (pp. 1-3 from the ARL Activities Report 2000) – not provided here*
5.1 STATISTICS AND MEASUREMENT

The Statistics and Measurement Program describes and measures the performance of research libraries and their contribution to teaching, research, scholarship, and community service. The Program includes support for the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee and collaboration with other national and international library statistics programs. For more information please visit the Statistics and Measurement website <www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/index.html>.

DESIGNATED PRIORITIES IN 2000

2000 OPERATING PRIORITIES

1. Enable on-schedule and error-free production for data collected for all statistical publications.
2. Continue to work closely with survey coordinators through meetings and electronic communications.
3. Continue to represent ARL in external statistical programs and investigate national and international efforts in the area of outcomes assessment and performance measures.
4. Continue to offer workshop and training opportunities.
5. Enhance data entry collection and publication process by taking advantage of new technologies.
6. Provide custom reports and tailored products and market their availability.
7. Update website with new data and reports as they become available.
8. Work with the Office of Leadership and Management Services to coordinate data collection and survey management for SPEC Kits.

2000 DEVELOPMENTAL PRIORITIES

- Support the development of the new measures agenda by managing electronic lists and coordinating projects, maintaining a website of documents and producing reports and publications as needed.
- Define next steps for the Higher Education Outcomes Research Review Project by (a) defining follow up activities for the learning outcomes assessment plan developed by Ken Smith and (b) supporting Doug Jones VPO assignment investigating research outcomes.
- Managing the FIPSE grant on Service Effectiveness in Academic Libraries (LibQUAL+ project) in cooperation with Texas A&M.
- Coordinate the e-metrics project under contract at the Information Use Management and Policy Institute at Florida State University with principal investigators Charles McClure and Wonsik Shim (two-year project) under the leadership of Sherrie Schmidt (Arizona State) and Rush Miller (Pittsburg).
- Promote further investigation of cost-drivers by (a) understanding the technical services cost study methodology developed by Dilys Morris at Iowa State and currently tested at five research libraries, and (b) identify other frameworks for cost accounting.
- Analyze and prepare reports and tables regarding demographic and compensation trends in ARL libraries (age, job positions, experience, education, and salaries).
- Increase opportunities for library staff to develop measurement and evaluation skills by organizing workshops on a cost-recovery basis and developing more online lyceum courses.
NEW MEASURES INITIATIVE

In January 1999, several members of the Statistics and Measurement Committee, the Leadership and Management Committee, and other interested member leaders, gathered to discuss what ARL can do to assist members in developing new measures that better describe research libraries and their services. Those attending the retreat addressed a set of questions regarding the data needed to describe research libraries in today's environment, the need for new measures, and the means by which useful data and measurement tools could be developed. A series of white papers were developed as a result (see <www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/nmbackground.html>.)

In 2000 a series of specific projects were initiated and supported with direct member financial contributions. What is now known as the New Measures Initiative supports currently five areas of investigation with a variety of projects at different stages of development. The New Measures website was revised and updated with the assistance of ARL Visiting Program Officer Vicki Coleman, who completed her term as an VPO. The site is organized by project and includes project information as well as links to other resources.

Higher Education Outcomes (HEO) Research Review is a project that currently focuses attention to two major outcome areas (a) learning outcomes and (b) research outcomes.

To advance the investigation of learning outcomes Ken Smith, Eller Distinguished Service Professor of Economics at the University of Arizona, was hired as a consultant. Ken Smith held a focus group meeting in February at Scottsdale, AZ, as well as additional discussions with librarians and developed a white paper entitled “New Roles and Responsibilities for the University Library: Advancing Student Learning Through Outcomes Assessment.” The white paper <www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/HEOSmith.html> outlines a strategy for involving research libraries in campus assessment activities to demonstrate the value of the library to the learning community. It was presented at the ARL May Membership Meeting. This project was made possible with direct member financial support of $16,000.

To advance the investigation of research outcomes, Doug Jones will serve as a Visiting Program Officer for ARL from February through April 2001 to explore the impact libraries have on research.

LibQUAL+: Service Effectiveness in Academic Research Libraries

This project, originally known as the SERVQUAL-pilot, was spearheaded by Texas A&M (Fred Heath and Colleen Cook) with 12 ARL member libraries participating in an initial pilot application of a uniform survey instrument to measure user perceptions of library services. The pilot that took place in spring 2000 following an initial meeting of the project participants on January 15 in San Antonio, TX, tested the applicability of a LibQUAL+ (the modified and regrounded SERVQUAL instrument) across research libraries and implemented a method for large-scale data collection through the Web.

The libraries gathered data via a web-based survey instrument from some 5,000 respondents in spring 2000. The original SERVQUAL instrument tests five dimensions of service and the pilot project added another two dimensions with additional questions. Initial results were reported out to the participants in July with mean scores for the questions and dimensions. Libraries also received the aggregate mean scores for each question and dimension as well as other descriptive statistics that could be used for comparative purposes in July. Colleen Cook and Bruce Thompson provided a brief overview of the process and lessons learned so far at the ARL Statistics & SPEC Survey Coordinators Meeting at ALA in July.

The project is more fully described in recent issues of the ARL Bimonthly Report:

“SERVQUAL and the Quest for New Measures” by Colleen Cook and Fred Heath

ARL was awarded a FIPSE (Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education) grant—a very competitive and prestigious award—to continue development work in this area over the next three years. FIPSE funding will allow ARL to refine the questions, dimensions, and data gathering processes and develop a service that ARL and other academic libraries can use to determine their own service effectiveness. The goals of the project include (a) the development of a regrounded protocol to evaluate service quality in all post secondary libraries; (b) an effective web-based delivery mechanism for the protocol; (c) identification of best practices to allow wiser allocation of scarce resources through cross-institutional comparisons; and (d) the establishment of an ongoing, cost-recovery, service quality assessment program at the Association of Research Libraries. The FIPSE funds of $498,368 for this project, which begins October 2000, will cover 49.5% of the estimated costs of the project and ARL and Texas A&M will contribute the remaining 50.5% of the total project costs.

In October 2000, a symposium on The New Culture of Assessment in Academic Libraries: Measuring Service Quality is being held in which results of the pilot project will be shared. Library directors and/or senior-level administrators in post-secondary institutions have been encouraged to attend this event if they are considering participating in the future LibQUAL+ activities. Symposium information is available at <www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/msqsymp.html>. The purpose of this symposium is to facilitate an informed exchange of theoretical frameworks for measuring service quality and discuss the implications of applying these frameworks in libraries. An international group of experts will gather to present their perspectives and provide feedback as to how their work relates to the pilot project currently conducted by ARL, and the future actions libraries need to take in this area. The symposium proceedings will appear as the summer 2001 Library Trends issue on “Measuring Service Quality” featuring papers from an international array of experts in library evaluation and measurement issues.

Investigation of Cost-Drivers:
This project is an effort to identify high-impact library functions that are susceptible to cost savings and performance enhancement as research libraries move into a more technologically sophisticated environment. Topics and criteria for evaluation of potential functions to study were gathered at ALA Midwinter and are available on the web at <www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/costdriver.html>.

Several areas for study have surfaced through these discussions and from member directors: the cost/benefit of remote storage and retrieval within a consortial setting; electronic reserves; and a public services function such as reference or circulation that could be modeled on the technical services methodology developed by Dily Morris, retired technical services libraries from Iowa State.

The Technical Services Time and Cost Study methodology is currently being tested at five research libraries. An invitation has been extended to the research team currently implementing the technical services Cost Study methodology and a presentation of this effort will be made at the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee meeting in October. Flo Wilson (Vanderbilt) will present the latest findings at the October Committee meeting and discuss how this methodology can be used to identify best practices across institutions, as well as what might be the future steps ARL can take to support this set of activities. For more information regarding the Technical Services Cost Study, see www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/tcs_overview.html. A larger discussion of comprehensive cost accounting frameworks will also be held at the forthcoming October committee meeting.

Assisted Self-Study for ILL/DD Operations
One of the new measures projects is the development of an assisted self-study for ILL/DD operations. The assisted self-study will use the experience gained from the ARL ILL/DD Performance Measures Study and will provide libraries with a tool to evaluate local ILL/DD operations. The assisted self-study consists of three parts: an organizational assessment, comparison of local activity against the benchmarks and best practices identified in the ILL/DD Performance Measures Study, and development of specific actions and changes that will result in a service that meets or exceeds those benchmarks. The draft study is in the process of being developed. In the fall, a small pilot group of libraries will test the methodology, with a goal of making the study available to the membership and library community in early 2001. For more information, please contact Mary Jackson <mary@arl.org>.

**ARL E-metrics project**

Previously known as e-Usage (Usage Measures for Electronic Resources), the ARL E-metrics project is an effort led by Arizona State (Sherrie Schmidt) and University of Pittsburgh (Rush Miller) to explore the feasibility of collecting data on the usage of electronic resources.

A planning meeting attended by 36 ARL libraries to define the project was held at Scottsdale, Arizona, in February. Meeting participants identified major project design issues and criteria that consultant Chuck McClure used to prepare a prospectus to enable a call for member participation. The prospectus entitled “Developing Statistics and Performance Measures to Describe Electronic Information Services and Resources in ARL Libraries” was sent to members in March. Twenty-four ARL member libraries committed $10,000 to participate in a 20-month project to be carried out under contract with the Information Use Management and Policy Institute, School of Information Studies at Florida State University. ARL signed the contract with Florida State University in May.
The June ARL Bimonthly Report (#210) features an article describing the issues to be addressed in this project <www.arl.org/newsltr/210/emetrics.html>. An ARL Task Force on Statistics from Vendor-Based Database Products was convened at ALA to initiate project activities in this area. The ARL Working Group (WG) on Database Vendor Statistics is currently collecting sample reports and other information related to the use and users of vendor-based electronic resources.

A survey of best practices took place in July and based on the preliminary analysis of the results four site visits were completed by Jeff Shim, one of the principal investigators of the ARL e-metrics project in August. The four institutions visited are: New York Public Library, U. of Pennsylvania, Virginia Tech, and Yale. The purpose of the visit was to have a close up examination of the local processes and issues that are related to collection and utilization of data describing electronic resources and services. Data collected from Phase I activities are currently being analyzed and will be reported later in the fall.

**ANNUAL STATISTICS SURVEYS AND PUBLICATIONS**

Statistical compilations produced in 2000 include:

- ARL Annual Salary Survey 1999-2000

Still under production are:

- ARL Supplementary Statistics 1998-99
- ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics 1998-99
- ARL Preservation Statistics 1997-98
- Developing Indicators for Academic Library Performance: Ratios from the ARL Statistics 1996-97 vs 1997-98

Most of the data collected for the annual publications comes through a website interface. This speeds the data entry process and ensures accuracy. The Web data entry interface for the annual surveys has been upgraded so that the survey coordinators may access the online survey as many times as necessary as a placeholder; “save” the data temporarily without actually submitting it. Once data is submitted, institutions cannot change the data themselves but they need to contact the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program staff. Every ARL library can view and print the data that have been submitted/edited including changes incorporated in the file by ARL staff. The data are immediately available to all other ARL libraries as soon as they are submitted for the first time this year.

**New surveys mailed to members during the summer include:**

- ARL Annual Salary Survey 2000-2001
- ARL Academic Law and Medical Library Statistics 1999-2000
- ARL Supplementary Statistics 1999-2000
- Library Expenditures as a Percent of University Expenditures 1998-99
Library Expenditures as a Percent of University Expenditures 1997-98

HUMAN RESOURCES ISSUES
A special double issue of ARL on Human Resources included a number of articles analyzing information collected through the ARL Annual Salary Survey regarding salaries, demographics, recruitment and diversity issues, educational credentials, job positions, and training staff for implementing changes in libraries. Also, an ARL/OLMS Library Human Resources Symposium took place on 2-3 March 2000, in Washington, D.C. focused on (a) recruitment and retention issues, (b) competencies and implementation of competency-based systems, and (c) performance assessment models.

Additional demographic data have been collected through the ARL Annual Salary Survey in 1986, 1990, 1994, 1998, and are currently being collected in the 2000 data collection cycle. These additional data provide an overview of some of the issues mentioned above and will be collected every five years starting in 2000. A planning meeting for further analysis of the additional demographic data was held with Stanley Wilder and two demographers, Dr. Murray Gendell and Dr. Michael Irwin, to update the 1995 projections regarding the age structure of ARL librarians. Additional analysis will be performed once the 2000 data collection is complete.

ELECTRONIC PUBLISHING

WEBSITE ENHANCEMENTS
Apart from its printed publishing efforts, the Program maintains a strong presence in electronic publishing activities. Special interest and new pages include:

- Interactive electronic publication of the ARL Statistics on the Web, maintained by staff of the Geospatial and Statistical Data Center at the University of Virginia:
  - Main Page <http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/newarl/>
  - Membership Criteria Index <http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/newarl/rankdat.html>
  - Annual Rankings and Ratios <http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/newarl/list.html>
  - ARL Survey Coordinators page including pdf versions of all annual surveys and links to data entry forms <www.arl.org/stats/coordinator.html>.
  - LibQUAL+ project <www.arl.org/libqual/>.
  - E-metrics project: <www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/e-metrics.html>.
  - Performance Measures Website: <www.arl.org/stats/perfmeas/>.

CUSTOM REPORTS AND CONTRACTS
Several custom reports on peer institution comparisons for various ARL member libraries were prepared from the ARL Salary Survey data, the ARL Statistics, and ratios used to produce the ARL Developing Indicators publication. This service expands each year as member libraries discover the utility of these reports within their campus environment. Program staff also managed under contract the 1999 AALL Biennial Salary Survey.

Workshops
A workshop on “Electronic Publishing of Data Sets on the WWW” was conducted at the University of Virginia on 13-15 March 2000. This workshop is designed for anyone who has a data set--such as a survey, class assignment, or statistical compilation--that they wish to make available through a website. These workshops provide individuals with the skills to develop web
services in support of data file management. This workshop conducted by Patrick Yott, Director of the Geospatial and Statistical Data Center at the University of Virginia, continues to receive excellent reviews. For more information about the workshop see <www.lib.virginia.edu/arl.workshop/>.

The ARL Statistics and Measurement Program in collaboration with the Diversity Programs developed and delivered in July the Online Lyceum workshop on “The Role of Assessment in Advancing Diversity”. (See <www.arl.org/training/assessment.html>.)

Julia Blixrud and Martha Kyrillidou will be providing training support for the Online Lyceum workshop on “Measuring Library Service Quality” developed by Danuta Nitecki and Toni Olshen to be offered October 23-December 1. (See <www.arl.org/training/quality.html>.)

An ARL/OLMS workshop on Building a Culture of Assessment in Libraries was developed and offered by Shelley Phipps and Amos Lakos at the University of Arizona, April 26, 2000. Planning is also underway for offering and developing additional workshops in 2001.

**COMMUNICATIONS AND LIAISON ACTIVITIES**

To further develop the presence and influence of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program, Program staff continues to participate in several groups and activities.

**ARL Survey Coordinators**

Program staff communicate with ARL Survey Coordinators through electronic lists for the three annual statistical surveys (arl-statsurvey, arl-statsalary, and arl-statpresv). Survey Coordinator meetings were held in conjunction with ALA in January and July.

**ALS Advisory Committee**

This committee chaired by Mary Jo Lynch advises NCES on the Academic Libraries survey and meets twice a year in conjunction with the ALA meetings. An internal change within NCES has moved the Academic Libraries survey out of the IPEDS program and made it part of the Library Statistics Program. This year’s committee meeting discussions were related to the FY 2000 data collection activities. *ED-TABS Academic Libraries: 1996* is the latest edition of the biennial data collection. A web interactive edition of the Academic Libraries survey is under preparation.

**ACRL Library Statistics 1999-2000**

ACRL data collection is underway using an older version of the ARL Statistics questionnaires—program staff receiving inquiries direct questions to Hugh Thompson at ACRL. ACRL is exploring new vendors for the electronic edition of the ACRL Statistics; the 1998 ACRL data are available through Scholarstat libraries from Management Dynamics and the printed publication is available through ALA publications.

**National Postsecondary Education Cooperative**

ARL’s official term of service to the Cooperative has expired. Information about future activities of the cooperative can be found at <www.nces.ed.gov/npec/membership.html>

**National Consortium on Continuous Improvement**

With administrative support from NACUBO, interested institutions have joined together to address performance measurement in higher education. ARL is a charter member of this new consortium. Julia Blixrud participated in the organizing meeting and serves on the membership and marketing committee and attended the the 1st Annual Conference of the National Consortium for Continuous Improvement in Higher Education.
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ARL both monitors the development of national and international standards on library statistics and performance measures. The ISO 2789:1991 Information and Documentation—International Library Statistics is currently under revision.

4th Northumbria International Conference on Performance Measures

The 4th Northumbria International Conference on Performance Measures in Libraries will be held on August 12-16, 2001 in Pittsburgh, PA. This international conference is co-sponsored by the ARL, NCLIS, the Oakland Library Consortium, University of Arizona, Arizona State, and Texas A&M. Carla Stoffle is serving on the editorial board for this conference. A call for papers for this conference was issued in July. The deadline for submission of proposals is January 1, 2001.
PRESENTATIONS

- "ARL New Measures Initiative" by Carla Stoffle was presented at the ARL Survey Coordinators Meeting in San Antonio, TX (January 14, 2000) and Scottsdale, AZ (February 27, 2000)
- "SERVQUAL-pilot" a planning meeting of the participating libraries organized by Fred Heath and Colleen Cook, San Antonio, TX (January 15, 2000).
- "Usage Measures for Electronic Information Resources" an invitational meeting at Scottsdale, Arizona, organized by ARL to initiate project activities under the leadership of Sherrie Schmidt and Rush Miller (February 27-29, 2000).
- "ARL Project on Usage Measures for Networked Information Resources" by Sherrie Schmidt and Rush Miller, CNI Spring Task Force Meeting (March 28, 2000)
- "Measures Matters, and Measures that Matter" by Martha Kyrillidou at FEDLINK (April 27, 2000)
- "How will Academic Libraries Measure Success in the 21st Century?" a conversation between the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Higher Education and the Academic Library Directors organized by the Congress of Academic Library Directors (CALD) of Maryland has invited Carla Stoffle, Dean of Libraries, University of Arizona, to present the ARL new measures initiative on (May 19, 2000)
- "Building Service Quality in Libraries through Continuous Assessment" a panel discussion featuring Carla Stoffle (Arizona), Amos Lakos (University of Waterloo) and Danuta Nitecki (Yale University) – LAMA, July 10, ALA, Chicago 2000.

RELATION TO OTHER ARL PROGRAMS

Statistics and Measurement works closely with all other ARL programs, particularly in the provision of data or survey information. This year, Program staff worked specifically with the Diversity Program on the online assessment workshop and in support of the data and research projects for the Leadership and Career Development Program; the Office of Leadership and Management Services, providing support for survey development and data analysis for the SPEC Kit series (produced analysis for nine SPEC Kit survey in 2000); the Preservation Program, conducting the annual survey on preservation activities; the Research Collections Program, providing support for occasional surveys and assistance in analyzing patterns of foreign acquisitions for the AAU/ARL Global Resources Program, as needed; and queries posted on the arl-directors list such as (a) the visibility of library on academic institution homepages, (b) facilities and (c) endowments have been summarized and reported back to the arl-directors list by member leaders or program staff.

STAFF CONTACTS:
Martha Kyrillidou, Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement <martha@arl.org>
Julia Blixrud, Director of Information Services <jblix@arl.org>
E-Metrics Progress Report

The main goal of the first phase of the E-metrics project was to have a description of current practices regarding collection of usage statistics of electronic resources.

The study team at FSU conducted a combination of survey questionnaire and site visits to collect data. 22 out of 24 project participants replied to the survey. Four site visits (VT, Penn, Yale, and NYPL) were conducted. Samples of vendor reports and library generated reports were also collected.

The project report will contain analysis of data in terms of measures being collected, their use, and issues surrounding describing electronic collection. Site visits summary will detail accounts of activities and issues at the four institutions. Finally, comparison of statistics including the formats and delivery method of 11 major vendors will also be included. The report will identify areas where the next step needs to take place and conclude with preliminary suggestions based on the analysis of data that will help libraries in planning efforts in the area.

The phase-one project report will be completed by the end of October and available to the participants by early November.