October 8, 2004

TO: ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee

Carol Pitts Diedrichs, University of Kentucky
David Ferriero, Duke University
Eileen Hitchingham, Virginia Tech
Ruth Jackson, University of California, Riverside
Mod Mekkawi, Howard University
Diane Perushek, University of Hawaii
Carolynne Presser, University of Manitoba
Sherrie Schmidt, Arizona State University
Paul Wiens, Queen’s University
Sandra Yee, Wayne State
Jennifer Younger, Notre Dame

Guests:
Shirley Baker, University of Washington-St Louis
Steve Hiller, University of Washington, ARL VPO
Sarah Pritchard, University of California, Santa Barbara
Helen Salmon, rep. U of Guelph
Denise Stephens, rep Syracuse
Jonathan LeBreton, rep Temple
Colleen Cook, Texas A&M University
Jim Self, University of Virginia, ARL VPO
Ginny Steel, Washington State University
Betsy Wilson, University of Washington

FROM: Brinley Franklin, University of Connecticut
Julia Blixrud, Assistant Executive Director, External Relations, ARL
Martha Kyrillidou, Director, ARL Statistics and Measurement Program, ARL

Enclosed are the agenda and supporting documents for the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee meeting that will take place from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, October 13, 2004, in the Chevy Chase room of the Westin Grand Hotel, Washington DC.

The meeting will focus on (a) a review of current measurement activities seeking feedback on the recently implemented changes in the ARL annual statistical survey forms and alerting committee members to related research that has been published recently; (b) a joint Visiting Program Officer assignment for Steve Hiller and Jim Self entitled “Making Library Assessment Work: Practical Approaches for Developing and Sustaining Effective Assessment”, and (c) a discussion on how to define an RFP on the topic of “Measuring Collections” in collaboration with the Collection and Access Committee and the Membership Committee.

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)
   Attachment 1: ARL Statistics and Measurement Activities Report 2004
   Outcome: Understanding and supporting Program Activities

2. Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)
   Attachment 2: Minutes of the Meeting of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee, May 2004 (forthcoming)
   Outcome: Approval of minutes

3. Review of current measurement activities (10 minutes)

New forms for the ARL Statistics and the ARL Supplementary Statistics have been mailed to the member libraries. The ARL Supplementary Statistics now incorporates all the E-Metrics variables and ARL has asked all members to consider collecting these items. Papers and presentations that have been recently published or submitted for publication describing issues related to measurement (E-Metrics, Draft white paper on measuring usage statistics across vendors and publishers, etc.). A brief summary of activities in relation to the various new measures initiatives is presented in the Activities Report highlighting developments related to E-Metrics, MINES, LibQUAL+™, SAILS, Learning Outcomes Working Group, e-QUAL or digiQUAL, training activities such as the Service Quality Evaluation Academy, and other projects.

Related articles:

Martha Kyrillidou, Library Assessment as a Collaborative Enterprise Preprint (9/7/2004) for special issue of Resource Sharing and Information Networks on the theme “Creative Collaborations: Libraries Within
Their Institutions and Beyond”.

Brinley Franklin and Terry Plum, Library usage patterns in the electronic information environment

Steve Hiller, University of Washington Libraries, Seattle, USA, Jane Schillie, University of Miami, Coral
Gables, Florida, USA, and Jin Self, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, USA. Community
assessment: An essential part of the Reference Librarian Toolkit, Presentations from the 70th IFLA
General Conference and Council in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Statistics and Evaluation with University Libraries - Cost of Information Access
Presentations from the 70th IFLA General Conference and Council in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

- Management of the electronic collection with cost-per-use data, by Brinley Franklin, University of
  Connecticut, Storrs, USA
- Cost of open access, by Gunnar Sahlin, National Library of Sweden, Stockholm, Sweden
- Library management with cost data, by Roswitha Poll, University and Regional Library, Münster,
  Germany
- Non-subscription costs of print and electronic journals on a live-cycle basis, by Ann Okerson,
  Yale University, USA, and Roger C. Schonfeld, Ithaka, USA

Outcome: Review and provide feedback for future program activities.

4. Making Library Assessment Work: Practical Approaches for Developing and Sustaining Effective Assessment (40 minutes)

Steve Hiller (University of Washington) and Jim Self (University of Virginia) will be available to discuss their Visiting Program Officer assignment, through which they will conduct an evaluation of assessment efforts and needs at 4-6 different ARL Libraries from February through June, 2005.

List of interested institutions includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Brinley Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Paula Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>Carol Mandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Nancy Slight-Gibney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State</td>
<td>Laurie Probst, Chris Avery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Donald H. Dyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Ontario</td>
<td>Margaret Martin Gardiner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment 4: Making Library Assessment Work: Practical Approaches for Developing and Sustaining Effective Assessment, a proposal for ARL Visiting Program Officers
Steve Hiller and Jim Self, September 1, 2004

Outcome: Provide advice on the VPO proposal

5. Measuring Collections (60 minutes)

In an environment with increasing emphasis on digital resources, what are the metrics that are appropriate for describing and characterizing collections, and what collection trends are particularly important to identify and track over time? The ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee in collaboration with the Collection and Access Committee and the Membership Committee is beginning a systematic investigation of this issue and a discussion will take place about the process we need to develop to understand this topic.

Outcome: Provide advice in shaping an RFP for position papers in this area to be presented during a one or two-day retreat with interested ARL directors

6. External Relations

A. Academic Libraries Advisory Committee/NCES. The Advisory Committee meets in conjunction with ALA had been chaired by Mary Jo Lynch, Director of the ALA Office of Research. Mary Jo Lynch retired recently and Denise Davis has been hired as her replacement. Brinley Franklin and Martha Kyrillidou are members of this Committee.

B. ACRL Library Statistics. Data for 2002-2003 have been published. ARL is working closely with ACRL to eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort by exchanging data with institutional permission. Brinley Franklin and Martha Kyrillidou have been appointed members of the ACRL Statistics Committee.

C. NISO. The Library Statistics Standard, ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995, was first released in 1968, revised in 1983 and 1995, and has been voted as a new standard. Julia Blixrud prepared and submitted on behalf of ARL an application for ARL to become the maintenance agency for this NISO Standard. Sherrie Schmidt served on the revision committee.

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

E. IFLA Statistics Committee. Brinley Franklin, Colleen Cook and Sherrie Schmidt are the U.S. representatives on this committee.
PERFORMANCE MEASURES

ARL OBJECTIVE: To describe and measure the performance of research libraries and their contributions to teaching, research, scholarship, and community service. Performance Measures also includes the New Measures Initiative, a series of projects and services that aim at developing new approaches for describing and evaluating library service effectiveness, diversity, and leadership.

PRIORITIES FOR 2004

- Describe human resource and institutional characteristics of research libraries and monitor for trends.
- Provide comparable information from peer institutions.
- Support libraries seeking to understand changes in user behavior by collecting and interpreting library user feedback systematically over time.
- Increase assessment capacity for interpreting and acting on data by creating learning opportunities.
- Identify best practices in providing library services and assist libraries seeking to reposition in the new environment.

KEY ACTIVITIES IN 2004

1. Describe Human Resources and Institutional Characteristics
   A series of annual publications describe salary compensation issues and institutional trends for research libraries. http://www.arl.org/stats/
   - In 2003–04, according to the ARL Annual Salary Survey, university libraries employed 9,492 professional staff members and paid them a median salary of $53,000; non-universities paid their 3,877 professional staff a median salary of $70,048.
   - ARL Statistics 2002–03 documented service trends, unit costs for serials and monographs, expenditure trends, and resources available per user.
   - Electronic resources and access are rapidly changing the ways libraries are providing services according to the ARL Supplementary Statistics 2002–03.
   - The evolution of the preservation function is described in the ARL Preservation Statistics 2002–03.
   - ARL members participated in the E-Metrics test implementation between October 2003 and summer 2004. ARL staff clarified definitions of E-Metrics data elements in the survey by incorporating feedback from last year’s participants as well as comparing ARL definitions to the NISO Z39.7-2002 Draft Standard for Trial Use. Some of the test findings were described by Martha Kyrillidou and Sarah Giersch in a “Qualitative Analysis of ARL E-Metrics Participant Feedback
about the Evolution of Measures for Networked Electronic Resources.”
http://www.libqual.org/documents/admin/kyrillidou_LQEmetrics04_web.doc

• The new surveys for the 2003–04 data collection cycle were mailed in August. The ARL statistics survey was revised to include expenditures for electronic resources previously collected through the ARL supplementary statistics survey. The supplementary statistics survey was revised to incorporate the data elements tested through the E-Metrics pilot activities.

2. Provide Comparable Information from Peer Institutions
ARL provides a variety of custom data reports to interested members. These reports are compiled primarily from the ARL annual salary survey data but consist of a large number of approaches, including special analysis of peer groups from the LibQUAL+™ database.

• Norms tables for the spring 2003 and 2004 LibQUAL+™ surveys allow librarians to interpret LibQUAL+™ scores with respect to typical profiles at other institutions. 2003 norms: http://www.coe.tamu.edu/~bthompson/libq2003.htm

• The 202 individual institutional notebooks, the consortia LibQUAL+™ notebooks, and the interactive statistics facilitate peer group comparisons using the LibQUAL+™ data. The LibQUAL+™ site currently includes more than 500 analysis notebooks summarizing data from more than 300,000 users.

• ARL Interactive Statistics, hosted at the Geostat Center of the University of Virginia, continues to be one of the most popular ways of accessing the annual data collected by ARL. The ranked lists allow users to pick from a list of more than 30 variables for data reports. http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/arl/index.html

3. Understand Changes in User Behavior
Through a variety of New Measures Initiatives, ARL continues to develop new assessment methods for understanding changes in user behavior.

• LibQUAL+™ measures user perceptions of, and satisfaction with, library services. Aggregate 2004 data show that over 112,000 responses were gathered from users at 202 participating libraries. Survey results continue to show that the widest gap between library users’ expectations and perceptions of library service is in the area of “information control.” http://www.libqual.org/

• Kent State University Libraries and ARL are cosponsoring the Project for Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) designed to develop an instrument for programmatic-level assessment of information literacy skills that is valid and credible to university administrators and other academic personnel. Thirty-eight libraries participated in Phase II of the project. Seventy-six North American libraries of all types have registered to participate in Phase III from August 2004 through July 2005. http://sails.lms.kent.edu
• In addition to trying to understand library user behavior in the familiar library environment, developmental work is underway for understanding user demographics, purpose of use, perceptions, and expectations in the digital library environment.
  
  o **e-QUAL or digiQUAL**, is partially supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation, National Science Digital Library (NSF/NSDL) to develop an instrument to assess the dimensions of library service quality in the digital environment. As documented in “Evaluating the NSF National Science Digital Library Collections: Categories and Themes from MERLOT and DLESE” by Yvonna Lincoln, Colleen Cook, and Martha Kyrillidou, qualitative analysis has created a model and a number of key dimensions for evaluating digital libraries. (http://www.libqual.org/documents/admin/MERLOT%20Paper2_final.pdf). Work is underway for developing an item bank for survey testing purposes at different digital library settings.
  
  o **MINES** (Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services) is a protocol for evaluating purpose of use and to collect user demographics for specific uses of electronic resources through a pop-up survey. ARL has contracted with the Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL) to implement the protocol and analyze the data collected from June 2004 to May 2005. Preliminary reports will be available on a quarterly basis.

4. **Increase Assessment Capacity in Research Libraries**

A key component of the assessment activities is training in qualitative and quantitative research methods, protocols and models for listening to users, marketing services training, and related areas.

• From October 2003 to September 2004, LibQUAL+™ trained more than 500 participants in using the survey results to improve library services. [http://www.libqual.org/Events/index.cfm](http://www.libqual.org/Events/index.cfm)

• In October 2003 ARL offered a one-and-a-half-hour webcast presentation on issues related to the ARL statistics annual data collection. [http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/webcast.html](http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/webcast.html)

• ARL presented a two-part webcast to assist libraries with collection of the new data elements in the ARL supplementary statistics survey that have migrated from the E-Metrics pilot. [http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/emetrics/index.html](http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/emetrics/index.html)

• A white paper on identifying “Strategies for Benchmarking Usage of Electronic Resources across Publishers and Vendors” is being developed by Jeff “Wonsik” Shim, Martha Kyrillidou, and Lynn Connaway for the October ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee meeting. In particular, the white paper is focusing on (1) describing current developments underway by Project COUNTER, NISO, ISO, and related agencies and (2) developing recommendations for next steps that will improve libraries’ ability to collect usage statistics for benchmarking usage of electronic content.
• In May, the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee endorsed the official charge of the ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group: define a course of action for libraries to engage on campus in promoting and evaluating libraries’ contributions to student learning outcomes. The emphasis will be on evaluating at the institutional programmatic level, not at the classroom or individual student level. The ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group members participated in a one-day workshop on June 24 led by Jeanne Hubelbank, Evaluation Consultant, to work through a process for evaluating the effect of the library on students’ learning outcomes that can be applied to individual ARL member campuses.

5. Identify Best Practices In Providing Library Services

• Steve Hiller, Head, Science Libraries and Library Assessment Coordinator at the University of Washington, and Jim Self, Director, Management Information Services and Co-Chair of the Collections Group at the University of Virginia, have been appointed ARL Visiting Program Officers to conduct an evaluation of library assessment efforts and needs. The goals of this project are to develop a design and conduct an evaluation of assessment needs and efforts at four to six different ARL member libraries from September 2004 to 2005.

• Clemson University and the University of Texas, in collaboration with ARL, are promoting the concept of a university summit as a constructive next step in moving from LibQUAL+™ data to decision making. The library summit brings together people who have a stake in the library’s future. These individuals spend a full or half day in facilitated small-group discussions about the LibQUAL+™ results, adding depth and context to the survey numbers, and generating fresh solutions and suggestions for service improvements. Administrative, faculty, staff, and student endorsement of a summit sets the tone for campus-wide collaboration in library success.
http://www.arl.org/arl/pr/libqual_summit.html

• “Libraries Act on their LibQUAL+™ Findings: From Data to Action,” a collection of 15 articles focusing on the experiences of the 2002 LibQUAL+™ participants edited by Fred Heath, Martha Kyrillidou, and Consuella Askew, was published in fall 2004. The book highlights the continued efforts of participating libraries that used the LibQUAL+™ survey data to assess and evaluate their service quality, resource allocations, staffing, technology, and policies.

• Three Share Fairs, offered in conjunction with LibQUAL+™ meetings, have provided a successful forum for identifying best practices in library service.

6. New Measures Initiative: Review and Status Report Published
projects undertaken by ARL and some of its member libraries in recent years.
http://www.arl.org/newsltr/230/

**Member Guidance and Staff Contact:**

These programs receive guidance from the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee. Project SAILS also receives guidance from the ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group.

Martha Kyrillidou
martha@arl.org
Director, Statistics & Measurement

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

http://www.arl.org/stats/
Committee Members present:
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The Committee meeting convened with a welcome from Brinley Franklin, Chair, and introductions from all present. Brinley welcomed Carol Diedrichs, a new member of the committee, and welcomed back Jennifer Younger. Brinley reviewed some of the major activities of the program and thanked ARL staff for their hard work. The minutes of the October 2003 meeting were approved.
In reviewing the upcoming changes to the annual data collection activities, concerns were discussed regarding the new proposed item, Volumes Held Collectively. The concerns included the question of whether, by adding this one item to the ARL Statistics, we truly focus on the short-term view of how to describe and measure collections in this new environment. The original idea behind proposing this item was that we would promote good management practices by encouraging libraries to use shared storage facilities and give them a place to report these figures. How can we describe collection counts in the ARL Statistics in ways that both accurately describe collections and encourage good management practices? Two years ago when this item was originally conceptualized, it seemed like a good idea. Now, however, other developments have changed the ways in which we view and characterize collections. There was a clear objection to including in this count items that may be owned by the Center for Research Libraries, since a library may decide to be a member of CRL one year and withdraw membership in another year. The University of California system was under a lot of pressure a couple of years ago to be proactive in using the shared storage facilities, especially after the Atkinson editorial published in the *Chronicle*.

Concerns were also expressed about the ability of some libraries to count as Current Serials Received those electronic serials accessed through consortial arrangements. According to the current instructions for this item, libraries are allowed to count duplicate serial subscriptions. Because the libraries often belong to a variety of consortia, these duplicate counts can increase the number of serial subscriptions dramatically. Libraries that do not actively participate in consortia are at a disadvantage.

A final issue of concern was whether the distinction between electronic full-text journals and electronic full-text article databases is meaningful at this point when accounting for journal subscriptions in the ARL Statistics. Should we count all journals available through full-text article aggregator databases?

The committee members affirmed that the library environment is changing drastically with the aggressive introduction of electronic resources. Ultimately, the real issue is how well we serve our users by providing them with the information content they need. We need to systematically investigate this topic. However, the committee members agreed that it is prudent to take the long-term view and work collaboratively with the Membership, Collections and Access Committees to define this issue of how to measure collections in the new digital environment.

In the short term, a straw vote was taken among committee members to determine how many want the Volumes Held Collectively to be (a) included in the annual ARL Statistics, (b) included in the Supplementary Statistics, or (c) not included at all. No one wanted this item in the annual ARL Statistics survey, five answered “yes” for including it in the supplementary statistics, and five answered “no.” The guests were also asked to vote on this item; eight of them wanted this to be included in the supplementary statistics and five not at all. The committee decided to include the item in the supplementary statistics, and to further tighten the definition in order to limit it to truly close, legally binding shared storage facilities.
The discussion of how to count collections continued with Brinley Franklin offering an example of how many additional electronic subscriptions have increased at the University of Connecticut through the NERL consortium, and what the state-wide arrangements offer to that institution. He suggested that counting multiple subscriptions might have worked in the print environment, but not in the electronic environment. Much of the electronic content provided by libraries may not be paid for directly by them. On the other hand, William Walker from the University of Miami stated how strange it seems that his institution, which has a budget similar to that of other institutions, is reporting much lower figures for serial subscriptions. The committee members encouraged program staff to continue these discussions with the survey coordinators through the webcast training sessions or the in-person meetings of the survey coordinators held in conjunction with ALA meetings.

The committee also advised that we convene a joint discussion between the Statistics and Measurement Committee and the Membership Committee and the Collections and Access Committee to define this topic, draft an RFP, solicit papers and organize a retreat. [A full hour of discussion is dedicated to this topic at the October 2004 Statistics and Measurement Committee meeting.]

Moving into the next agenda item, Karen Williams, Chair of the ARL Learning Outcomes Working Group, described how this working group is defining an action plan. Karen presented a ‘Learning Outcomes Working Group Charge’ to the committee. The draft charge was approved and the committee members emphasized how important the work of this committee is to them, and that they would like to see progress in this area.

Understanding how libraries impact learning and teaching at their institutions is critical. Colleen Cook mentioned that LibQUAL+™ includes five outcomes related questions and we have a lot of data that show how outcomes are related to perceived service quality. The ARL Working Group on Learning Outcomes is planning a full-day workshop with a consultant in conjunction with ALA annual, and will define a course of action to be implemented in the coming year. Mod Mekkawi encouraged ARL to find ways to promote attendance at AAHE forums where issues of institutional quality are discussed. Issues such as “What is the research library of the future?”, “How is success going to be defined in the university?” and “How does the library contribute to teaching, learning and research?” need to be addressed in the coming years. We need to move into describing and characterizing this set of issues more clearly. David Ferriero emphasized how Duke is called to demonstrate how the library works closely with students and faculty to achieve desirable outcomes. We cannot rely on resource counts any more. We need tangible ways to demonstrate how our users value us. Many of the new measures initiatives help us do this (LibQUAL+™, SAILS, MINES, etc.), but we need to move more aggressively in measuring outcomes. The Learning Outcomes Working Group is viewed a one of the main ways we can achieve this goal.

Jennifer Younger (Notre Dame) presented the status of a pilot time-allocation study across library functional areas using software produced by Chronus Inc. The powerpoint presentation is now available on the web. The committee observed how detailed the
study methodology is and how comprehensive the list of cost centers. It is a very detailed way of describing library operations.

The ARL Board forwarded to the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee a document sent by ACRL “Standards for Libraries in Higher Education” that was approved by the ACRL Board of Directors in June 2004. The committee reviewed these standards and highly commends ACRL for completing them. Furthermore, the committee wanted to encourage all ARL members to look closely at the Standards to determine their usefulness for their individual libraries.

The committee meeting came to closure with the presentation of a commendation to Carla Stoffle for her service as past chair of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee:

A Commendation of Carla J. Stoffle

The Association of Research Libraries Statistics and Measurement Committee commends Carla Stoffle for her vision and work as the founding and guiding spirit of the ARL New Measures Initiative. Through the Initiative, the ARL community has set new directions for the evaluation of research libraries. Under Carla Stoffle’s leadership, the Committee has made great strides addressing the critical assessment issues facing research libraries during a period of rapid change. Carla Stoffle’s powerful commitment and dedication will resonate for years to come.

In recognition of the five year anniversary of the New Measures Initiative, we commend and thank Carla Stoffle for her service to the Committee, the Association, the profession, research and learning.

Association of Research Libraries Statistics and Measurement Committee

May 12, 2004
Tucson, Arizona

Rev. October 12, 2004
MAKING LIBRARY ASSESSMENT WORK: PRACTICAL APPROACHES FOR DEVELOPING AND SUSTAINING EFFECTIVE ASSESSMENT

Proposal for ARL Visiting Program Officers Steve Hiller and Jim Self

Appointment Period: September 1, 2004 through August 31, 2005

Background

ARL has a long tradition of describing the performance of research libraries and monitoring performance measures and trends in these institutions through its historical data collection activities. More recently, ARL has launched the New Measures Initiatives, a series of activities and services that have established new assessment tools. These new measures were created in response to the increasing demand for libraries to demonstrate outcomes/impacts in areas important to the institution, and the increasing pressure to maximize use of resources - benchmark best practices to save or reallocate resources.

The ARL New Measures Initiatives were launched five years ago as a collaborative activity between the ARL Statistics and Measurement program and the Office of Leadership and Management Services as an effort to move away from using inputs and outputs to judge service quality and instead develop ways to measure library outcomes and assess the value the library adds to the community. A recent review of New Measures (Blixrud, December 2003) reported on ARL activities in this area and discussed some ways in which new measures were applied in libraries.

ARL has made excellent progress in raising the visibility and importance of library assessment and in supporting the development of new measures. A sense of how individual libraries are faring with the application of LibQUAL+™ is evidenced through two collections of essays written by 2001 and 2002 LibQUAL+™ participants, respectively (Cook, 2002; Heath, Kyrillidou and Askew, 2004), as well as through conference presentations by participants, such as the highly successful LibQUAL+™ Share Fairs at ALA Mid-Winter and Annual meetings in 2004.

However, we don’t have a good sense of how individual libraries are faring with their assessment efforts in general. There is growing evidence in the literature and from informal discussions that a sizeable number of libraries experience difficulty devising appropriate measures or methods, understanding and analyzing the data, using data to make changes, and building a sustainable assessment program. Now is an opportune time to assess the state of assessment efforts in individual research libraries, identify barriers to and facilitators of assessment, and devise pragmatic approaches to assessment that can flourish in different local environments. Our proposal is intended to provide libraries with the knowledge and understanding to make wise selections and applications of measurement techniques and wise use of assessment data in sound management practices. It will help libraries identify different approaches to support sustainable assessment and more effective use of data for decision-making.
Specifically, the goals of this project are to conduct an evaluation of assessment needs and efforts at 4-6 different ARL Libraries from February through June, 2005. Libraries would be selected based on expressed interest and a group composition that is representative of library size, type and geographic distribution within ARL.

The evaluation would center on a site visit to each library, which would include:

- Discussions of local issues with administrators, managers, and staff involved in assessment
- Review of current ARL assessment-related programs and opportunities
- Presentation on developing and employing appropriate assessment methods, data analysis, presentation and reporting, and using assessment data to improve libraries
- A succinct report identifying assessment-related issues and recommendations for action, to be delivered generally within 30 days of the visit.

Information and insight acquired during these site visits may be followed by visits to other libraries, as appropriate, to determine the extent of issues, practices, and needs.

The final project report will summarize the site visit results and other issues associated with library assessment. It will also recommend a range of options and practical approaches to data acquisition, analysis, reporting, and use that libraries can use to develop and support ongoing and sustainable assessment programs.

Libraries That Will Benefit from Participation (Target Libraries)

- Libraries starting assessment programs and efforts
- Libraries trying to understand assessment and usage data
- Libraries that want to turn data into action
- Libraries that want to establish benchmarks and performance standards
- Libraries interested in cost analysis
- Libraries that have participated (or will participate) in LibQUAL+™
- Libraries whose institutions will undergo regional accreditation within the next few years

VPO Experience and Qualifications

Steve Hiller (Library Assessment Coordinator, University of Washington Libraries) and Jim Self (Director, Management Information Services at the University of Virginia Library) have many years experience in library assessment and both have established model assessment programs at their institutions. They have published and presented widely on library assessment with an emphasis on practical approaches that can lead to libraries better supporting their communities. Their forthcoming paper, “From Measurement to Management: Using Statistics Wisely in Planning and Decision-Making,” Library Trends (Special Issue on Organization Development in Libraries), 54 (1), Summer 2004, is especially germane to this issue. Short bios for Steve Hiller and Jim Self are included below.
Each man brings a different set of abilities and expertise to this project. Steve specializes in user needs assessment, qualitative assessment methods, cultures of assessment, large scale surveys, and outcomes based assessment. He also serves as an Evaluator for the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, a regional accrediting agency. Jim brings strengths in surveying, sampling, data analysis, performance standards and measurement, usability testing, and the “balanced scorecard.” He has worked as a consultant with a number of libraries on these issues. Both have extensive library management experience and a broad perspective on libraries. Steve has served as Head of Science Libraries at the University of Washington since 1984 and Jim was Director, Clemons Library (Undergraduate) at the University of Virginia from 1982-2000.

More detailed information can be found on the attached resumes.

**Expectations and Outcomes**

**ARL will:**

- Designate Martha Kyrillidou, Director, ARL Statistics and Measurement Program as a contact person to work with Steve Hiller and Jim Self
- Market the availability of this service to member libraries (and potentially others)
- Bill each evaluated library for travel expenses and consulting fees
- Pay program-related travel expenses not related to site visits
- Provide material and information that describe ARL assessment tools
- Coordinate and/or participate in the site visits
- Advise on the project methodology
- Arrange for distribution of the final report and gather evaluative feedback from participating libraries

**The University of Washington Libraries and University of Virginia Library will:**

- Pay VPO’s salaries
- Provide release time to work on this project
- Provide office space and equipment that can be used for this project.

**The participating libraries will:**

- Identify a contact person to:
  - Assist with pre-site preparation
  - Assist in establishing goals, programs and outcomes for the site visit
  - Help identify local staff for the visiting team to speak with
  - Coordinate and announce a presentation to all library staff members.
- Contribute $2,000 plus travel expenses to support the site visit
- Receive a succinct report of no more than five pages, generally within 30 days
- Lean about some next steps to take, as an institution, to support sustainable assessment, and how to better use data for decision-making
- Provide evaluation/feedback to ARL about the value of the process.
Steve Hiller and Jim Self will:

- Consult with and involve appropriate ARL staff in developing site evaluation plans
- Keep the ARL contact person informed about progress and site visits
- Prepare updates and interim reports as needed
- Provide each library evaluated with a report summarizing site visit observations and options for action
- Deliver a final report to ARL by September 15, 2005
- After the project concludes, Steve Hiller and Jim Self will be available to continue their work with ARL as consultants to interested libraries

Project Timeline – Development and Promotion Phase, August to November 2004

- Jim and Steve will produce expanded version of proposal, including preliminary timetable, work plan, site visit activities, final report and expected outcomes; send to Martha Kyrillidou by August 4 with conference call scheduled for August 10.
- Revise proposal as necessary for final submission and approval
- Complete publicity release and marketing strategy by mid-September
- Identify an alpha site for testing an initial design in November
- ARL announcement made September 20 with expression of interest due October 20
- Meet with ARL Statistics and Measurement and ARL Leadership and Management committee and potential interested libraries, Oct. 11-13 in Washington D.C.
- Participating libraries selected and notified by November 1
- Jim and Steve develop detailed site visit outline and materials September 20-November 1
- Pilot site visit to library in Washington D.C. area, November 5 or 6
- Revise plans as necessary

Project Timeline – Site Visits, November 2004 to June 2005

- Pre-site visit preparation (environmental scan, issues, discussion with each library), November-February
- Establish goals, program and outcomes for each site visit
- Site visits scheduled between February and mid-June 2005

Sample Site Visit Schedule
Each visit will consist of an open presentation on developing sustainable, effective library assessment and meetings with library administrators and staff.

Presentation on Developing Sustainable and Effective Library Assessment
  - Organizing for assessment, developing culture of assessment
  - Assessment methods
  - ARL assessment tools, programs and support
  - User needs assessment
  - Usability
Benchmarking and performance standards
E-Metrics and cost analysis
Data analysis (including LibQUAL+™)
Applying the results
Outcomes-based assessment

Meet with administrators, managers, assessment group, and library staff on issues including e-metrics, interpreting and using LibQUAL+™ results, information literacy, digital services, etc.

Wrap up at the end of the day

A succinct report of no more than five pages will be sent to the participating library and ARL, generally within 30 days of the site visit.

**Final Report to be submitted by September 15, 2005**

Summarize findings from site visits; identify facilitators and barriers to assessment; recommend strategies and options for sustaining effective assessment, including ARL programs and support.

**Dissemination beyond ARL by publishing the results of the investigation in the professional literature**
Steve Hiller
hiller@u.washington.edu

Current Positions:
Head, Science Libraries, University of Washington Libraries, 1985-
Library Assessment Coordinator, University of Washington Libraries, 1999-

Major Responsibilities:

Library Assessment Coordinator: Develop, implement and coordinate library assessment programs and
activities, including large-scale surveys, focus groups, and other efforts. Provide support for other library

Head, Science Libraries: Manage department with 9 libraries, 17 librarians and 24 support staff that
provides science-related information resources and services to the University of Washington community.
Coordinate annual science collection development budget of $3.3 million.

Selected Recent Publications Related to Assessment:
and Decision-Making.” Library Trends (Special Issue on Organization Development in Libraries),


Conference, Loughborough (England), August 2002. Library and Information Statistics Unit (LISU)
Occasional Paper No. 32, 10-23.

Hiller, S. (2002). “The Impact of Information Technology and Online Library Resources on Research,
Teaching and Library Use at the University of Washington.” Performance Measurement and Metrics,
Volume 3, (2), 134-139.

Priorities, and Information Needs at the University of Washington.” Issues in Science and Technology

Measure Library Performance at the University of Virginia and the University of Washington.”
Proceedings of the 4th Northumbria International Conference on Performance Measurement in Libraries
and Information Services, August 2001, Pittsburgh Pennsylvania, Association of Research Libraries, 253-
262.

**Selected Assessment-Related Presentations (some publications above first presented at conferences)**


“LibQUAL+™ in an Established Assessment Program: The University of Washington Libraries Experience,” LibQUAL+™ ShareFair, American Library Association Mid-Winter, January 2004, San Diego, ALA Annual, Orlando June 2004


“Assessment Methods Used at the University of Washington Libraries,” Joint meeting of the Oregon-Washington Chapters of ACRL, Menucha, Oregon 2002


**Other Related Recent Assessment Activities**
Evaluator for the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, a regional accreditation agency

Conducted full-day library assessment workshops (including presentations) at Purdue University (2001) and Kansas University (2004).
Jim Self
self@virginia.edu

Current Positions:
Director, Management Information Services, University of Virginia, 2000-
Co-Chair, Collections Group, University of Virginia Library, 2002-

Major Responsibilities:

Director, Management Information Services: Develop, implement and coordinate library assessment programs and activities, including large-scale surveys, usability testing, focus groups, and other efforts. Oversee the compilation and reporting of library statistics. Prepare reports and provide data as needed for the administration of the library.

Co-Chair, Collections Group: Allocate and manage collections budget of the University Library (approximately $6.5 million annually). Work with selectors and other staff to see the budget is spent in an appropriate and effective manner.

Recent Publications Related to Assessment:


Presentations and Workshops (some publications above first presented at conferences)


Consultations

University of Richmond Library, Summer 2003. Analysis of survey data.
James Madison University Library, Spring 2003. Usability testing.
Harvard College Library, Fall 2000. Sampling and surveying methodology.