ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

October 2, 2009

TO: ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee

Larry Alford (Temple)	2009-2011
Chris Filstrup (Stony Brook, SUNY)	2007-2009
Eileen Hitchingham (Virginia Tech)	2008-2010
Ernie Ingles (Alberta)	2008-2010
Ruth Jackson (California, Riverside)	2007-2009
Judith Nadler (Chicago)	2008-2010
Randy Olsen (Brigham Young)	2008-2010
Louis Pitschmann (Alabama)	2007-2009
Bill Potter, Chair-designate (Georgia)	2009-2012
Scott Seaman (Ohio)	2009-2011
Tom Wall (Boston College)	2009-2011

FROM:

Colleen Cook, Chair, Texas A&M University
Martha Kyrillidou, Senior Director, Statistics and Service Quality Programs, ARL

Enclosed are the agenda and supporting information for the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee meeting that will take place from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, October 14, 2009, in the New York Room of the Renaissance Mayflower Hotel, Washington, DC.

The meeting will focus on (a) an overview of the work on the profiles (profiles can be accessed at: <http://directors.arl.org/wiki/institution-profiles>), (b) a review of the program activities, and (c) program updating, planning, advising, and feedback within the context of the emerging ARL Strategic Plan 2010-2012.

The committee chair will provide a briefing at the Business Meeting regarding the status of various assessment activities. The committee chair is also reviewing the program grids from all the ARL capabilities to ensure that the Statistics and Assessment programmatic activities serve the needs of ARL's strategic directions. Colleen Cook is also serving as an ARL Board member liaison to the committee.

We look forward to working with you in continuing to build the strong agenda of the Statistics and Assessment Committee in charting future directions that support ARL member libraries. We look forward to a productive meeting and your continuing engagement, input, direction and support.

155th ARL Membership Meeting
ARL Statistics and Assessment
Wednesday, October 14, 2009
8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
New York Room
Renaissance Mayflower Hotel
Washington, DC

AGENDA

Welcome/introductions; Thank you to Bill Potter for being the chair-designate (2010-2012).

(a) Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)
Attachment a: *Minutes from the 154th ARL Membership Meeting, ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee*

(b) The ARL Profile exercise – process, observations, and next steps. A discussion of the experience, the process, and the findings to date. (55 minutes)
Attachment b: *ARL Profiles: Proposed Timeframe 9/10/2009*

(c) Update on the status of current projects and developments (45 minutes);
Attachment c: *Grid report*

(d) ARL Strategic Planning and issues accelerating the Statistics and Assessment agenda for 2010-2012 (15 minutes):

   a. Qualitative indicators: the role of narratives and other methods
   b. Quantitative data elements
   c. Return on Investment (ROI)
   d. Balanced Score Card – setting priority and/or strategy maps
   e. Accreditation process -- learning outcomes and the library
   f. Renewing the preservation statistics; determine interest/engagement in implementing recommendations outlined in Appendix B by Lars Meyer (May 2009) – *Safeguarding Collections at the Dawn of the 21st Century*, see pages 45-50: http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/safeguarding-collections.pdf
       i. Also see ARL preservation statistics survey and instructions:
           1. http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/09ssurvey.pdf
           2. http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/09pinstruct.pdf

154th ARL Membership Meeting
ARL Statistics and Assessment
Wednesday, May 20, 2009
8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Conroe Room
Four Seasons Hotel
Houston, TX

MINUTES

ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee Members

Larry Alford (Temple)	2009-2011
Chris Filstrup (Stony Brook, SUNY)	2007-2009
Eileen Hitchingham (Virginia Tech)	2008-2010
Ernie Ingles (Alberta)	2008-2010
Ruth Jackson (California, Riverside)	2007-2009
Judith Nadler (Chicago)	2008-2010
Randy Olsen (Brigham Young)	2008-2010
Bill Potter (Georgia)	2006-2009
Louis A. Pitschmann (Alabama)	2007-2009
Scott Seaman (Ohio)	2009-2011
Tom Wall (Boston College)	2009-2011

Colleen Cook, Chair (Texas A&M University)
Martha Kyrillidou, Senior Director, Statistics and Service Quality Programs, ARL

The meeting opened with a welcome to the committee members and introduction. The minutes of the October 2008 meeting were approved.

Market, Merit and Salary Compression

The committee invited Scott Seaman (Ohio U) to present his experience in dealing with salary compensation, in particular market, merit and salary compression issues. Scott Seaman has done extensive research in this area while at the University of Colorado, Boulder. He outlined three steps in the process of library salary assessment: market equity, internal equity, and compression adjustment. He outlined the confidential nature of these studies and the long term perspective one has to take when dealing with salaries and salary adjustments. An extensive discussion followed his presentation regarding the opportunities for engaging in such studies. Committee members expressed the concern that local institutional circumstances often define whether an organization can engage in studies like the ones Mr. Seaman presented.

Jim Neal mentioned a similar study at Columbia University where they examined both years in the profession and years in the institution but not gender issues. Mr. Neal pointed out that to the extent these studies can be tied to the need for new skills in the profession, it would be useful to understand where the emerging values are. There is often a need for

someone to be compensated outside the norm, or with values that are explicitly articulated (for example, at UC Boulder there was a need to reward professional engagement and there was an explicit negotiation in identifying the value of that component). Often legacy systems and positions do not seem to have explicit performance criteria. Stress can be created organizationally because equity is a conceptual issue that can only be informed by data and it is not data driven but rather driven by negotiations regarding what is valued and what is equitable. The committee concluded that ARL should promote custom report services and consulting in this area.

Given the general economic downturn, salary adjustments is probably not a hot issue but there are benefits to keep this set of issues within people's radar screen. There are many intangible benefits that are not captured in salaries. The ClimateQUAL^{TM} protocol to some extent attempts to capture larger issues of culture and personal choice. Salary and compensation is only one piece of the puzzle – not everyone who leaves is unhappy and not everyone who stays is happy according to the findings of a turnover study conducted by Jim Neal. The key hot issue may be "how to hold onto good people in tough times." Also, issues related to other benefits are of interest (NOTE: SPEC Kit topic on Benefits is scheduled for 2010).

Profiles

The committee members were presented with notebooks of the profiles collected. Word clouds were also presented to them as an initial crude analysis step. The data collection of profiles will be extended over the summer. We plan to use Altas.ti for systematic coding of the narratives. The goal is to come up with conceptual categories, understand the salience of different themes, and we hope to identify those issues that are prevalent within the narrative data. Colleen Cook expressed a concern that people may be influenced by reading other profiles and encouraged committee members (and all ARL libraries during the Business meeting briefing) to provide narratives that reflect the local strengths – 'what do I want to say for my library that is not reflected in the annual statistics?' The qualitative approach has to reflect the context of the value within each institution. One of the important themes that seems to be coming from the data is the importance of collaboration (still, full analysis needs to be completed for final judgment on this issue). Important to: describe yourself in terms of how you support your larger organization,

Ernie Ingles pointed out that what he thought was important was not necessarily what staff identified as important. He thought that staff members tend to be more traditional in their approach. Mr. Ingles also posed the question that it is rather hard to imagine how we can move from these narratives to quantitative data elements. He did assert that he thinks the profiles exercise has merit in itself but it is still hard to see how we can move it to the next level. Will we be able to come up with a three factor index (collections, services and collaborative relations)? Colleen Cook responded that we are looking for reflections and representations of concepts that will emerge as important in the future of research libraries and that it is those concepts that we will want to measure in a quantitative manner in the long run. She proposed that we need to have a little trust in the research

process. Print volumes reflected an important value for libraries for a long time but it was not like that a century ago. We simply have to identify those concepts that reflect important values for the coming decades. For example, we may assert that multimedia and visual literacy is front and center and if that's the case, what are some appropriate measures libraries will want to capture? Similarly, collaboration is a means for providing collections and services – will that result in an artificial factor? Regarding collections, can we count web-based collections that we are cataloging and providing access to? How does that differentiate us from libraries in a world where every library may have access to Google Books?

We need to explore these issues and attempt to measure them. We can also look into best practices and identifying peer groups that are engaged in similar service and collection provisions. How are we remaining the primary information provider for our institutions? What do we want to work towards? There may be a fourth dimension of interest: innovation. Identifying and relating these concepts is not straight forward. Larry Alford offered that collaboration may be telling us that doing quantitative measure may be less meaningful – few people talk about campus collaborations in their profiles, though. Colleen Cook mentioned that ultimately the core mission of research libraries may simply be to ensure that humankind does not repeat/rediscover things, and to provide information so that further discovery is achieved.

Review of activities

The committee reviewed briefly the rest of the grid activities highlighting some continuing issues with the deduplication of serial titles in the ARL Statistics^{TM} and welcoming the upcoming LibQUAL+® Lite protocol.

ARL Profiles: Proposed timeline 9/10/2009

<u>Notes:</u>
"Codebook" below is shorthand for a hierarchical codebook including evolving themes and sub-themes.
"ARL directors" means whoever of Colleen Cook, Bill Potter are available at any time.
"ARL Staff director" is Martha

"ARL coders" is David Green (ARL), Jennifer Rutner (Columbia U), Michael Maciel (Texas A&M) and Martha Kyrillidou (ARL)

Nick Woolf is the ARL Atlas.ti consultant who helped define the following workplan.

Phase	Completion date	Description
	<u>By September 18</u> ARL directors	1. Colleen and Martha and Bill independently write short Atlas comments on (a) all of Colleen's 99 codes, and (b) any quotations of particular interest, to educate Nick with their thoughts, reflections, and perspectives
<u>Phase 1:</u> Development of initial codebook	<u>September 21-25</u> Nick	2. Nick prepares an initial codebook based on Colleen's pilot coding and ARL directors' code/quotation comments 3. Nick downloads all available profiles, prepares this data for Atlas, and prepares working HU
	<u>September 28-October 9</u> ARL directors, Nick	4. ARL directors review initial codebook 5. ARL directors and Nick meet by conference call to discuss 6. ARL directors (whoever is most familiar with profiles) informally categorize profiles into richest/most helpful 25%, and least rich 25%, to determine efficient order of analysis 7. Nick prepares updated initial codebook

Phase 2: Training in required Atlas skills and coding procedures	October 12-16 Nick, ARL coders	8. Nick trains ARL coders by web conference in (a) basics of qualitative coding, and (b) Atlas skills needed for efficient coding and commenting 9. ARL coders study initial codebook and Colleen's pilot coding 10. Nick conducts coding training with ARL coders by web conference, by reviewing, discussing and refining Colleen's pilot coding, and agreeing on procedures for production coding
Phase 3: Coding first 60 profiles and development of second round codebook	October 19- November 13 Nick, ARL coders	11. ARL coders code 15 profiles each 12. Nick merges the HU's, integrates the coding work, and distributes merged HU to coders 13. ARL coders review and write comments on each other's coding in the merged HU 14. Nick re-merges, conducts final integration of coding work, and prepares second round codebook 15. Nick and ARL coders review and finalize second round codebook by web conference
	November 17-25 ARL directors, Nick	16. ARL directors review second round codebook 17. ARL directors and Nick meet by conference call to discuss 18. Nick prepares updated second round codebook based on feedback from ARL directors
Phase 4: Coding remaining 40 profiles	November 30- December 18 Nick, ARL coders	19. ARL coders code 10 profiles each 20. Nick merges the HU's, integrates the coding work, and distributes merged HU to coders 21. ARL coders review and write comments on each other's coding in the merged HU 22. Nick re-merges, conducts final integration of coding work

Phase 5: Member checks	<u>January 4-February 12</u> Nick, member libraries, ARL directors	23. Member libraries review and comment on analysis 24. Nick integrates comments into a report for ARL directors 25. ARL directors and Nick meet by conference call to discuss member comments 26. Nick prepares final codebook based on review of member checks by ARL directors
	<u>February 15-19</u> Re-coding	27. ARL coders conduct any necessary re-coding work
Phase 6: Exploration of coded data	<u>February 22-March 5</u> Colleen, Martha, Bill	28. ARL directors review final HU and generate hunches and hypotheses for Nick to explore the prevalence or distributions of themes, sub-themes, or individual codes or groups of codes among any potentially interesting groups of profiles (e.g. regions, sizes, types of institutions)
	<u>March 8-12</u> Nick	29. Nick conducts explorations (a) based on ARL directors' hunches and hypotheses, and (b) to search for any unanticipated patterns of coding among groups of institutions, and produces a report
Phase 7: Write report and extract variables	<u>March 15-</u> ARL directors	30. Following completion of analysis and explorations, write report 31. Extract candidate variables for future quantitative data gathering

ARL Statistics and Assessment
Review of 2009 Activities, Projects, and Priorities as of October 2009

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	*Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2009*
1. Statistics and Assessment Committee	• Statistics and Assessment follow up to the ARL Board/Task Force recommendations: collect profile qualitative data describing research library contributions; and develop new data elements for services, collections and collaborative relations. Engaged consultants and coders for analysis. Report expected out in spring 2010. • Based on discussions at the NCES ALS committee, discuss possible modification to the reference question. • Near-time enterprise platform used for profile data collection. Collaborative space for ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee established: statscommittee.arl.org • Sustain communication with liaisons to external organizations such as ALA, NISO, CARL, ABDU, SCONUL, and LIBER. • Participating in the NCES Academic Libraries Advisory Committee and offering advice on revisions for the Academic Libraries Survey. • Participating in the NISO Library Statistics Committee engaged in maintenance of the existing standard and exploration of the desirability of a standard on performance measurement.	• 61 ARL institution profiles collected as of September 22. Initiated qualitative analysis and preliminary insights were presented by Colleen Cook at several meetings. • Based on feedback from the May membership meeting, collecting titles in addition to volumes. • Annual data collection regarding ARL statistics serials definitions has established serial titles as the new metric for serials. • Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Task Force on New Ways of Measuring Serials; issued best practices document on counting serials. • Statistics and Assessment Committee has explored interest in "Market, Merit, Compression Assessment" (presentation by Scott Seaman at Ohio) and used the ARL Annual Salary Survey data to determine potential interest in this topic. • Updated Library Expenditures as a Percent of University Library expenditures. • Analysis of the importance of the Investment Index (or Expenditures Focused Index) was published in the Library Assessment Conference proceedings. Index was published in the Chronicle of Higher Education August 2009 Almanac issue.

Accomplishments since May 2009 ARL Board Meeting noted in purple.

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	*Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2009*
1. Statistics and Assessment Committee, continued.	• Participating in the ACRL *Academic Library Trends and Statistics Survey* editorial subcommittee of the ACRL Publications Committee (formerly ACRL Statistics Committee). • Discuss next steps for Preservation Statistics and self-assessment in this area following Lars recommendations. • Migrate ARL Statistics Interactive Edition from the U of Virginia in the ARL StatsQUAL infrastructure. • Participating in the newly established ACRL Assessment Committee.	• Participated and contributed at the 8th Northumbria International Conference on Performance Measurement in Libraries and Information Services (see: http://libraryassessment.info/?p=380) • Meeting of Survey Coordinators and SPEC Liaisons held on July 17, 2009 with presentations from Colleen Cook (Profiles), Notre Dame staff (e-metrics) and Gary Roebuck (ARL Statistics data entry interface).
2. StatsQUAL® A gateway to library assessment tools	• Engaging in redesigning the StatsQUAL® gateway with a new web design to accommodate all available assessment services and tools. Migration of LibQUAL+® in the new environment, enhancing ARL Statistics interface. • Most frequent requests for improvement have been to shorten the LibQUAL+® protocol. In response, developed the LibQUAL+® Lite customization feature. For a percentage of all surveys presented to users, LibQUAL+® Lite selects eight out of 22 questions. The percent is defined by the library in the customization interface. • University of Cyprus implementing LibQUAL+® in Greek in response to EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management) during Fall 2009; Finnish, Swiss, and Malay academic libraries implementation in 2010.	• LibQUAL+® data collected from more than 106,241 library users across 126 institutions from January to May 2009; a total of 180 institutions registered for 2009. Four institutions implementing LibQUAL+® Lite fall 2009. • Awarded two in-kind grants for 2009: Sistema CETYS Universidad, Biblioteca y Centro de Información "Luis Fimbres Moreno"and North Carolina Central University, James E. Shepard Memorial Library. Issued call for grant applications for 2010. • The LibQUAL+® team was available for individual consultations at the LibQUAL+® Booth at ALA in January 2009. Held LibQUAL+® ShareFair and workshops on July 13.

Areas of Activity	*UNDERWAY AND PLANNED*	*Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2009*
2. StatsQUAL® A gateway to library assessment tools, continued.	• Lib-Value: The University of Tennessee (Lead-PI: Carol Tenopir) in collaboration with UIUC (Co-PI: Paula Kaufman), and ARL (Martha Kyrillidou) were awarded an IMLS leadership grant "Value, Outcomes, and Return on Investment of Academic Libraries (Lib-Value)". Lib-Value addresses academic librarians' need to demonstrate the return on investment (ROI) and value of the library to the institution and will help guide library management in the redirection of library funds to important products and services for the future. Lib-Value will provide evidence and a set of tested methodologies and tools. The three-year grant starts on December 1, 2009. Consultants are: Bruce Kingma (Syracuse) and Donald W. King (UNC-CH). Advisory committee members include: José-Marie Griffiths (UNC-CH), Michael Koenig (Long Island University), Carol Mandel (NYU), Colleen Cook (Texas A&M), George Deltas (UIUC) and Nicolas Flores (Colorado).	• Analyzing Fall 2008 and 2009 LibQUAL+® Lite data. Transferring historical data into the new platform. • LibQUAL+® Lite is the most important LibQUAL+® development in the last several years! Published findings from Spring 2008 pilot: Thompson, B., Kyrillidou, M., & Cook, C. (2009). Item sampling in service quality assessment surveys to improve response rates and reduce respondent burden: The "LibQUAL+® Lite" example. <u>Performance Measurement & Metrics</u>, 10(1), 6-16. • Lib-Value (ROI) related article: Paula Kaufman, "The Library as Strategic Investment: Results of the Illinois Return on Investment Study" LIBER Quarterly 18 (3/4), December 2008 – ISSN: 1435-5205. P424-436. http://liber.library.uu.nl/ publish/articles/000269/article.pdf • Implemented LibQUAL+® Lite for the University of Haifa in Israel in Hebrew; translated LibQUAL+® in Greek. New groups for 2009: academic libraries in Belgium and Norway. • Workshop "Working Effectively with LibQUAL+®" took place in Chicago, July 13. • Published special issue of LibQUAL+® articles: "LibQUAL+® and Beyond: Library Assessment with a Focus on Library Improvement" *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 9 (3) 2008; chapter on "Measuring the Quality of Library Service through LibQUAL+®" in *Academic Library Research: Perspectives and Current Trends.*

Areas of Activity	*Underway and Planned*	*Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2009*
2. StatsQUAL® A gateway to library assessment tools, continued.		• Service Quality Evaluation Academy was held in New Orleans in March 16-20, 2009 co-sponsored with CARL. • ARL Statistics was implemented in the new database platform. Revised ARL Statistics data entry interface to allow comparison of changes from year to year and more control over the final data submission by the local ARL institutions. • Enhancement in 2007-2008 interface implemented to allow access to all the data as entered in the system by ARL libraries. • Initiated a self-login process with automatic generation of the 'password-forgot' function and working on automating the production of the print publications.
3. Effective, Sustainable and Practical Assessment	• Planning is underway for a Library Assessment Conference scheduled to take place on Oct. 25-27, 2010, in Baltimore. Advisory committee met in July. Explore engagement from international institutional associations: Research Libraries UK, SCONUL, CARL, and CAUL. Secured plenary speakers: Fred Heath (Texas), Joe Matthews (San Jose), Danuta Nitecki (Yale), Megan Oakleaf (Syracuse), Stephen Town (York). Arranged with John Bertot, editor of *Library Quarterly*, for special theme issue to be published before the conference. • Operating libraryassessment.info blog.	• Call for participation in Effective, Sustainable and Practical Assessment was issued for 2009. VPOs Jim Self (Virginia) and Steve Hiller (Washington) conducted three site visits in 2009. • Library Assessment Forum on January 23 featured discussion on budget reduction strategies. Powerpoints by Steve Hiller and Sharyn Ladner are available at: http://libraryassessment.info/?p=193; July 10 event featured planning for the Library Assessment Conference in Baltimore. • Library Assessment Conference printed and available on the web – a volume of more than 60 papers with keynotes by Susan Gibbons, Rick Luce and Betsy Wilson. www.libraryassessment.org

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2009
3. Effective, Sustainable and Practical Assessment, continued.	• Initiated a pilot activity with the Balanced Scorecard involving Johns Hopkins, McMaster, Virginia and Washington. Ongoing communication underway for 12 months.	• Implementing Library Scorecards work is moving along with libraries having developed 'strategy maps' and working on their metrics.
4. Human Resources	• In process of publishing on the Web the institutional and normative data from ClimateQUAL™- OCDA using Nesstar. • Exploring the establishment of a consulting service to meet the needs of library organizations that are currently facing planning and reorganization challenges. • ClimateQUAL™ partners in person meeting held on July 10. Upcoming meeting on January 15, in Boston.	• ClimateQUAL™ paper presented at Northumbria in August. • ARL assumed responsibility for ClimateQUAL™-OCDA 2009 with eight additional libraries. One additional library implementing Fall 2009. • Financial sustainability beyond the implementation of the survey once every four years needs to be supported by repeat participation. • Launched new website: climatequal.org. • In March 2009, M. Kyrillidou and S. Baughman's article "ClimateQUAL™- Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment" in *College and Research Libraries News*. • Kyrillidou, M., C. Lowry, and P. Hanges. ClimateQUAL™: Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment. Presented at the ACRL 14th National Conference. Seattle, WA, January 2009. Available at: http://www.climatequal.org/bm~doc/kyrillidou_climatediversityassessment.pdf • ARL Annual Salary Survey available at: http://www.arl.org/stats/annualsurveys/salary/index.shtml

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	*Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2009*
4. Human Resources, continued.		• Branded OCDA as ClimateQUAL™ and pursuing trademark to add this tool in the StatsQUAL® set of tools ARL is offering.
5. MINES for Libraries/E-Metrics	• Monitor developments within NISO regarding the development of SUSHI. • Monitor developments with Project COUNTER, the ScholarlyStats project, and other external efforts aiming at the development of decision support systems for libraries. • Analyze ARL Supplementary Statistics with an emphasis on the networked electronic services usage data (searches, downloads and sessions) and ebooks. • METS workshop to be offered in Boston, January 15-19, 2010, in collaboration with Rick Beaubien (California, Berkeley) and Nancy Hoebelheinrich (Stanford). • MINES for Libraries™ at the University of Toronto and OCUL (2009-2010); experiment to identify differences between mandatory and optional method.	• Conducting the third of a three-year implementation of MINES for Libraries™ at Iowa (2007-2010). • Communicated with OCLC the need to work on building functionality in EZproxy. Contacted consultant, Chris Zagar, to determine next steps in defining the MINES protocol within EZproxy. • Explore external funding opportunities (IMLS grant) and partnerships for R&D on the MINES for Libraries™ working with PALCI (not funded). • Published ARL Supplementary Statistics 2006-07 and 2007-08, with trends on ebooks and other networked resources and services. • B. Franklin, M. Kyrillidou & T. Plum "From usage to user: library metrics and expectations for the evaluation of digital libraries" (preprint: at: http://www.libqual.org/documents/admin/UsageMetrics.doc) • M. Kyrillidou, C. Cook & Y. Lincoln "Digital Library Service Quality: What does it looks like?" (preprint: http://www.libqual.org/documents/admin/DigitalLibrary1.rtf. [Both articles appear in Giannis Tsakonas and Christos Papatheodorou. Eds. *Evaluation of Digital Libraries: an Insight into Useful applications and methods.* (Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2009]

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2009
5. MINES for Libraries/E-Metrics, continued.		• XML workshop in North Carolina, January 2009. • Held Google Analytics Workshop, April 24, 2009, Washington DC and July 10, 2009, Chicago.

6. SPEC Survey Program	• A call for SPEC Kit topics for 2010 has gone out through arl-announce.	• The SPEC survey program gathers information on current research library operating practices and policies and publishes the SPEC Kit series as guides for libraries. SPEC Kits for 2009 are:
		  – Leave and Professional Development Benefits (315);
		  – Processing Decisions for Manuscripts & Archives (314);
		  – e-Book Collections (313);
		  – Public Engagement (312);
		  – Author Addenda (310);
		  – Public Access Policies (311).
		
		• Collaborated with SCONUL to survey their members in the UK and Ireland on library assessment activities. ARL published the results as *Library Performance Measurement in the UK and Ireland* in August 2009.

Appendix B: Recommendations to the ARL Statistics & Measurement Program

The following recommendations are intended to serve as catalysts for further discussions. Although this report did not include a specific charge to address the ARL Preservation Statistics, interviewees and comments made at the experts meeting were frequent and varied enough to include consideration here.

Environmental Conditions and Housing

Recommendation

ARL member libraries should monitor environments and maintain information on monitoring practices for spaces housing collections. Monitoring records should include the following information.

Table 1. Environmental Monitoring Statistics

Collections monitored by facilities and collection types	Air qualities monitored	In addition to preservation staff, who receives the environmental data
Special collections	Temperature	University facilities management
General collections	Relative Humidity	University administration
Storage collections	Other	
Others:		

Physical Treatment: Conservation

A problem with current measures of conservation treatments is that different formats are gathered into a single count. In particular, treatment of photographs and other non-paper items require different expertise or treatments may be vended separately. Stabilization and conservation of photographic materials oftentimes requires a skill set significantly different from cleaning magnetic tape or repairing motion picture film, for example; currently these are reported as an aggregate. Moreover, the stabilization and conservation of containers might be closely aligned with reformatting efforts and completed by staff operating outside typical or traditional library preservation operations, leading to those efforts being underreported.

Recommendation

To ensure a balance of investments, libraries should continue to count conservation treatments performed. To reflect the range of work, counts should be broken down by bound volumes, manuscripts, photographs, and other artifacts with greater granularity. In addition, given the emphasis on special collections, libraries should collect separate statistics for conservation work performed on special collections and general collections. [44]

---

44 Libraries should consider the nature of their collections in developing preservation policies since many general collections, particularly large ones, include unique or nearly unique materials.

Table 2. Conservation Treatment Statistics

The distinction between special and general collections varies from one library to another. Circulating materials in one library may be housed in special collections in another. By segmenting the statistics in this manner, general trends about priorities in ARL libraries might emerge.

	Special Collections	General Collections
Unbound sheets		
Bound volumes		
Photographic material (prints, negatives, transparencies, etc.)		
Moving image materials		
Motion picture film		
Video		
Other		
Sound recordings (repaired, stabilized, not reformatted)		
Disc, analog		
Magnetic		
Objects (paintings, works on paper, sculpture, botanical specimens, etc.)		

Physical Treatment: Binding

Recommendation

Libraries should continue to measure binding activities and expenditures. They should also measure, track, and monitor use of other services provided by their binder.

Table 3. Services Purchased from Vendors

	Quantity
Boxing, phase boxing	
Conservation work	
Level 1	
Level 2	
Level 3	
Digitizing	
Paper	
Other media	
Print on Demand when made from a digital surrogate to replace brittle or irreparable materials.	

Physical Treatment: Deacidification

Recommendation

To maintain consistency with other recommendations for reporting conservation activities, libraries should identify the relative quantities of special collections and general collection materials that are deacidified.

Staff and User Education, Disaster Preparedness and Response

Recommendation

ARL should collect information on whether member libraries have a disaster preparedness and response plan and whether their staff receives training on care and handling of library materials.

Table 4. Recording Staff and User Education Activities

Does your library have a disaster response plan
Yes
No
What types of disasters does it address?
When was the plan last updated?
What media does it address?
Books
Manuscripts
Archives
Sound recordings
Disc, analog
Magnetic media
Optical media
Other carrier/storage
Moving image materials
Motion picture film
Magnetic media
Optical media
Other carrier/storage
Art objects
Does the plan include contact information for
Relevant library staff
Library or campus security
Disaster recovery vendors
Relevant administrators (finance, risk assessment, legal, etc.)
Are library staff trained in disaster awareness and response?

Yes	
No	
Do staff receive training on the proper care and handling of library materials?	
Yes	
No	
If yes, with what frequency?	
Who performs the training?	
Preservation staff	
Consultants	
Other staff	

Reformatting

Recommendations

The ARL report "Recognizing Digitization as a Preservation Reformatting Method" notes that to be considered a preservation effort, digitization must be accompanied by an institutional plan to preserve the digital content. Therefore, if a library has a plan or mechanism for preserving digital surrogates created by the library or a vendor, it should count its digital reformatting efforts as preservation.

To better identify reformatting trends in ARL libraries, statistics gathering should more clearly identify specific reformatting efforts. In particular, the distinction between analog and digital reformatting in the ARL statistics is useful because it conveys important information about access. Equally, or perhaps more, important is data about the materials being preserved. Typically, preservation reformatting efforts are divided by format: still images (photographs, books pages, posters, etc.), sound recordings, and moving images. Most libraries probably already distinguish format in their internal statistics gathering. To be useful for comparative purposes, ARL libraries should collect and report data for these three categories of effort—microfilming, preservation photocopying, and digitization—and specify quantities for kinds of source materials. In addition, reasons for choosing a particular reformatting option should be indicated.

ARL also should collect parallel expenditure data for microfilming, preservation photocopying, and digitization. Currently, only data for photocopying and microfilming expenditures are collected. Interviews for this report revealed that some libraries include digitization efforts under "other preservation expenditures."

Table 5. Additional Reformatting Data

Microfilming	
Does your library microfilm?	
Yes	
No	
Where does the microfilming take place? Indicate activity in each category by percentage.	
In house lab	
Vendor	

For all microfilming activities, what is the relative percentage for each category (totals to 100)
General collections:
Special collections:
Why do you microfilm? (Check all that apply)
Replace brittle volume
Create a surrogate
Cost effective
Copyright concerns
External funding source
Internal funding source
Preservation
Access

Photocopying (including print out from digital file)

Does your library photocopy library materials?
Yes
No
Where does the photocopying take place? Indicate activity in each category by percentage.
In house lab
Vendor
For all photocopying activities, what is the relative percentage for each category (totals to 100)
General collections:
Special collections:
Why do you photocopy? (Check all that apply)
Replace brittle volume
Create a surrogate
Cost effective
Copyright concerns
External funding source
Internal funding source
Preservation
Access

Digitization

Does your library digitize library materials?
Yes
No
Where does the digitization take place? Indicate activity in each category by percentage.
In house lab

Vendor
For all digitization activities, what is the relative percentage for each category (totals to 100)
General collections:
Special collections:
Why do you digitize? (Check all that apply)
Replace damaged item
Create a surrogate
Migrate from obsolete technology or format
Cost effective
Copyright concerns
External funding source
Internal funding source
Preservation
Access
Vendor driven mass digitization effort
In what quantities are the following digitized annually:
Bound volumes
Unbound sheets
Sound recordings
Analog disc
Magnetic tape
Digital
Optical media
Other
Moving Image Materials
Motion picture film
In addition to digitizing, do you have new negatives, internegatives, and prints struck?
Magnetic media
Optical Media
Total number of digital files created.
Total number of files submitted for long-term preservation

Third Party Strategies for Preserving e-Journals and Other Content

Recommendation

The ARL preservation statistics should provide opportunities for libraries to note examples of collaborative work and preservation R&D activities. A checklist for common national-level projects like Portico and LOCKSS should be developed. Ideally, such statements would be brief and include a link to a project Web site.

ARL PRESERVATION STATISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE, 2008-09
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Please read all instructions carefully before you answer the questionnaire. Make sure your responses are as complete and accurate as possible. Give estimates when you must, but please do not make wild guesses. Use footnotes to expand upon or clarify your responses. All questions assume a *fiscal year ending June 30, 2009*. If your library's fiscal year is different, please use footnotes to explain.

Please respond to every question. If an exact figure cannot be provided, use UA/NA (unavailable or not applicable). If the appropriate answer is zero or none, use **0**; **note that UA/NA is different from a real 0 (zero)**. Use the same basis for reporting as is used in responding to the main *ARL Statistics* questionnaire. For example, if in *ARL Statistics* you normally include data for a law library and/or a medical library, also include those libraries in response to this survey and note the inclusions in footnotes as prompted.

Although the form allows for data to be entered from both main and branch campuses, <u>an effort should be made to report figures for the main campus only</u>. (The U.S. National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) defines a **branch institution** as "a campus or site of an educational institution that is not temporary, is located in a community beyond a reasonable commuting distance from its parent institution, and offers organized programs of study, not just courses.") If figures for libraries located at branch campuses are reported, please specify which "branch libraries are included and which ones are excluded" in the comments box on the web form..

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

SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

For the purposes of this survey, the elements of a "preservation program" include: *conservation treatment, commercial binding, and preservation reformatting*. While shelf preparation activities (e.g., plating, labeling, insertion of security devices) and stack maintenance have obvious preservation implications and may be supervised by the preservation administrator, these activities are not quantified in this survey.

Question 1. Does the library have a preservation administrator who spends at least 25% of his or her time managing a partial or comprehensive preservation program?

Question 2. What percentage of the preservation administrator's total job assignment is dedicated to preservation activities? If the library has a full-time preservation administrator, general management activities (e.g., meeting attendance, committee participation) should be considered an integral part of the administrator's responsibilities and the answer to this question recorded as 100%. In contrast, where the preservation administrator is a part-time staff member or has a dual assignment (e.g., she or he is also a serials librarian, bibliographer, or curator), the percentage of time devoted to preservation activities and preservation management should be recorded. If the library has no preservation administrator enter "0."

Question 3. Record the job title (not the individual name) of the person to whom the preservation administrator reports (e.g., "Associate Director for Collection Development"). If the library has no preservation administrator enter "0."

Questions 4-5. FTE (i.e., "Full-Time Equivalent") is the numerical representation of full- and part-time work activities. A person working full time is represented by an FTE of 1.00; a person working half time by an FTE of 0.50. Five persons working half time are represented by a combined FTE of 2.50. The number of FTE staff should be determined on the basis of the length of the work week in the reporting library. ***Round figures to the nearest two decimal places***.

Record FTE staff in filled positions or positions that are only temporarily vacant on the date that ends the library's fiscal year. Also record staff hired for special projects, internships, and grants, but provide an explanatory note in the footnotes indicating the FTE of such staff. The footnotes should also be used to record such information as the number of hours worked by volunteers (this figure is not recorded in the survey itself), and the number of months that a full-time position was vacant during the year.

Report trained professional conservators and photographers (senior practitioners—not technicians) in the "professional" category whether or not they have a master's degree in library studies.

Question 4. Only the preservation administrator and staff who report directly to him or her, or to someone supervised by him or her, should be recorded here. If the library has no preservation administrator, or if the administrator does not have direct line responsibility for staff, enter "0."

Question 5. This figure includes staff who report to the preservation administrator, as recorded in Question 4, *plus* staff outside the preservation unit who are involved in preservation activities. The following activities should be included regardless of the department or library to which staff report: conservation, preparation for commercial binding, all activities associated with preservation reformatting (including selection for preservation, searching, and cataloging), and service on preservation committees.

For staff members with dual assignments, record only that time devoted to preservation activities. For example, a student assistant who works 0.40 FTE and devotes half of his or her time to book repair and the rest to serials check-in would be recorded as 0.20 FTE.

Question 7-11. Report all expenditures, regardless of the source of funding (e.g., funds may come from the regular institutional budget, grants, or fees for services).

Canadian libraries should report expenditures only in Canadian dollars. These amounts will be translated into U.S. dollars using a conversion exchange rate of 1.1667 Canadian dollars to 1 U.S. dollar, which was determined using the average monthly noon exchange rate published in the *Bank of Canada Review* for the period July 2008 through June 2009.

Question 7. This answer is the sum of the answers to Questions 7a through 7c. Attach any footnotes for Questions 7a-7c here, as only this figure appears in the data reports.

Questions 7a-7c. Record salaries for staff reported in response to Question 5, the number of staff engaged in preservation activities library-wide. Do not include fringe benefits.

Question 8. "Contract expenditures" refers to expenditures for preservation services for which the library is invoiced by an outside vendor, organization, or individual (e.g., a commercial library binder, commercial microfilming service, or professional conservator in private practice).

This answer is the sum of the answers to Question 8a through 8e.

Question 8a.

> **Conservation**: Refers to the remedial and protective treatment (both mechanical and chemical) of bound volumes, manuscripts, maps, posters, works of art on paper, photographic

materials, magnetic tapes, and other library materials to restore them to usable condition and/or to extend their useful lives. Note that conservation involves preserving information in its original form. The reproduction of materials (e.g., the copying of information onto the same, similar, or new media) is recorded in the preservation reformatting section of this survey. Conservation also refers to the construction of protective enclosures (e.g., wrappers, jackets, boxes) for library materials. Use of archivally sound methods and materials is presumed.

Conservation encompasses a wide range of treatments, including pamphlet and paperback binding, temporary serials binding, tipping in inserts, making pockets for loose parts, slitting uncut pages, making paper repairs, removing tapes and stains, tightening hinges, replacing endpapers, rebacking, recasing, rebinding, repairing sewing structures before sending volumes out for commercial binding, and item-by-item and mass deacidification. Treatments range from minor procedures that can be done relatively quickly by technicians to major procedures that are chemically and mechanically complex and require the skill and judgment of a conservator.

Conservation may also include item-by-item treatment of materials damaged by water, fire, and mold. Because mass freeze drying and fumigation can involve very large numbers that would mask the size and nature of the in-house conservation effort, such activities are recorded in response to Question 8e, "other contract expenditures" and explained in the footnotes, but are not recorded in response to Questions 13-14. Exhibit preparation is recorded as conservation activity when an item is treated (e.g., a print is cleaned), but not when a temporary support (e.g., a book cradle) is constructed to display an item. In the latter case, total FTE staff suffices as a measure of effort.

If fees paid to commercial binders for products and treatments other than library binding (e.g., for phase boxes) have been recorded on the main **ARL Statistics** *in response to Question 16, please note instructions for answering Question 8b, below.*

Question 8b.

> **Commercial binding:** Refers to the binding, rebinding, and recasing performed by commercial library binderies, as described in the *Library Binding Institute Standard for Library Binding,* 8th edition (Rochester: Library Binding Institute, 1986). Commercial library binderies use oversewing machines; Smythe-type sewing machines; double-fan adhesive binding equipment; and automated rounders and backers, hydraulic presses, and spine stamping equipment, in a high-production environment.

This figure should match the figure reported on the main *ARL Statistics 2008-09* survey in response to Question 16, unless the library purchases conservation services from a commercial library binder. *Where fees have been paid to a commercial library binder for conservation services, record those fees in response to Question 8a herein*. Subtract conservation fees from the dollar amount reported in response to Question 17 of the main *ARL Statistics 2008-09* and record the resulting figure in response to Question 8b herein. Explain the discrepancy between answers to Question 17 of the main *ARL Statistics* and Question 8b of the *ARL Preservation Statistics* in a footnote.

Question 8e. Other contract expenditures might include fees paid for commercial freeze-drying, fumigating, or mass-deacidification of library materials; membership fees for use of regional conservation facilities; or equipment repairs. If answers are recorded in response to optional Questions 20c and 21c (number of items digitized), record expenditures here. Use footnotes to note the amount and nature of major expenditures.

Question 9. Supplies include materials used for conservation treatment (e.g., papers, book cloths, adhesives, pamphlet binders, box board, chemicals, disposable filters for water systems); commercially available archival quality boxes, wrappers, file folders, and envelopes; paper used for preservation photocopying and digitizing; and film, chemicals, and other supplies used for preservation microfilming. Expenditures for equipment and tools costing under $100 should be recorded here. Expenditures for security labels and stamps, book pockets, call number and bar code labels, and book plates fall outside the scope of this survey and should not be recorded.

Since housing of commercially available boxes, wrappers, folders, and envelopes can involve very large numbers that would mask the size and nature of the in-house conservation effort, the use of such supplies to protect books, manuscripts, maps, microfiche, photographs, videotapes, and other library materials is recorded only here—not in response to Questions 13-14.

Question 10. Record expenditures for equipment and tools costing over $100, such as machinery (e.g., board shears, fume hoods, microfilming cameras, photocopy machines and scanners exclusively used for preservation reformatting), furniture (e.g., laboratory benches, chemical supply cabinets), and computer hardware purchased for exclusive use by a preservation department for such purposes as conservation management, bindery preparation, and bibliographic searching related to preservation reformatting. Capital expenditures for building renovations (e.g., the construction of a conservation facility) or for construction that results in improved housing of library materials (such as replacement of heating, ventilating, and air conditioning systems) should be recorded only in footnotes.

Question 11. This answer is the sum of the answers to Questions 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Certain preservation-related expenses are not requested in this survey (e.g., the cost of staff training, conference attendance, and other staff development activities; printed brochures and posters; purchase of reference materials). If significant, these should be noted in footnotes.

Question 12. Record total preservation expenditures that were funded by external agencies in the form of grants. Funds allocated from the library's regular operating budget (including gifts, royalties, endowment income, and special funds provided to the library by its parent institution) are regarded as internal and should not be reflected here.

Questions 13. This answer is the sum of answers to Questions 13a-13c. See definition of *conservation* under instructions for Question 8a above. ***Record the number of volumes (including pamphlets) given conservation treatment, not the total number of treatments performed***. ***Answers to these questions should be mutually exclusive. While any given volume may receive several treatments, it should be recorded only once, as a Level 1, 2, or 3 treatment depending on the amount of time devoted to the volume.*** For example, when an errata sheet is tipped into a volume, three pages are repaired, and its hinges are tightened, and these procedures take a total of 25 minutes to perform, the volume should be recorded only once, as a Level 2 treatment. The repair of several pages of a volume or pamphlet should not be recorded under "unbound sheets" (Question 14), even if the volume is disbound at the time the pages are treated. Rather, treatment of the volume should be recorded once, as a Level 1, 2, or 3 book treatment, depending on the time required to perform all procedures.

When a volume receives conservation treatment and a box is made for it, however, the conservation should be recorded as a Level 1, 2, or 3 treatment, and the boxing should be recorded in response to Question 18 (number of custom-fitted protective enclosures constructed). Likewise, when two pages of a book are repaired and the book is sent to a commercial bindery, the volume should be recorded as a Level 1 conservation treatment and as a "commercial binding" (Question 19).

Because the nature of procedures and the level of in-house conservation expertise varies significantly across ARL libraries, treatments are recorded based on the length of time they require, time being a meaningful and comparable measure of effort. Use of archivally sound methods and materials is presumed.

Question 13a. Level 1 conservation treatments require 15 minutes or less to perform.

Question 13b. Level 2 treatments require more than l5 minutes but less than two hours to perform.

Question 13c. Level 3 conservation treatments require two hours or more to perform. Where an extraordinary number of hours is required to treat selected items, this information can be recorded in footnotes.

Question 14. Unbound sheets include items such as manuscripts, maps, posters, and works of art on paper. Procedures include a variety of mechanical and chemical treatments (e.g., paper repair, surface cleaning, washing, deacidifying, encapsulating, mounting, matting) that lengthen the life of the item. Use of archivally sound methods and materials is presumed. ***Report the total number of sheets of paper that were treated—not the total number of treatments performed***.

Questions 15-16.

> **Mass deacidification is** a process by which books and papers are treated to neutralize acidity and to introduce an alkaline buffer. Materials are deacidified in batches, in chambers that hold several (or many) items.

Item-by-item deacidification of bound volumes and papers, performed by conservators and technicians, should be recorded in response to Questions 13-14.

Question 17. Record conservation treatment of photographic materials here, including photographs printed on paper, glass, plastics, and other materials. "Non-paper items" include materials other than bound volumes, unbound paper, and photographs. Treatment of non-paper items might include such activities as conserving globes, cleaning videotapes, and repairing motion picture film. Report activities such as remastering videotapes, copying photographs, re-recording sound, and other activities involving duplication of media in response to Question 22 (number of photographs and non-book/paper items reformatted).

Question 18. Custom-fitted enclosures are distinguished from the commercially available boxes and other enclosures identified in Question 9 as "supplies," in that the former are custom-made to fit their contents and the latter are standard-sized enclosures available through supply catalogs. Custom-fitted enclosures include paper and polyester book jackets, paper and board wrappers, portfolios, phase boxes, double-tray boxes, and other boxes. (Polyester encapsulation of single sheets should be reported in response to Question 14—not here.) Use of archival quality methods and materials is presumed.

Question 19. See definition of *commercial binding* under instructions for Question 8b above. Record all volumes (including pamphlets) bound or rebound by a commercial bindery.

Questions 20-21. "Number of bound volumes/pamphlets" refers to the reformatting of volumes in their entirety (i.e., each page is copied to produce a facsimile volume in paper, on film, or in digital form). "Number of unbound pages" refers to the sum of the number of full pages copied. For a manuscript written on one side of a sheet, record one page. For a manuscript written on two sides of a sheet, record two pages. For one frame of film that captures one page, record one page. For one frame of film that captures two pages, record two pages.

> **Preservation photocopying** refers only to items photocopied on paper that has a minimum pH of 7.5, a minimum alkaline reserve equivalent to 2% calcium carbonate based on oven-dry weight of the paper, and includes no groundwood or unbleached pulp. Images must be properly fused to the paper.

> **Preservation microfilming** presumes adherence to relevant American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and Association for Information and Image Management (AIIM) standards

as well as microfilming guidelines published by the Research Libraries Group and National Library of Canada.

For microfilming, record data only for first-generation microforms.   For a monographic set of three volumes, record three volumes; for thirty volumes in a serial run record thirty volumes. Include data for projects that are undertaken cooperatively with other libraries, but not for commercial projects wherein a commercial vendor borrows library materials for filming and subsequent sale of the film. When the library serves as a commercial microfilming vendor for another institution, this filming should be reported by the library that contracts for the filming—not by the library that does the filming. Dissertations that are sent to UMI for filming should not be recorded.

Record preservation microform masters produced by copying non-archival or damaged film, or produced from digitized text. Use footnotes to indicate the scope and nature of such activity.

> **Digitizing for preservation purposes** is the reproduction of bound volumes, pamphlets, unbound sheets, manuscripts, maps, posters, works of art on paper, and other paper-based materials for the purpose of:
>
> a) making duplicate copies that replace deteriorated originals (e.g., by digitizing texts and storing them permanently in electronic form and/or printing them on alkaline paper);
> b) making preservation master copies and thus guarding against irretrievable loss of unique originals (e.g., by making high-resolution electronic copies of photographs and storing them permanently and/or printing them; or
> c) making surrogate copies that can be retrieved and distributed easily, thereby improving access to information resources without exposing original materials to excessive handling;
>
> or some combination of these factors.

Record the total number of items that were digitized—not the total number of versions of these items that were created. Where a photograph is scanned and printed, a low resolution image mounted on the World Wide Web, and images having higher resolution recorded on CD-ROM, report one photograph digitized.

Question 22. Refers to the copying of all types of photographs, and non-paper media such as audio tapes, videotapes, various types of disks, and motion picture film for preservation purpose (see instructions for *digitizing for preservation purposes*, above). A photograph copied using a 35mm. camera is an analog reproduction; a photograph copied using a digital camera is a digital reproduction.

Footnotes. Please consult the data entry Web interface (www.arlstatistics.org) for a copy of last year's footnotes. These can be found under "Data Repository" after you login into www.arlstatistics.org. Reporting libraries are urged to record in the footnote section any information that would clarify the figures submitted, e.g., the inclusion of branch campus libraries (see paragraph six of the "General Instructions" for definition of branch campus libraries).

<div align="center">

Submit the completed questionnaire by <mark>November 30, 2009</mark>**.**
Please contact Martha Kyrillidou (martha@arl.org) or Les Bland (les@arl.org)
at (202) 296-2296 for assistance.

</div>

ARL Preservation Statistics 2008-09
Worksheet

This worksheet is designed to help you plan your submission for the 2008-09 *ARL Preservation Statistics*. Include here ALL libraries for which you want to report data in the *ARL Preservation Statistics*.

If an exact figure is unavailable, use NA/UA. If the appropriate answer is zero or none, use "0."

Reporting Institution _____ Date Returned to ARL _____

Report Prepared by (name) _____

Title _____

Email address_____ Phone number _____

Contact person (if different) _____

Title _____

Email address_____ Phone number _____

ADMINISTRATION

1. Does the library have a preservation administrator?   (1)   _____ Yes _____ No

2. If yes, what percentage of the administrator's total job assignment is dedicated to preservation activities and preservation program management?

(2)   _____

3. If yes, what is the job title of the person to whom the preservation administrator reports?

(3)   _____

4. If the library has a preservation administrator who supervises staff, how many staff are in the preservation unit (including the preservation administrator)?

(Total Preservation Unit Staff: 4.a + 4.b + 4.c)   (4)   _____

4a. Professional Staff FTE   (4a)   _____

4b. Support Staff FTE   (4b)   _____

4c. Student Assistants FTE   (4c)   _____

5. How many staff are engaged in preservation activities library-wide (including staff reported in item 4 above)?

(Total Preservation Staff Library-wide: 5.a + 5.b + 5.c)   (5)   _____

5a. Professional Staff FTE - Library Wide   (5a)   _____

5b. Support Staff FTE - Library Wide   (5b)   _____

5c. Student Assistants FTE - Library Wide   (5c)   _____

6. Expenditures reported in Canadian dollars?   (6)   _____Yes

                                                                       _____No

7. Salaries and wages for staff engaged in preservation activities *(as reported in line 5 above)*

　　　　(Total salaries and wages: 7.a + 7.b + 7.c)   (7)   _____

　　　　7a. Professional Staff -*Preservation*   (7a)   _____

　　　　7b. Support Staff - Preservation   (7b)   _____

　　　　7c. Student Assistants - Preservation   (7c)   _____

8. Contract expenditures

　　　　(Total contract expenditures: 8.a + 8.b + 8.c + 8.d + 8.e)   (8)   _____

　　　　8a. Contract Conservation   (8a)   _____

　　　　8b. Contract commercial binding *(related to line 17 on the 2007-08 ARL Statistics questionnaire; see instructions)*

                                                                       (8b)   _____

　　　　8c. Contract preservation photocopying   (8c)   _____

　　　　8d. Contract preservation microfilming   (8d)   _____

　　　　8e. Other contract expenditures   (8e)   _____

9. Preservation supplies   (9)   _____

10. Preservation equipment   (10)   _____

11. Total library expenditures   *(7 + 8 + 9 + 10)*   (11)   _____

12. Total preservation expenditures that came from external sources   (12)   _____

CONSERVATION TREATMENT

13. Number of volumes/pamphlets given conservation treatment

    (Total number of treated volumes/pamphlets: 13.a + 13.b + 13.c)   (13)   _____

    13a. Volumes/pamphlets given Level 1 treatment   (13a)   _____

    13b. Volumes/pamphlets given Level 2 treatment   (13b)   _____

    13c. Volumes/pamphlets given Level 3 treatment   (13c)   _____

14. Number of unbound sheets given conservation treatment   (14)   _____

15. Number of bound volumes/pamphlets mass deacidified   (15)   _____

16. Number of linear feet of unbound papers mass deacidified   (16)   _____

17. Number of photographs and non-paper items given conservation treatment
(e.g., audio tapes, motion picture film)   (17)   _____

18. Number of custom-fitted protective enclosures constructed   (18)   _____

COMMERCIAL BINDING

19. Number of volumes commercially bound   (19)   _____

PRESERVATION REFORMATTING

20. Number of bound volumes/pamphlets reformatted in their entirety

    20a. Photocopied   (20a)   _____

    20b. Microfilmed   (20b)   _____

    20c. Digitized *(optional)*   (20c)   _____

21. Number of single unbound sheets reformatted *(e.g., one side of one manuscript page, one map)*

    21a. Photocopied   (21a)   _____

    21b. Microfilmed   (21b)   _____

    21c. Digitized *(optional)*   (21c)   _____

22. Number of photographs and non-paper items reformatted *(e.g., audio tapes, motion picture film)*

    22a. By analog means   (22a)   _____

    22b. By digital means   (22b)   _____

FOOTNOTES

Please provide footnotes to individual questions, as well as footnotes that apply to your entire institution. Please provide any information which would clarify the figures submitted, e.g., the inclusion of branch campus libraries or any special projects which might cause radical increases or decreases. Please compare this year's footnotes to what you reported last year. Please consult the data entry Web interface (www.arlstatistics.org) for a copy of last year's footnotes. These can be found under "Data Repository" after you login under www.arlstatistics.org. Please make an effort to word your footnotes in a manner consistent with notes appearing in the published report, so that the ARL Office can interpret your footnotes correctly. Use a sentence/paragraph format when writing footnotes—**do not use "bullets" or make a "bullet list**."

NOTE: Any change over 10% for any response to the surveys questions over the preceding year (2007-08) should be addressed with a footnote.

Submit the completed questionnaire by **November 30, 2009.**

For assistance, please e-mail Martha Kyrillidou (martha@arl.org) or Les Bland (les@arl.org)
Or call the ARL Office at (202) 296-2296.