



October 5, 2010

TO: ARL Statistics and Assessment Board Committee

Larry Alford (Temple)	2009–2011
Colleen Cook (Texas A&M)	2010–2012 (ARL Board Liaison)
Joan Giesecke (Nebraska)	2010–2012
Eileen Hitchingham (Virginia Tech)	2008–2010
Ernie Ingles (Alberta)	2008–2010
Victoria Montavon (Cincinnati)	2010–2012
Judith Nadler (Chicago)	2008–2010
Ingrid Parent (British Columbia)	2010–2012
Scott Seaman (Ohio)	2009–2011
Suzanne Thorin (Syracuse)	2010–2012
Tom Wall (Boston College)	2009–2011

FROM:

Bill Potter, Chair of the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee, U of Georgia
Martha Kyrillidou, ARL Staff

Enclosed are the agenda and supporting documents for the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee meeting that will take place 8:00 a.m. to noon on Wednesday, October 13, 2010, in the New Jersey Room of the Mayflower Renaissance Hotel, Washington DC. The meeting will take place in two parts – the first part will focus on our regular review of the program and the second part will focus on discussing the “Task Force on Reviewing the ARL Statistics, ARL Supplementary Statistics and ARL Annual Salary Survey” charge.

In addition to the attachments, the agenda also includes recommended readings from the recent August *RLI* issue on “Value in Libraries: Assessing Organizational Performance.” Committee and staff have been called to accelerate the assessment agenda with the 2010-2012 strategic plan. The committee chair typically is expected to provide a briefing at the Business Meeting regarding the status of various assessment activities. The committee chair is also reviewing the summary grid reports to ensure that assessment related programmatic activities serve the needs of ARL’s strategic directions. Colleen Cook is the designated 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 with your continuing engagement, input, direction and support.

21 Dupont Circle, 8th floor
Washington, DC 20036
tel. 202.296.2296
fax. 202.872.0884
www.arl.org

**157th ARL Membership Meeting
ARL Statistics and Assessment
Wednesday, October 13, 2010
8:00 a.m. – noon
New Jersey Room
Mayflower Renaissance Hotel
Washington DC**

AGENDA

Welcome and introductions; recognize Gordon Fretwell's service as a consultant; Note that parenthetical times below are suggestive and actual time may vary depending on the tenor of the discussion.

- (a) Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)
Attachment a: Minutes from the 156th ARL Membership Meeting, ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee

- (b) An overview of the programmatic activities (25 minutes)
Attachment b: Grid report

- (c) IMLS grant: Lib-Value activities (15 minutes). See RLI article:
<<http://publications.arl.org/rli271/38>>

- (d) Balanced Scorecard pilot involving Johns Hopkins, McMaster, U of Washington and the U of Virginia (30 minutes). See RLI article: <<http://publications.arl.org/rli271/35>>

- (e) Summary report of the ARL Profiles (15 minutes). See RLI article:
<<http://publications.arl.org/rli271/27>>
Attachment c: ARL Profiles Summary Report (forthcoming)

- (f) ARL profile analysis conducted by four RLLF fellows, Bob Fox, Patrick Reakes, Bryan Skib, and Ann Snowman (30 minutes)
Attachment f: ARL Profiles: Emerging Themes

BREAK

- (g) Task Force charge reviewed and issues related to annual surveys discussed (up to 90 minutes as needed)

Attachment g1: Task Force on Reviewing the ARL Statistics, ARL Supplementary Statistics and ARL Annual Salary Survey

Attachment g2: ARL Statistics Chronology

Attachment g3: ARL Statistics & Supplementary Statistics 2009-10 surveys

156th ARL Membership Meeting
ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee
Wednesday, April 28, 2009
8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Congress Room
Fairmont Olympic Hotel
Seattle, WA

MINUTES

ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee Members

Larry Alford (Temple)	2009–2011 (absent)
Colleen Cook (Texas A&M)	2010–2012 (ARL Board member)
Joan Giesecke (Nebraska)	2010–2012 (absent)
Eileen Hitchingham (Virginia Tech)	2008–2010
Ernie Ingles (Alberta)	2008–2010
Victoria Montavon (Cincinnati)	2010–2012
Judith Nadler (Chicago)	2008–2010 (absent)
Ingrid Parent (British Columbia)	2010–2012
Scott Seaman (Ohio)	2009–2011
Suzanne Thorin (Syracuse)	2010–2012
Tom Wall (Boston College)	2009–2011 (absent)
Bill Potter, University of Georgia, Chair (2010-2012), chaired by phone	
Martha Kyrillidou, ARL Staff	

Bill Potter chaired the committee by phone and asked Colleen Cook to provide local support as needed. The Minutes of the 155th ARL Membership Meeting - Statistics and Assessment Committee Meeting were approved with no changes.

Jim Self (U of Virginia) and Steve Hiller (U of Washington) were attending the meeting and presented on the Effective, Sustainable and Practical Assessment Service work they did over the last five years. From their site visits to more than 40 libraries they see the need to integrate assessment activities with strategy. Suzanne Thorin also mentioned that assessment and decision making has not filtered down into the daily life of the organization. Colleen Cook pointed out that management and assessment is one of the major themes that surfaced through the profile descriptions and LibQUAL+® activities often are used to serve strategic goals. Steve Hiller emphasized that integration of assessment activities is not always done well within our organizations. Eileen Hitchingham also pointed out that interpretation of the data presents challenges sometimes as we are uncertain whether growth or decline in certain indicators is a positive or negative trend. ARL libraries can use more help in contextualizing and integrating the data, tying the data to interpretations and to strategic objectives.

The Balanced Scorecard pilot (both the U of Virginia and the U of Washington are involved in this activity) that has taken place at four ARL institutions may be a model we can track and expand to serve those needs. Some of the major challenges in the implementation of the scorecard has been getting time with senior leadership to develop strategy maps and the second major challenge has been the ability to develop good measures. There are also some similarities among the four institutional approaches. For example, all institutions had some measures related to learning, space, financial needs and customer service. We will continue our work of learning from each other on this project and this is another effort that can inform a potential revision of the annual ARL Statistics. [Note: During the October Forum there will be a session highlighting the implementation of the Scorecard at the four pilot institutions.]

Eileen also highlighted the need to emphasize the outcomes assessment in what we do and understand faculty trends like the Ithaka reports have tried to do. Martha Kyrillidou mentioned that we have had discussion with Roger Schonfeld exploring potential future collaborations. Also, the profiles are helpful in contextualizing the issues and capturing some of the horizon challenges.

Bill Potter moved the discussion by presenting the draft reports on the ARL Profiles. He pointed out that we asked members to describe their libraries and we received 88 profiles (we worked and analyzed 82 from academic libraries and focused primarily on these when we drew the recommendations listed in the report). The profiles are providing context that the annual statistical are not capturing. We used Atlas.ti to come up with themes in the profiles engaging a consultant and team of coders. In addition to the draft report there is a framework that outlines the analysis conducted. All libraries mentioned the need for assessment in their profiles and all of them provided some examples of quantitative measures but a smaller set of institutions provided qualitative measures. It is unclear how to use qualitative measures in this environment. Also collection building is often integrated with other concepts in the profile descriptions. The fact that collection building was not mentioned a lot it could mean that we take it for granted assumed that everyone is doing it or it may mean that we are worried about preservation and the collective collection and how it relates to preservation/digitization/storage facilities/collaborations. There is a need to better characterize the notion of the 'collective collections.' Scott Seaman pointed out that authorship of the profile descriptions may vary from institution to institution since many directors may have asked their AULs to do these descriptions. Sarah Pritchard also pointed out that the profiles reflect inconsistent approaches because the instructions were open. We may want to collect some of the information regarding what we are doing and what we wish we were doing in a password protected environment.

In addressing the issue whether the profile are useful to collect periodically, Ernie Ingles pointed out that they do have utility (every 2 or 3 years maybe) as they allow us to see the evolution of the collective concerns, issues that ARL might want to address with collective actions. Ernie also asked whether we have abandoned the possibility of developing a new three-factor index. There is interest in raising awareness of the information collected through the profiles. These profiles can be used as a way to address how effectively we can assess our research libraries in a qualitative fashion so we can get to the point to view the annual statistics with truly new eyes. There is a group of RLLF fellows that is trying to look at the profiles with an eye of informing potential changes in the annual ARL Statistics. The report and the recommendations were accepted by the committee. [Note: the

report was presented to the membership during the Business meeting and a follow up *RLI* article was published in August 2010 based on this report].

In relation to the annual statistics, there was confirmation that the ARL Board accepted the committee's recommendation to cease the publication of the annual ARL Preservation Statistics. The ARL Board also wishes that the committee engages in a systematic review of the annual surveys and there will be more information regarding this set of activities in the coming months. Sarah Pritchard mentioned an older effort that took place in the past that informed planning for the statistics and other efforts was a survey done on what keeps directors up at night.

Even though time was short the committee attempted to address some of the issues related to the annual surveys. In particular we were asked whether we are modify the reference transactions question the way the NCES Academic Libraries Survey decided to modify the survey – that is by asking a separate question regarding virtual reference transactions. Committee members agreed that we do not want to split further an activity that overall is declining.

Another question regarding whether libraries can count HathiTrust/GoogleBooks volumes was brought forward. Again the committee members agreed that if our definition relies on cataloging records we can follow the same guideline for these items – if cataloged it may be counted. This issue though needs broader discussion as it relates to the emerging concept of the collective collection.

These are some the very questions that are indicating that our annual stats do not get onto what we try to accomplish. What we try to do is to describe the breadth and depth of the content that would be available to our users. Due to time limitations the committee deferred further discussion on the annual data elements to the October meeting. The meeting was adjourned.

ARL Statistics and Assessment

Review of Activities, Projects, and Priorities as of September 2010

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2010
<p>1. Statistics and Assessment Committee</p> <p><i>Focus on revising annual surveys to reflect changing trends in scholarly communication and public policies, emerging transformations, and new roles</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerate the assessment agenda • Collect evidence that is useful in influencing laws, public policies, regulations, and judicial decisions • Explore analytical frameworks that demonstrate the benefits of open access • Support new models for the management and access to government information by collecting appropriate evidence • Ensure wide use of the data to ensure better understanding of research library operations • Advocate ARL's strategic directions and support ARL member libraries improvement strategies <p><i>Provide evidence that influences the marketplace so as to advance fair pricing</i></p> <p><i>Provide evidence that supports new modes of scholarly communication</i></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><i>Accomplishments since July 2010 ARL Board Meeting noted in purple.</i></p> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistics and Assessment follow up to the Board/Task Force recommendations - collect profile qualitative data describing research library contributions and develop new data elements for services, collections and collaborative relations. Preliminary report delivered at the April membership meeting and is on the ARL directors' wiki: http://directors.arl.org/wiki/institution-profiles; final report anticipated November. • ARL Statistics survey definitional issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on NCES ALS committee discussions, decided not to modify questions regarding reference transactions to include virtual reference transactions - Further discussion and clarification required on whether titles definition can include titles beyond volumes held - Digital library variables instructions also need further clarification/modification. • Following the recommendations of the report, "Safeguarding Collections in the 21st Century," the Statistics & Assessment Committee ceased the annual collection of Preservation Statistics and is focusing on more strategic aspects of preservation activities. • The Board approved the Task Force on Reviewing ARL Statistics, Supplementary Statistics and Annual Salary Survey charge and formation. Members will be drawn from the Statistics and Assessment Committee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collected 86 profile descriptions from member libraries. Agility funds were used for coding the profiles in Atlas.ti with help from librarians in the field (J. Rutner, Columbia, M. Maciel, Texas A&M) in addition to ARL staff. Four RLL Fellows (Robert Fox, Georgia Tech; Patrick Reakes, Florida; Bryan Skib, Michigan; Ann Snowman, Penn State) are engaged in the analysis and synthesis of the profiles with the goal of extracting meaningful variables to revise the annual statistical surveys. The coding of the profiles has been completed and the materials were presented at the ARL April business meeting. A full report will be available in November. A June discussion between the RLLF fellows and the survey coordinators is captured at: http://libraryassessment.info/?p=538 • Collected titles in addition to volumes. • Guest Editor for special RLI issue 271 on "Value in Libraries: Assessing Organizational Performance, August 2010." • ARL released University & Library Total Expenditures Data for 2007-2008. • Survey Coordinators and SPEC Liaisons meeting took place on June 25, 2010. • Participated in the ACRL <i>Academic Library Trends and Statistics Survey</i> editorial subcommittee of the ACRL Publications Committee (formerly ACRL Statistics Committee).

Statistics and Assessment • Review of Activities, Projects, and Priorities as of September 2010

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2010
<p>1. Statistics and Assessment Committee, continued.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gordon Fretwell was recruited to serve as consultant to the Statistics and Assessment Committee. • Sustain communication with liaisons to external organizations such as ALA/ACRL, NISO, CARL, ABDU, SCONUL, and LIBER. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participated in the ACRL Assessment Committee and consulted on the report, <i>The Value of Academic Libraries, A Comprehensive Research Review and Report</i> by Megan Oakleaf. • Participated in the NCES Academic Libraries Advisory Committee and offered revisions for the Academic Libraries Survey. • Participated in the NISO Library Statistics Committee engaged in maintenance of the existing standard. Presented at a NISO webinar on September 8, 2010.
<p>2. StatsQUAL® A gateway to library assessment tools including ARL Statistics™, LibQUAL+®, ClimateQUAL®, MINES for Libraries®</p> <p><i>Support infrastructure, research and development and operational activities that ensure the evidence collected for strategic purposes, as articulated in item #1, is readily available and usable</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deploy StatsQUAL® gateway with new tools; enhance LibQUAL+® Analytics; augment ARL Statistics Analytics; refine the family of StatsQUAL® websites including LibQUAL+®, ClimateQUAL®, MINES for Libraries®, ARL Statistics™; automate the production of the .pdf publications. • Develop Value/ROI tools building upon earlier work at Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Tennessee and other libraries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migrated ARL Statistics Interactive Edition from University of Virginia to our in-house ARL Statistics™ Analytics supported by the StatsQUAL® infrastructure http://www.arlstatistics.org/; working on making available a subscription model for non-profit and for profit organizations. • LibQUAL+® /StatsQUAL® Booth at ALA, January and June 2010, training and community meetings were well attended and a great success.
<p>3. LibQUAL+® Charting Library Service Quality</p> <p><i>Understanding and tracking user perceptions systematically over time through well-documented and thoroughly researched protocols</i></p> <p><i>Track user perceptions of how libraries affect their desired outcomes (academic advancement,</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LibQUAL+® training scheduled for January 10, 2011, in San Diego, CA. • LibQUAL+® Share Fair planned in conjunction with the Library Assessment Conference, October 2010. • Full-day training on how to use results effectively planned as a pre-conference workshop at the Library Assessment Conference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LibQUAL+® Lite in production. • Highlights from Session I (Jan-May) 2010 available on the LibQUAL+® website. 141 institutions completed the survey, collecting more than 150,000 surveys from faculty, graduate and undergraduate students primarily in colleges and universities.

Statistics and Assessment • Review of Activities, Projects, and Priorities as of September 2010

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2010
<p>3. LibQUAL+® Charting Library Service Quality, continued.</p> <p><i>... success, etc.) and how libraries are used as physical buildings, remote gateways, and how they compare to other popular gateways like Google</i></p> <p><i>Foster a culture of excellence in providing library service</i></p> <p><i>Help libraries better understand user perceptions of library service quality</i></p> <p><i>Collect and interpret library user feedback systematically over time</i></p> <p><i>Provide libraries with comparable assessment information from peer institutions</i></p> <p><i>Identify best practices in library service</i></p> <p><i>Enhance library staff members' analytical skills for interpreting and acting on data</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research underway to understand the full implications of implementing LibQUAL+® Lite such as trends over time, faculty perceptions trends, etc. • The new LibQUAL+® Lite protocol has a median time for completing the survey of five minutes, while the median time for completing the long version is nine and a half minutes. LibQUAL+® Lite also appears to increase the response rate: 42% of long surveys garner complete responses, compared to 53% of Lite surveys. To date, 147 institutions have collected over 165,000 complete surveys from undergraduate and graduate students and faculty in 2010. About 68% of all surveys presented to users have been of the Lite version. • Implementing a translation of the survey in Arabic. • Service Quality Evaluation Academy accepting nominations for 2011. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data were collected across ten different countries with sizable cohorts of libraries from the USA (70 libraries) and Canada (46 libraries). The LibQUAL+®-Canada effort represented the second country-wide implementation since 2007. • Opened LibQUAL+® registration for 2011. • Three presentations/ articles on LibQUAL+® Lite at the Second Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML 2010) International Conference, Chania (Crete), Greece, May 27, 2010, by Cook, Kyrillidou & Thompson: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does using item sampling methods in library service quality assessment affect zone of tolerance boundaries?: A LibQUAL+® Lite study. - Does using item sampling methods in library service quality assessment affect score norms?: A LibQUAL+® Lite study. - Does using item sampling methods in library service quality assessment affect zone of tolerance boundaries?: A LibQUAL+® Lite study. • Awarded three in-kind grants for 2010: Elizabeth City State University - G.R. Little Library, Castleton State College Library, Capital Community College Library. Issued call for 2011 grants.
<p>4. MINES for Libraries®/E-Metrics</p> <p><i>Understand value and impact of new roles and services</i></p> <p><i>Describe digital library operations and their effect on users</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor developments with Project COUNTER, the ScholarlyStats project, and other external efforts aiming at the development of decision support systems for libraries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed data collection for the third of a three-year implementation of MINES for Libraries® at Iowa (2007-2010). Final report delivered.

Statistics and Assessment • Review of Activities, Projects, and Priorities as of September 2010

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2010
<p>4. MINES for Libraries®/E-Metrics, continued.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MINES for Libraries® at the University of Toronto and OCUL (2009-2010); experiment to identify differences between mandatory and optional method; partnering with Catherine Davidson (RLLF Fellow) on presenting a paper at the Library Assessment Conference. • Analyze further ARL Supplementary Statistics and consider revisions when needed in definitions (see Areas of Activity, Underway and Planned #1). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted IMLS demonstration grants for MINES for Libraries® in partnership with PALCI. OCUL study is underway with modifications regarding sampling plan and optional/mandatory requirements.
<p>5. Lib-Value (ROI)</p> <p><i>Explore the value proposition and return on investment of library operations in relation to research, teaching, learning, space and other important dimensions of the established and emerging library roles and responsibilities</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lib-Value will provide evidence and a set of tested methodologies and tools. The three-year grant began on 12/1/2009. 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), Judy Luther and Joe Matthews (Independent Consultants). • Lib-Value monthly phone calls as well as an in person meeting in August. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collected feedback on Lib-Value project at ALA Midwinter during the Library Assessment Forum from participants regarding research areas of interest to the community. During ALA annual organized workshop with Lib-Value partners at George Washington University on June 26. A workshop with Stephen Town (York University, UK) at ALA annual on Value and Impact was held on June 28. • Lib-Value: Tennessee (Lead-PI: Carol Tenopir) with Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Co-PI: Paula Kaufman), and ARL (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.

Statistics and Assessment • Review of Activities, Projects, and Priorities as of September 2010

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2010
<p>6. Effective, Sustainable and Practical Assessment</p> <p><i>Building assessment capacity within organizations and supporting individual growth in this area for improved alignment of strategy and metrics</i></p> <p><i>Supporting publication of research results in statistics and assessment</i></p> <p><i>Building a community of practice around library assessment</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning is underway for Library Assessment Conference, October 25-27, 2010, in Baltimore. Advisory committee met in January and June. Plenary speakers: Fred Heath (Texas), Joe Matthews (San Jose), Danuta Nitecki (Drexel), Megan Oakleaf (Syracuse), Stephen Town (York). Arranged with John Bertot, editor of <i>Library Quarterly</i>, for special theme issue to be published before the conference. Sixty percent more proposals submitted for this iteration than in 2008 (more than 200 proposals submitted). A peer review process ensured a competitive and fair selection process. Registration is at full capacity with more than 450 people attending. • Library Assessment Conference: Planning competitive poster session with two step judging process: expert choice and people's choice award. Library Assessment Career Achievement Award nominations solicited. • Implementation in Library Scorecards work is moving along with Johns Hopkins, McMaster, Virginia and Washington having developed 'strategy maps' and are working on their metrics. Additionally, exploring how Balanced Scorecard activity for these four informs next steps in ARL data collection activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library Assessment Forum on January 15 featured discussion on Lib-Value, and a presentation by Linda Plunkett (Boston). June 25 Forum focused on budget justifications and economic impact. See: http://libraryassessment.info/?p=536 • Selected five articles from 2008 Library Assessment conference to be published in <i>Performance Measurement and Metrics</i> special issue. • METS workshop held in January and June; collaboration with Rick Beaubien (California, Berkeley) and Nancy Hoebelheinrich (Knowledge Motifs, Inc.) on both. Plans underway for additional workshop in San Diego, January 2011. • Working with Jim Self, Steve Hiller, and Raynna Bowlby on next steps for strengthening assessment activities in libraries. Further exploration regarding the establishment of a consulting service to meet the needs of library organizations that are currently facing planning and reorganization challenges. Tentatively branding the new service Organizational Performance Assessment (OPA).

Statistics and Assessment • Review of Activities, Projects, and Priorities as of September 2010

Areas of Activity	UNDERWAY AND PLANNED	Summary of Accomplishments Since Jan. 2010
<p>7. Human Resources</p> <p><i>Describe the level of racial/ethnic diversity in ARL libraries, salary trends for professionals, and the economic and competitive health of those salaries</i></p> <p><i>Increase our understanding of improving organizational climate and diversity support</i></p> <p><i>Understand demographic trends in the profession</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage a larger number of libraries in organizational improvement issues; define next steps in helping libraries with short-term decision making to reach long term goals, presenting on ClimateQUAL® / StatsQUAL® at the October Library Research Seminar at the University of Maryland. • Stanley Wilder forwarded proposal to study demographics as part of his dissertation research; additional demographic data collected every five years will be asked as part of the ARL Annual Salary Survey 2010-2011. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ClimateQUAL® participants convened in January & June; three libraries implemented in 2010 and three more are interested for fall; normative data updated on the Web. Financial sustainability beyond the implementation of the survey once every four years to be supported by repeat participation. • ARL Annual Salary Survey available at: http://www.arl.org/stats/annualsurveys/salary/index.shtml • ARL Annual Salary Survey mailing 2010-11 available at: http://www.arl.org/stats/annualsurveys/salary/salform10.shtml • Presented on ClimateQUAL® at the National Diversity Conference in July.
<p>8. SPEC Survey Program</p> <p><i>SPEC topics are aligned with ARL's strategic initiatives and make the program more visible to savvy researchers; grounded in information that the authors seek to support their own institutional planning and development, participation can benefit ARL institutions' directly along with the broader library community.</i></p> <p><i>For more than 35 years ARL has gathered and disseminated data through the SPEC survey program to assist libraries in the continuous improvement of their management systems.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for Proposals for 2011 SPEC Survey Topics http://www.arl.org/news/pr/spec-26april10.shtml 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPEC survey program gathers information on current research library operating practices and policies and publishes the SPEC Kit series as guides for libraries. Topics for 2010: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Special Collections Engagement by Adam Berenbak, et al, North Carolina State – Impact Measures in Research Libraries by Zsuzsa Koltay and Xin Li, Cornell – Services for Users with Disabilities by Suzanne Brown, Florida – Diversity Plans and Programs by Toni Anaya and Charlene Maxey-Harris, Nebraska-Lincoln – Evaluating E-resources by Richard Bleiler and Jill Livingston, Connecticut – Core Benefits by Brian Keith, Florida

Statistics and Assessment • Review of Activities, Projects, and Priorities as of September 2010

ARL PROFILES: EMERGING THEMES

Robert Fox
Patrick Reakes
Bryan Skib
Ann Snowman

October 13, 2010

A project report presented to the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee.

Background

Four members of the 2009-2010 ARL RLLF program (Bob Fox, Pat Reakes, Brian Skib, and Ann Snowman) selected the Qualitative Profile initiative as their RLLF group project. The group began conversations with Martha Kyrillidou, Senior Director for ARL Statistics, in March 2010 about the Qualitative Profile initiative and potential contributions by the fellows in support of the initiative. The agreed scope of the project was that the fellows would use information gleaned from the profiles to make recommendations that might inform future changes to the ARL Annual and Supplementary Statistics. Initially, the fellows read the submitted profiles, worked to complete the profiles for their home institutions, and reviewed the initial data coding of the profiles as it became available. Through a series of conference calls, Martha and the fellows refined the possible scope and deliverable for their project and the themes that were beginning to emerge from the profiles. The fellows attended the Statistics and Assessment Committee meeting at the April 2010 ARL Membership Meeting. At this meeting, Committee Chair Bill Potter distributed a draft committee report on the profiles. Armed with the report and their previous observations, the fellows drafted a list of themes that warranted consideration. The fellows distributed this list to the other program fellows and asked them to share it with others at their institutions. We specifically requested consideration for which of the themes warranted additional study, how they might be studied or be appropriate for data collection, and with what frequency. Where some type of data collection might be warranted, we also asked for recommendations on the appropriate collection mechanism (ARL Annual/Supplementary Statistics, SPEC survey, ARL Salary Survey, etc.) The form that we distributed is attached as Appendix A.

Potential Themes

The themes that emerged from the review of the profiles are:

- Development/Fund Raising/Grantsmanship
- Digital publishing
- E-science/Data curation and management
- Collaborations across all levels and on/off campus
- Scholarly communication
- Assessment activities/Space utilization
- Social networking tools/mobile applications
- Staffing changes (i.e. new or reworked positions, new job titles, degree requirements)
- Collaborative collection building/development
- Warehousing/remote storage
- Instruction activities - current statistics include actual classroom instruction but do not capture efforts preparing materials for asynchronous instruction or the use of those materials (web guides, podcasts, etc.)
- Digitization efforts beyond or more specific than those already collected in the Supplementary Statistics (IRs, created and converted digital collections, etc.)

Horizons - an open-ended question requesting feedback from each institution annually on areas of emerging interest - new services, trends, services/resources you no longer provide, etc.

Responses to potential themes

In addition to input from the four fellows working on the project, we received 21 additional responses to our request to review the potential themes. These responses are summarized below by theme. The full responses are attached as Appendix B.

Development

Respondents in general believed this to be an important area for libraries and somewhat valuable for data collection. Responses were more mixed on what information might be collected. While dollars are very measurable, some concern was expressed whether grant funding should be separated from general fund raising. There were also concerns on how deferred giving/estate planning gifts and in-kind gifts might be addressed. Some respondents thought that a narrative report or a SPEC survey might be best here rather than statistics.

Digital Publishing

While there were several respondents who agreed that digital publishing activities represented a growing area of interest for research libraries, there was little consensus on what should be measured or how often. Suggestions for potential questions included: How many new e-journal titles did your library publish this year? How many e-journal issues did your library publish this year? How many e-books did your library publish this year?

E-science/Data curation

There was consensus that this area was very valuable but a concern was expressed that e-science *activity* may not yet be widespread enough to merit annual collection. Many libraries might answer that they are thinking about this type of service but are not actually providing the service yet. Please note that a report on E-science activities was published August 2010 and is available at: <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/reports/index.shtml>

Collaborations

While collaborative partnerships are critical for research libraries, there was little interest expressed in collecting any information here. Most respondents felt that there was little that could be quantitatively expressed and that any attempt to do so would be based on ambiguous criteria.

Scholarly Communications

There was recognition of the significant impact of this theme but almost no interest in attempting to address it through the annual or supplementary statistics. A number of respondents did feel that a narrative report possibly including best practices would be of value. Two recent SPEC Kits, SP299 Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives, August 2007 and SP310 Author Addenda, July 2009, have addressed scholarly communication components but perhaps a survey with a broader scope may be valuable.

Assessment

Respondents indicated little interest in collecting information regarding assessment activities. There was limited interest in a narrative report or SPEC survey but there has been a somewhat recent SPEC Kit (SP303 Library Assessment, December 2007).

Space Utilization

While one respondent suggested number of square feet renovated and cost per square foot for renovations as possible measureable data points, there was little overall interest in data collection for this theme. There was interest, however, in looking at studies of space utilization and reviewing innovative uses or best practices associated with library spaces. This theme may be valuable for a SPEC or ad hoc survey.

Social Networking/Mobile Applications

One potential question suggested for mobile applications would solicit the percentage of library-student interactions accomplished through mobile devices versus other methods. Most respondents though did not feel that either of these themes lent themselves well to data collection and that a SPEC survey would be the appropriate venue for determining library usage here. SP304 Social Software in Libraries, July 2008, does address social networking but may be suitable for an update at some point. It does not appear that mobile applications have been a SPEC survey subject.

Staffing Changes

Respondents indicated a broad interest in areas such as new types of library positions and changing educational requirements for positions. There was also some interest in folding succession planning into this topic. While some respondents believed the topic might warrant annual or periodic data collection, no potential questions were offered. The potential for a SPEC survey was also noted. Previous SPEC Kits (SP256 Changing Roles of Library Professionals, May 2000; SP257 The M.L.S. Hiring Requirement, June 2000; and SP276 Recruitment and Retention, September 2003) have provided some coverage for this area but are several years old so it may be timely to revisit this theme.

Collaborative Collection Building

Respondents believed this theme to be valuable and felt that a SPEC survey would be the most appropriate tool to address it. There are no recent SPEC Kits focusing on this theme.

Warehousing/Remote Storage

Respondents had very mixed reactions to this theme. Some felt the theme was valuable enough that it should be included with the annual statistics. Potential questions included the percentage of collections in remote storage and whether remote storage was managed on an institutional or consortial basis. One respondent felt a SPEC survey would be valuable. Others questioned whether

the use of remote storage should be studied at all as they viewed it not as any quality or service measure but simply a reflection that the library lacked shelving space.

Instruction Activities

There was widespread interest in this theme. Respondents felt that the current statistics did not adequately reflect efforts in this area. Particularly, respondents indicated that the current statistics should be amended to include asynchronous instructional activity such as number of podcast or web guide views. There was also interest in noting how many libraries link instructional support tools to course management systems.

Digitization Efforts

There was interest in broadening the current data collection for this theme in the supplementary statistics to collect specific information on the number of “born digital “ and converted documents added as well as more detailed information on institutional repositories.

Horizons

We asked respondents to comment on the value of an open-ended question each year seeking institutional response on new services, trends, emerging interest areas, and areas where services have either been reduced or discontinued. While some respondents noted that the question would produce no quantifiable information or might be too broad, all agreed that it would be interesting to see the ideas shared.

Summary

Respondents supported amending the current annual and supplementary statistics to seek additional information on instructional and digitization activities. They also believed an open-ended “horizons” question could produce an interesting view on current trends and should be considered for inclusion with the annual statistics. They felt that several of the themes (Development, Scholarly Communication, Assessment, Space Utilization, Mobile Applications, Staffing Changes, and Collaborative Collection Building) could be studied in future SPEC surveys though some may be more appropriate as an ad hoc survey. Limited interest was expressed in adding either annual or supplementary statistics questions in the areas of development, digital publishing, space renovation, and mobile application usage. These may warrant further attention but lacked strong support at this time. Finally, there was interest expressed in having an ongoing periodic narrative report from member institutions that went beyond the quantitative information supplied through the annual and supplementary statistics. Perhaps some version of the qualitative profile could fill this expressed need for telling the stories of how libraries meet their user needs.

The findings of this report will be shared with members of the Statistics and Assessment Committee, the upcoming statistics task force, and with key ARL personnel to determine which themes warrant data collection and what collection and reporting mechanisms would be most appropriate.

This report and its appendices are available online at:
<http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/profilesRLLFproject.pdf>

Task Force on Reviewing ARL Statistics, ARL Supplementary Statistics, and ARL Annual Salary Survey

Sponsor:

ARL Board and ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee

Background:

Historically ARL member libraries have provided annual survey data to ARL for the purpose of describing research libraries and their contributions to research, teaching and learning. The annual data collection takes place through the ARL Statistics survey, the ARL Supplementary Statistics Survey and the ARL Annual Salary Survey. Based on the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee recommendations and with support from the ARL Board of Directors, the ARL Preservation Statistics that used to be part of the annual survey cycle was discontinued after 2008-09. In general there is a need to focus the annual data collection on strategic and critical issues facing research libraries.

The data collection activities are being used by member libraries to plan for salary allocations and budget justifications, understand trends in research libraries, especially for investments, collections and staffing, identify similarity of characteristics for prospective ARL member libraries, and articulate commonality of purpose among ARL member libraries among other things. The data are readily available to member libraries as soon as they are submitted by the institutions and used frequently by library directors. The final edited data are published and analyzed in a variety of ways including print publications, pdf and spreadsheet files on the ARL website, analytics through the StatsQUAL+® gateway and often peer reviewed articles examining trends. The data are often cited and used by policy analysts, local campus newspapers, and higher education administrators.

The ARL Statistics annual survey has been augmented over the years to include variables that are deemed important to collect. For example, the ARL Statistics annual survey incorporated data on government documents in 1990-91, and different collection formats in 1992-93 to demonstrate that research library collections extend beyond volumes and serials. In 1994-95 service activity variables were included to demonstrate that services are important in addition to collections; in 2003-04 expenditures for electronic resources were included to signify the growing portion of the materials budget spent on electronic resources and services; in 2006-07 and 2007-08 libraries started collecting serial titles instead of serial subscriptions and in 2008-09 titles held in addition to volumes held. The latter changes emphasize the need to have information on the extensiveness of the collections rather than the sheer number of physical units.

Typically the ARL Supplementary Statistics has served as a testbed for doing trial data collection on new questions for a period of years before these variables are transferred into the annual ARL Statistics. In 2003-04 the ARL Supplementary Statistics was overhauled to include data on digital collections, usage of electronic resources, and digitization activities. Some of these data elements

have proven hard to collect in a reliable and consistent manner across member libraries. Yet the importance of getting reliable indicators of digital library activities in ARL libraries has not waned.

The ARL Annual Salary Survey was last revised in 2004-05 by augmenting the Functional Specialist category with different job codes. The need to look into the definitions of the job categories is often surfaced and should be addressed as part of the Task Force's work. Library workforce is undergoing a lot of changes and the job definitions need to reflect the current environment.

The key question the ARL Board and the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee has identified is: Are we asking libraries to collect annual data on issues that are strategic and important in a rapidly changing environment? While the proposed task force on 21st century collections is undertaking the task to provide a vision that describes "the range of new content and new formats, many of which may not yet exist," the Task force on reviewing the annual surveys needs to focus on the empirical evidence that describes the reality of research libraries here and now.

Charge:

The task force is charged to review the annual surveys and drop, revise, or add to the survey instruments and the instructions by focusing on issues of strategic importance in terms of describing research libraries and their contributions to research, teaching and learning. The annual surveys include the ARL Statistics, the ARL Supplementary Statistics and the ARL Annual Salary Survey. The task force should regularly communicate progress to the ARL leadership and membership during business meetings.

Strategies:

The Task Force may consider establishing subgroups for the different surveys and an action timeline for different strands of investigation; look closely at the recently collected ARL member profiles; conduct an empirical investigation of the existing annual data. The effort will be informed by many ARL initiatives including the ARL Profiles, the Scenarios Toolkit, the Balanced Scorecard project, the effort led by the RLLF group to propose new questions based on the profile descriptions, and the 21st Century Collections Proposed Task Force among other efforts.

Timeframe:

The task force is expected to commence its work in the Fall of 2010 and move forward with revisions to the annual surveys that will be mailed in 2011 and possibly continue with further changes in 2012. The task force should complete its work by the end of calendar 2012. Consideration of the group's recommendations will likely continue in the years following 2013.

Resources:

The task force will require regular staff support during the life of the project. While the task force members will take the lead in writing any documents and planning any events, ARL staff would

benefit from the assistance of a visiting program officer and/or a consultant assigned to the project. Staff will work with the task force chair in efforts to identify and recruit appropriate expertise to work closely with the task force.

Composition:

Recommended: 6-8 individuals drawn from the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee, consultants, and representatives from the survey coordinators. At least one member should liaise with the 21st Century Collections Task Force.

ARL Statistics Chronology

ARL Supplementary Statistics 2003-04. New form including new data elements that were developed through the ARL E-Metrics pilot, one of our New Measures Initiatives; ***stopped publishing ARL Supplementary Statistics report*** to allow for *a period of adjustment, learning and experimentation* with the new variables and definitions within the ARL libraries.

ARL Statistics 2003-04. Incorporated useful data elements from earlier ARL Supplementary Statistics into main survey.

* December 2004 ARL Task Force on New Ways of Measuring Collections established (focus groups conducted by task force members)

ARL Supplementary Statistics 2004-05. Revised instructions to reference Project COUNTER for items measuring usage of electronic resources. Project COUNTER is an effort supported by ARL. Project COUNTER promotes the development of a code of practice for publishers and vendors in reporting use statistics for electronic resources to libraries in a standardized way.

ARL Statistics 2004-05. Revised instructions for Serials purchased encouraging libraries to report electronic serials subscriptions that are bundled with print subscriptions under serials purchased. It allows easier reporting of serials purchased when there are small surcharges, demonstrates that electronic subscriptions are becoming mainstream and the primary purchasing unit, helps libraries demonstrate readiness at the emerging possibility of canceling print in favor of electronic.

* 2006 Released reports from consultants on qualitative and quantitative approaches to ARL Statistics data gathering

ARL Statistics 2006-07. Key revision in the way serials are reported (de-duplication of serial titles whenever possible across formats). An extensive ARL Statistics FAQ document is accompanying the survey forms providing insights on how to count e-books, electronic serial titles, and digitization activities through the Google and Open Content Alliance activities. ARL organized a series of training sessions providing background on the changes implemented, the new ARL Expenditures-focused index and the future directions of experimentation as we attempt to identify more robust variables that describe (a) services, (b) collections and (c) collaborative relations.

* 2007 Implemented Library Investment Index replacing the historical ARL Membership Criteria Index in its public form

ARL Statistics 2007-08 "serial titles received, not purchased" revised to streamline data collection in areas important for serials not purchased (consortial serials, freely accessible, print exchanges/gifts, government documents). This change reflects recommendations from the Ad Hoc Task Force on Best Practices for Counting Serial Titles adopted by the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee.

ARL Supplementary Statistics. Published 2007-08 and 2006-07 editions after three years of keeping these data unpublished. Figures related to digital library statistics, and to a lesser extent, usage statistics counts are causing concerns because of lack of standardization.

* Fall 2008 ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee members experimented with profile descriptions

ARL Statistics 2008-09 Introduced new variable 'Titles held' in addition to 'Volumes held' to facilitate the transition from emphasis on the container to emphasis on content.

* 2009 Collected 88 ARL library profile descriptions

* 2010 Analysis of ARL library profiles underway

May 2010 Annual survey issues under discussion at the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee:

1. Based on discussions at the NCES ALS committee, explore possible modification to the questions regarding reference transactions to include virtual reference transactions
2. Titles definition needs further discussion and clarification as to whether it can include titles beyond volumes held
3. Digital library variables also need further clarification and modifications in instructions; email request from ARL director to drop collecting these data
4. How is ARL handling the digitization of collections digitized by Google? Are these stats being reporting in ARL Pres Stats?

*** July 2010 Task Force Charge on Reviewing the ARL Statistics, ARL Supplementary Statistics and the ARL Annual Salary Survey approved by the ARL Board**

ARL STATISTICS 2009-10

WORKSHEET

This worksheet is designed to help you plan your submission for the 2009-10 *ARL Statistics*. The figures on this worksheet should be similar to those in the "Summary" page of your web form, except in cases where data are unavailable. 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 _____

PAGE ONE – VOLUMES AND TITLES:

1. Volumes held June 30, 2010 (1.a + 1.b) (1)

1a. Volumes held June 30, 2009 (1.a) _____

1b. Volumes added during the year (1.b.i – 1.b.ii) (1.b) _____

(i) Volumes added – Gross (1.b.i) _____

(ii) Volumes withdrawn during year (1.b.ii) _____

2. Titles held June 30, 2010 (2)

3. Number of monographic volumes purchased (3)

4. Basis of volume count is: (4) _____ Physical

Bibliographic _____

PAGE TWO – OTHER COLLECTIONS

SERIALS

5. Total number of serial titles currently received, including periodicals (5.a + 5.b)
(5) _____

5a. Number of serial titles currently purchased (5a.i + 5a.ii) (5a)

5a.i Electronic (5a.i) _____

5a.ii Print (and other format) serials purchased (5a.ii) _____

5b. Number of serial titles currently received but not purchased
(5b.i + 5b.ii + 5b.iii + 5b.iv) (5b)

5b.i Consortial (5b.i) _____

5b.ii Freely accessible (5b.ii) _____

5b.iii Print (and other format) – *Exchanges, gifts, etc.* (5b.iii) _____

5b.iv Government documents (5b.iv) _____

6. Government documents are included in count of Current Serials? (6) _____ Yes _____
No

OTHER LIBRARY MATERIALS

7. Microform units (7)

8. Government documents not counted elsewhere (8)

9. Computer files (9)

10. Manuscripts and archives (linear ft.) (10)

AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

11. Cartographic (11)

12. Graphic (12)

13. Audio (13)

14. Film and Video (14)

PAGE THREE – EXPENDITURES

15. Are the below figures reported in Canadian dollars? (15)

_____ Yes

_____ No

16. Total Library Materials Expenditures (16.a + 16.b + 16.c + 16.d) (16)

16a. Monographs (16a) _____

16b. Serial titles, including periodicals (16b) _____

16c. Other Library Materials (16c) _____

16d. Miscellaneous (16d) _____

17. Contract binding (17)

18. Total Salaries and Wages (18.a + 18.b + 18.c) (18)

18a. Professional staff (18a) _____

18b. Support staff (18b) _____

18c. Student assistants (18c) _____

19. Fringe benefits are included in expenditures for salaries and wages? (19) _____

Yes

_____ No

20. Other operating expenditures (20)

21. Total library expenditures (16 + 17 + 18 + 20) (21)

ELECTRONIC MATERIALS EXPENDITURES

22. One-time electronic resource purchases	(22)

23. Ongoing electronic resource purchases (e.g., subscriptions, annual license fees)	(23)

24. Bibliographic Utilities, Networks, and Consortia	
24a. From internal library sources	(24a) _____
24b. From external sources	(24b) _____
25. Computer hardware and software	(25)

26. Document Delivery/Interlibrary Loan	(26)

PAGE FOUR – PERSONNEL AND PUBLIC SERVICES**PERSONNEL** (Round figures to nearest whole number.)

27. Total Staff FTE (27.a + 27.b + 27.c) (27)

27a. Professional staff, FTE (27a) _____

27b. Support staff, FTE (27b) _____

27c. Student assistants, FTE (27c) _____

STAFFED SERVICE POINTS AND HOURS

28. Number of staffed library service points (28)

29. Number of weekly public service hours (29)

INSTRUCTION

30. Number of library presentations to groups (30)

30a. Is the library presentations figure based on sampling? (30a)
 _____Yes _____No

31. Number of total participants in group presentations reported in line 30 (31)

31a. Is the total participants in group presentations figure based on sampling? (31a)
 _____Yes _____No

REFERENCE

32. Number of reference transactions

(32)

32a. Is the reference transactions figure based on sampling?
_____ Yes _____ No

(32a)

PAGE FIVE – PUBLIC SERVICES AND LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS**CIRCULATION**

33. Number of initial circulations (excluding reserves) (33)

34. Total circulations (initial and renewals, excluding reserves) (34)

INTERLIBRARY LOANS

35. Total number of filled requests provided to other libraries (35)

36. Total number of filled requests received from other libraries or providers (36)

PhD DEGREES AND FACULTY

37. Number of PhDs awarded in FY2009-10 (37)

38. Number of fields in which PhDs can be awarded (38)

39. Number of full-time instructional faculty in FY2009-10 (39)

ENROLLMENT – FALL 2009

(Line numbers refer to IPEDS survey form.)

40. Full-time students, undergraduate and graduate (40)

(Add line 8, columns 15 & 16, and line 14, columns 15 & 16.)

41. Part-time students, undergraduate and graduate (41)

(Add line 22, columns 15 & 16, and line 28, columns 15 & 16.)

42. Full-time graduate students *(Line 14, columns 15 & 16.)* (42)

43. Part-time graduate students (*Line 28, columns 15 & 16.*)

(43)

FOOTNOTES

On the web form, you will be able to add 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 use the footnotes in the *ARL Statistics 2008-09* for comparison if necessary. Please consult the Data Repository under www.arlstatistics.org for a copy of last year's footnotes. These can be found under "Data Repository" after you login to 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. **Please use a concise sentence/paragraph format when writing footnotes—do not use bullets or make a bullet list.**

NOTE: Any change over 10% in any answer to any of the survey's questions over the preceding year's response (2008-2009) should be addressed with a footnote.

Submit the completed questionnaire by **October 15, 2010.**

For assistance, please e-mail Martha Kyrillidou (martha@arl.org) or Shaneka Morris (shaneka@arl.org)
Tel. (202) 296-2296.

ARL SUPPLEMENTARY STATISTICS 2009-10 WORKSHEET

Reporting Institution _____ Date Returned to ARL _____

Report Prepared by (name) _____

Title _____

Email address _____ Phone number _____

Contact person (if different) _____

Title _____

Email address _____ Phone number _____

Definitions of the statistical categories used in this questionnaire can be found in the COUNTER Code of Practice (http://www.projectcounter.org/code_practice.html) and in *Information Services and Use: Metrics & statistics for libraries and information providers--Data Dictionary*, NISO Z39.7-2004 (<http://www.niso.org/home>).

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, 2010**. If your library's fiscal year is different, please use footnotes to explain.

If your library does not perform a given function or had no activity for this function or if the appropriate answer is zero or none, use **0**. If an exact figure is unavailable, check NA/UA.

Please do not use decimals. All figures should be rounded to the nearest whole number.

Electronic Books

1. Number of electronic books held. (1) _____

This number is a subset of volumes held reported in Q1, in the ARL Statistics.

2. **Expenditures for electronic books.** (2) _____

Include annual access and service fees paid directly or through consortial arrangements. Include initial purchase cost only for items purchased this fiscal year. Expenditures here are only for the electronic books reported in (1).

3. **Are the above expenditures reported in Canadian dollars?** (3) _____ Yes
_____ No

Use of Networked Electronic Resources and Services

4. **Number of virtual reference transactions.** (4) _____

Virtual reference transactions are conducted via email, a library's website, or other network communications mechanisms designed to support electronic reference. A virtual reference transaction *must* include a question *either* received electronically (e.g., via e-mail, WWW form, etc.) *or* responded to electronically. A transaction that is both received and responded to electronically is counted as *one* transaction. Exclude phone and fax traffic unless either the question or answer transaction occurs via the manner described above. Include counts accrued from participation in any local and national projects, such as DigiRef and the Library of Congress's CDRS (Collaborative Digital Reference Service).

A reference transaction is an information contact, which involves the knowledge, use, recommendations, interpretation, or instruction in the use of one or more information sources by any member of the library staff (e.g., circulation, technical or reference services).

This number is a subset of reference transactions reported in Q32, in the ARL Statistics.

5. **Does your library offer federated searching across networked electronic resources?** (5) _____ Yes _____ No

Networked electronic resources may include any information resource, such as databases, journals, e-books, reference materials, and non-textual resources that are provided to the library's users through licensing and contractual agreements. Include electronic resources that institutions mount locally.

6. **Number of sessions (logins) to databases or services.** (6) _____

- 6.a. **Number of resources for which you are reporting.** (6.a) _____

A session or login is one cycle of user activities that typically starts when a user connects to an electronic resource and ends with explicit termination of activities (by leaving through logout or

exit) or implicit termination (time out due to user inactivity). Report here those figures that you derive from Database Report 1 and Database Report 3 in the COUNTER Code of Practice. In a footnote, please include the types of resources reported in 6a.

7. **Number of searches (queries) in databases or services.** (7) _____
- 7.a. **Number of resources for which you are reporting.** (7.a) _____

A search is intended to represent a unique intellectual inquiry. Typically, a search is recorded each time a search request is sent/submitted to the server. Report here those figures that you derive from Database Report 1 and Database Report 3 in the COUNTER Code of Practice. In a footnote, please include the types of resources reported in 7a.

8. **Number of successful full-text article requests.** (8) _____
- 8.a. **Number of resources for which you are reporting.** (8.a) _____

Items reported should include only full-text articles as defined in the COUNTER Code of Practice. Report here those figures that you derive from Journal Report 1 in the COUNTER Code of Practice. In a footnote, please include the types of resources reported in 8a.

9. **Number of virtual visits.**
- 9.a. **Number of virtual visits to library's website.** (9.a) _____
- 9.b. **Number of virtual visits to library's catalog.** (9.b) _____
- 9.c. **Excludes virtual visits from inside the library?** (9.c) ___Yes ___No

Virtual visits include a user's request of the library web site or catalog from outside the library building excluding the number of pages or gratuitous elements (images, style sheets) viewed. Exclude, if possible, virtual visits from within the library, from robot or spider crawls and from page reloads.

A visit is usually determined by a user's IP address, which can be misleading due to Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and Firewalls or Proxy Servers. Thus, this measure is actually an estimate of the visits.

Library Digitization Activities

10. **Number and Size of Library Digital Collections.**

- 10.a. Number of Collections.** (10.a) _____
- 10.b. Size (in gigabytes).** (10.b) _____
- 10.c. Items.** (10.c) _____

Library digital collections can include born digital materials or those created in or converted from different formats (e.g., paper, microfilm, tapes, etc.) by the library and made available to users electronically. This includes locally held digital materials that are not purchased or acquired through other arrangements (e.g., vendor, individual or consortial licensing agreements). Born digital collections can include materials self-archived in an institutional repository. Created or converted digital collections can include electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs); special collections materials; maps; sound recordings; and films.

For each type of collection (e.g., subject, theme), include the size (in gigabytes) and, if possible, the number of items (e.g. digital objects or unique files) in each collection. Exclude back up copies or mirror sites since items should be counted only once. Exclude e-reserves. In the footnote, provide a paragraph describing the general nature of library digital collections and, if possible, provide the URL where collections are listed.

11. Use of Library Digital Collections.

- 11.a. Number of times items accessed.** (11.a) _____
- 11.b. Number of queries conducted.** (11.b) _____

Number of times library digital collection items (unique files) were accessed and the number of searches (queries) conducted (if there is such a capability) during the reporting period. Please explain in a footnote how library digital collections are accessed, and if possible, list the URLs of those collections.

12. Direct cost of digital collections construction and management.

- 12.a. Direct cost of personnel** (12.a) _____
- 12.b. Direct cost of equipment, software or contracted services.** (12.b)

Report annual direct costs (personnel, equipment, software, contracted services and similar items) spent to create digital materials (texts, images, and multimedia) or to convert existing materials into digital form for the purpose of making them electronically available to users. Include expenditures related to digitization, OCR, editorial, creation of markup texts, and preparation of metadata for access to digitized materials, data storage, and copyright clearance.

Exclude expenditures for information resources purchased or acquired from outside the institution through individual or consortia licensing agreements.

Please describe any additional funding (university, state, private grants, etc.) provided specifically for the library's digitization activities in a footnote. Also provide a footnote for any cost-recovery operations.

13. Volumes Held Collectively [i.e., Withdrawn] (13)

The defining criterion for this number is that the library formerly devoted financial resources for the purchase of these items and is now taking responsibility for their availability through participation in a cooperative that supports shared ownership. The library may demonstrate commitment to shared ownership through a shared storage facility, or similar collaborative arrangements, by supporting a consortium financially through a legally binding arrangement. Report here volumes originally held that were withdrawn from the local collection beginning with fiscal year 2003-04. Note that this is not the number of volumes held in a shared storage facility but literally volumes withdrawn from your collection.

This number is a subset of volumes withdrawn in Q1.b.ii reported in the ARL Statistics beginning with fiscal year 2003-04. Report here the cumulative number beginning with fiscal year 2003-04.

Exclude volumes held collectively because they are held by other organizations such as the Center of Research Libraries (CRL) that are supported by membership dues and determination on whether to maintain membership may vary from year to year.

Footnotes: Please provide footnotes as requested. 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 to www.arlstatistics.org. Please use a concise 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 (2008-09) should be addressed with a footnote.

Submit the completed questionnaire by **October 15, 2010**.

For assistance, please call the ARL Office at (202) 296-2296,
or e-mail Martha Kyrrillidou (martha@arl.org) or Shaneka Morris (shaneka@arl.org).