October 10, 2003

To: Statistics and Measurement Committee
    David Ferriero, Duke University
    Eileen Hitchingham, Virginia Tech
    Robert Hudson, Boston University
    Ruth Jackson, University of California, Riverside
    Mod Mekkawi, Howard University
    Diane Perushek, University of Hawaii at Manoa
    Carolyne Presser, University of Manitoba
    Sherrie Schmidt, Arizona State University
    Paul Wiens, Queen’s University
    Sandra Yee, Wayne State University
    Jennifer Younger, University of Notre Dame

From: Brinley Franklin, University of Connecticut, Chair
      Julia Blixrud, ARL
      Martha Kyrillidou, ARL

cc: Guests
    Tyrone Cannon, University of San Francisco, ACRL
    Colleen Cook, Texas A&M University
    Carol Diedrichs, University of Kentucky
    Fred Heath, University of Texas
    Maxine Melling, Liverpool John Moores University, SCONUL
    Lou Pitschmann, University of Alabama
    Sarah Pritchard, University of California, Santa Barbara
    Stephen Town, Cranfield University, SCONUL
    Mark Weber, Kent State University

Enclosed are the agenda and supporting documents for the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee meeting that will take place from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 15, at the Westin Grand Hotel, Washington, DC. The first agenda item of the meeting will be the review of the Assessing ILL/DD Services Study in the Washington Ballroom. We will then continue our meeting in the Chevy Chase Room.

The meeting will include reports on current projects and a continuation of the discussion begun last spring on proposed changes to the ARL data collection activities.

Thank you for your interest and participation in the work of this committee. We look forward to a productive meeting.
143rd ARL Membership Meeting
ARL Committee on Statistics and Measurement
Wednesday, October 15, 2003
8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Washington Ballroom and Chevy Chase Room
Westin Grand Hotel, Washington, DC

Note: The parenthetical times shown are estimates only to aid in moving the meeting along. If an issue warrants, we will take as much time as necessary.

Begin meeting in the Washington Ballroom

1. Assessing ILL/DD Services: Briefing on the Study Findings (Mary Jackson) (45 minutes)

ARL undertook a third study of the performance of ILL/DD operations in North American libraries. The study collected data on the 2001-02 performance of medicated and user-initiated ILL/DD operations in 72 research, academic, and special libraries. The project measured unit cost, fill rate, and turnaround time both operations. Cost data included staff, network/communications, delivery, photocopying, supplies, equipment, and borrowing fees. The current findings for the 59 participating ARL libraries will be presented and compared with the results for the 97 ARL participants in the 1996 study. The current study confirms informal, institution-specific studies and impressions that user-initiated services provide better service to users than mediated ILL. Overall, user-initiated services have lower unit costs, higher fill rates, and faster turnaround times than mediated ILL.

Attachment: To be distributed

Outcome: Understanding of study results

Reconvene in the Chevy Chase Room at 9:00am

2. Introductions and Meeting Overview (Brinley Franklin) (5 minutes)

Committee members and guest will introduce themselves and guests will be welcomed. A brief review of 2003 Statistics and Measurement Programs will be given.


Outcome: Knowledge and understanding of 2003 activities
3. Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)

Attachment 3: Minutes from the May 2003 meeting

Outcome: Approval of minutes

4. Project SAILS (Julia Blixrud, Mark Weber) (10 minutes)

Project SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) is being let by a team from Kent State University to develop a tool to measure information literacy skills and assess the impact of information literacy programs on student learning. Phase I participants met at ALA June and reviewed draft reports from their spring test administration; final reports were recently issued. The call for participation for Phase II was issued in the spring and 40 institutions are administering SAILS in 2003-04.

Attachment 4a: “Project SAILS: Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills” (article from ARL Bimonthly Report 230/231)
Attachment 4b: List of Phase II participants
Attachment 4c: Project SAILS Update

Outcome: Understanding of project status

5. Changes to ARL Data Collection Activities (Brinley Franklin, Sarah Pritchard, Sandra Yee, Jennifer Younger, Martha Kyrillidou) (30 minutes)

A subcommittee was established to address a variety of questions that arose regarding the major variables in the ARL descriptive statistics. Three items were handled in the May 2002 meeting (moving items from the supplementary statistics to the main statistics data collection activities, testing more measures for electronic resources, and publishing the ARL Membership Criteria Index in the ARL Statistics publication). The subcommittees remaining work focused on the issue of accounting for volumes that libraries deposit in remote storage facilities or hold collaboratively with other institutions.

Attachment 5: Subcommittee recommendation on volumes held

Outcomes: Understanding of the data collection changes
Consensus on how to handle volumes held

6. E-Metrics (Brinley Franklin, Martha Kyrillidou) (30 minutes)

Feedback on issues related to the ARL E-Metrics pilot effort as the tested variables are incorporated into the annual supplementary data collection, which will begin in July 2004 with collection of data for 2003-04.
7. **LibQUAL+™** (Colleen Cook, Fred Heath, Martha Kyrillidou, Stephen Town, Maxine Melling) *(30 minutes)*

The LibQUAL+™ research and development project undertaken by ARL in collaboration with Texas A&M has completed its final year of FIPSE funding. 308 libraries participated in 2003 and over 120,000 individuals submitted survey responses providing libraries with a wealth of information about perceptions of service quality. For the first time in 2003, the protocol was applied to a set of public libraries in New York; a British English version was tested with members of SCONUL, and a Canadian French translation of the instrument was developed to support the participation of French Canadians. Institutional and aggregate reports were once again provided shortly after the survey instrument closed. After four iterations and revisions of the survey instrument, three dimensions of library service quality have surfaced: library as place, information control, and affect of service. A representative from SCONUL will share their experience with LibQUAL+™. Registration for 2004 is now open until mid-December and LibQUAL+™ is now an ongoing service quality assessment program at ARL.

**Outcome:** Understanding of current developments

8. **NSF/NSDL LibQUAL+™** (Colleen Cook, Fred Heath, Martha Kyrillidou) *(10 minutes)*

Additional funding from the National Science Foundation is helping ARL and Texas A&M develop an adaptation of LibQUAL+™, called e-QUAL, for the digital library environment. Currently in qualitative stages of research, the ARL/Texas A&M study team is studying digital libraries via interviews site visits and focus groups. An initial set of survey questions are planned for testing in late 2003 with a second round scheduled for spring 2004.

**Outcome:** Understanding of current status of the e-QUAL project
9. **Project MINES** (Brinley Franklin, Martha Kyrillidou) *(10 minutes)*

   MINES is a transaction web survey using a pop-up protocol. It focuses on identifying the demographics of users of electronic resources and the purpose of their use of these resources. A proposal has been submitted to the Ontario Council of University Libraries.

   Attachment 9: “Documenting Usage Patterns of Networked Electronic Services” (article by Brinley Franklin and Terry Plum for *ARL Bimonthly Report* 230/231)

   Outcome: Understanding the development of Project MINES

10. **Changes to Functional Specialist Category of the ARL Salary Survey** (Jennifer Younger, David Ferriero, Eileen Hitchingham) *(15 minutes)*

   Members of the ACRL Personnel Administrators and Staff Development Officers Discussion Group look at the Functional Specialist category of the ARL Salary Survey and recommended changes to clarify the positions included in the category in order to ensure more comparability in use of the resulting data. A subgroup of the Statistics and Measurement Committee volunteered to review the recommended changes.

   Outcome: Understanding the status of the discussion in relation to recommendation for changes to the Functional Specialist category in the ARL Salary Survey

11. **October 2004 Fall Program** (Brinley Franklin, Martha Kyrillidou) *(10 minutes)*

   The Statistics and Measurement Program proposes organizing a one-day program after the October ARL membership meeting on Assessment and New Measures issues. It is asking for support for the concept from the Statistics and Measurement Committee.

   Outcome: Decision on support for an October 2004 Program on Assessment and New Measures that can be forwarded as a recommendation to the ARL Board

12. **Information Items**

   **Project COUNTER** (Martha Kyrillidou) *(5 minutes)*

   ARL is one of the original sponsors of Project COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of NeTworked Electronic Resources), an international initiative designed to facilitate the exchange of online usage statistics. Release 1 of the COUNTER Code of Practice, which
focuses on journals and databases, was agreed to and issued in December 2002. Seven publishers have reported they are now COUNTER-compliant. COUNTER was initially supported by umbrella organizations and major publishers, but is now soliciting institutional member support from libraries and other constituencies. For more information, see <www.projectcounter.org>.

Learning Outcomes Working Group (Brinley Franklin, Julia Blixrud) (5 minutes)

In addition to their oversight of Project SAILS, the Learning Outcomes Working Group is continuing their investigation into how libraries can participate in campus assessment activities. Tasks in progress include development of a SPEC survey to assess ARL library activities, conversations with individuals working on national student learning assessment surveys, and a white paper that provides a literature review and environmental scan.
**ARL Objective:** To describe and measure the performance of research libraries and their contributions to teaching, research, scholarship, and community service. Performance Measures also includes the New Measures Initiative whose programs develop new approaches for measuring and improving library service effectiveness, diversity, and leadership.

**Priorities for 2003**

- **Statistics and Measurement:** Collect, analyze, and publish valuable, quantifiable information about research libraries and their parent institutions; Continue to clarify and refine existing definitions to ensure that data about e-journals and e-books are systematically and consistently represented in ARL statistics; Provide workshops in programmatic areas related to statistics, data management, and assessment.

- **New Measures Initiative:** Support development of the New Measures agenda; Continue to identify measures that indicate the roles libraries play in support of campus learning outcomes; Establish LibQUAL+™ and E-Metrics as regular service activities; Define next steps for determining how libraries support institutional outcomes; Support work on developing an instrument to collect data on the allocation of staff time to library service areas.

Specific New Measures project priorities include:

- **LibQUAL+™:** Establish the LibQUAL+™ suite of services as a cost-recovery service activity; Continue to expand the application of LibQUAL+™ in new types of libraries, geographic areas, and languages; Conclude the FIPSE grant from the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education that partially funds the project.

- **E-Metrics:** Continue testing proposed measures to determine if there is enough consistency of results to extend to whole ARL community; Promote Project COUNTER to develop an achievable and widely supported common code of practice for vendor-based online usage statistics; Identify core set of data that vendors can provide to libraries.

- **NSDL Digital Library Assessment Project (e-QUAL):** Implement interviews with users of various NSDL collections and modify the LibQUAL+™ protocol by incorporating relevant experience from the various New Measures projects to advance the goals of the NSDL LibQUAL+™ project.

- **Assessing ILL/DD Services:** Distribute the final instrument for mediated ILL in February and the instruments for user-initiated...
and turnaround time in March; Analyze and disseminate results to each participant for their review in June; Prepare final report and publicize findings to the community in the fall of 2003.

- **SAILS**: Launch the SAILS project with Kent State University; Offer the necessary training to all participating libraries; Administer the SAILS instrument via the Web at 10 libraries to spring 2003 and 30 libraries in fall 2003.

**KEY ACTIVITIES IN 2003**

1. **Statistics and Measurement Program**

   **Data Collection and Publication**
   
   Completed collection, analysis, and publication of the following data:

   - ARL Supplementary Statistics 2001–2002
   - ARL Academic Health Sciences Library Statistics 2001–2002
   - ARL Membership Criteria Index for 2001–2002 was distributed to members via e-mail on April 7, 2003

   **Important Changes in ARL Data Reporting**
   
   Informed by lessons learned from the New Measures Initiative over the last five years, the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee decided on the following changes: (a) in the ARL Statistics, the “volumes held” category will be revised to account for the positive impact of collaborative de-duping activities that are taking place as a result of volumes transferred or de-accessioned to a shared remote facility; (b) a series of questions will move from the ARL Supplementary Statistics to the annual ARL Statistics starting in 2004, after ten years of testing; (c) the data elements collected through the ARL E-Metrics pilot will be moving into a regular ARL Supplementary Statistics collection cycle starting in 2004; and (d) the ARL Membership Criteria Index will be included in the ARL Statistics publication starting with the 2002-03 edition.

   **Demographic Change in Academic Librarianship**
   
   Using ARL data, Stanley J. Wilder (Rochester) has updated his 1995 research on the age demographics of academic librarians. Published by ARL in August, his new work revisits the aging of librarianship and presents revised projections and updated analysis of demographic trends. But it also brings a somewhat changed perspective, one that recognizes the connection between
the aging of the profession and new entries to the population. The new report employs this broader perspective—as well as substantial new data—to shed fresh light on the demographics of academic librarianship.

**Visiting Program Officers Work with Data-Mining Techniques**

Brendan A. Rapple and Barbara Mento (Boston College) are exploring the extent to which libraries and universities are using data-mining technologies to improve research productivity. A SPEC survey on the extent to which data mining technology is being used at ARL member institutions by researchers, libraries, and administration was published in September 2003.

**2003 Statistics Program Workshops**


2. **New Measures Initiative**

Since 1999, the New Measures Initiative has promoted the development and use of tools to better manage libraries. The initiative has developed new ways to describe and measure traditional and networked information resources and services; mechanisms to assess the relationship between campus information resources, high-quality research, and the teaching and learning experiences of students; and workshops on statistics and measurement issues in research libraries. The New Measures Initiative currently supports the following projects:

**LibQUAL+™** is a suite of services to measure user perceptions of, and satisfaction with, library services. The project emerged from a pilot spearheaded by Fred Heath and Colleen Cook of Texas A&M University Libraries. The goals include the development of tools and protocols for evaluating library service quality, development of effective Web-based delivery mechanisms for those tools, identification of best practices in providing library service, and the establishment of an ongoing, cost-recovery, service quality assessment program at ARL. The transition from a grant-funded activity to cost recovery is being done with the oversight of the LibQUAL+™ steering committee: Duane Webster and Martha Kyrillidou (ARL), Fred Heath (University of Texas), and Colleen Cook and Bruce Thompson (Texas A&M).

**2003 LibQUAL+™ Survey Results Released**

The spring 2003 survey results were distributed to participants during a series of meetings held in Toronto, New York, Albany, Durham (U.K.), Columbus, and Washington, DC. Participants received their individual data results in print form in addition to having them available online. Results from the 2003 LibQUAL+™ survey were published in 11 volumes summarizing data for more than 125,000 library users across 308 libraries, including college and university, community college, public research, and health sciences.
libraries. This year the project expanded beyond North America covering libraries in the UK and the Netherlands. A French language version of the instrument was implemented in two different institutions in Canada.

**ARL Service Quality Evaluation Academy Graduated Second Class**

In May, eighteen participants completed an intensive five-day program of training for library service quality assessment in San Antonio, Texas. The Academy is designed to develop a critical mass of assessment skills within the library profession. During the event, participants engaged in a program of training and education in quantitative and qualitative assessment skills.

**LibQUAL+™ Workshops**

- “New Ways of Listening to Library Users: Tools for Measuring Service Quality.” This popular two-day workshop provided participants an opportunity to discuss user-focused approaches to measuring library service quality with experts in the field. It was offered twice, in September 2002 (jointly with SLA) and in October 2003. The “New Ways of Listening to Users: LibQUAL+™” preconference event was presented in April 2003 at the ACRL Conference. This workshop explained the development of LibQUAL+™, reviewed the process for running the survey, and discussed recent survey results.

- Workshops were given in “LibQUAL+™: Process Management” and “LibQUAL+™: A Total Market Survey” at the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January as well as the “LibQUAL+™ Moving from Data to Action” and “LibQUAL+™ 2003 Results” workshops at the ALA Annual Conference in June.

- LibQUAL+™ held its first international workshop in Bristol, England, in January for the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries (SCONUL) participants, interested European libraries, and other international participants.

- At the CNI Spring 2003 Task Force Meeting, Fred Heath (Texas A&M) and Jonathan Sousa (ARL) delivered a presentation on “LibQUAL+™ from a Technological Perspective: A Scalable Web-Survey Protocol across Libraries.”

- Planning was completed for the November workshop on “Analyzing and Interpreting Your LibQUAL+™ Data with SPSS” that will be led by Bruce Thompson and Colleen Cook (Texas A&M) and Martha Kyrillidou (ARL).

**NSDL Digital Library Assessment Project (e-QUAL).** ARL is collaborating with the Texas A&M University Libraries to adapt the LIBQUAL+™ instrument for use in the digital library environment for measuring the quality of electronic services. The funded proposal, e-QUAL, will focus on the science, math,
engineering, and technology education digital library community. The principal investigators are Duane Webster (ARL); Fred Heath (University of Texas); and Colleen Cook, Yvonna Lincoln, and Bruce Thompson (Texas A&M University). During the past year the project was represented at various NSDL meetings, visits were conducted at the Math Forum, DLESE, and MERLOT, and Martha Kyrillidou submitted a proposal for participation in the NSDL evaluation workshop in September.

**E-Metrics**, a self-funded project originally led by Sherrie Schmidt (Arizona State) and Rush Miller (Pittsburgh), was designed to explore the feasibility of collecting data on the usage of electronic resources. The formal, funded project was completed in 2002 and the project investigators’ report was accepted. ARL libraries continued data collection in 2002-03. Another phase is being planned for collecting data for the period 2003-04. These data elements will move into a regular supplementary data collection beyond that point.

**Members Invited to Participate in 2003-04 E-Metrics Pilot Project**
During 2003-04, the ARL E-Metrics pilot process will be open to additional participants for a modest participation fee. Past participants who have financially supported this project will not be charged any additional fees.

**E-Metrics Project Participants Met at ALA Midwinter**
Participants discussed definition issues in relation to the measures being tested, examined process steps in collecting these statistics, and explored the possibilities for continuing the data collection cycle for a whole fiscal year. Gordon Fretwell, Visiting Program Officer for E-Metrics, supported these activities in early 2003 and Martha Kyrillidou concluded the data collection for 2002-03. During the meeting, it became clear that many libraries are focusing on how to manage the use of database collection more effectively. The large corpus of data generated by these databases indicates the need for a data warehouse infrastructure.

**Project COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of NeTworked Electronic Resources)**
Project COUNTER, an international effort sponsored by ARL as part of the E-Metrics project, aims at developing a uniform code of practice for reporting publisher and vendor statistics to libraries. In January 2003, the COUNTER Steering Group issued Release 1 of the COUNTER Code of Practice that specifies in detail the requirements vendors must meet to have their online usage reports designated COUNTER-compliant. The Code of Practice will be systematically extended to cover other categories of publications, such as e-books. The project is actively supported by the international community of librarians and publishers and by their professional organizations.
Assessing ILL/DD Services. In summer 2002 ARL issued a call to participate in this self-funded study to update, replicate, and expand the 1997 ARL ILL/DD Performance Measures Study. The new study obtained data on the performance of mediated and user-initiated (unmediated) interlibrary loan/document delivery operations in research, academic, and special libraries with a total of 75 ARL and non-ARL libraries participating. Tom Delaney (Head of ILL at Colorado State) and Bruce Kingma (Associate Dean, School of Information Studies, Syracuse University) assisted Mary Jackson (ARL) in the study. ARL will publish a final report and sponsor a series of workshops to disseminate the findings.

SAILS. The Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) is a project developed at Kent State University to create a tool for measuring information literacy and assessing its impact on student learning. It is based on the outcomes defined by the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. Phase I participants met at the ALA Annual Conference in June to review their test results, suggest how data could be best formatted for use by the libraries, and share their experiences in administering the survey to different student groups. Over forty libraries are participating in Phase II of the project and a project briefing session was also held at the June ALA meeting. Phase II will continue to test both the items in the survey as well as how best to administer the instrument within different library and academic settings.

For more information, please contact:

Martha Kyrillidou
Senior Program Officer for Statistics & Measurement
<martha@arl.org>
<http://www.arl.org/stats/>

Julia Blixrud
Assistant Executive Director, External Relations
<jblix@arl.org>
<http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/newmeas.html>

Consuella Askew
LibQUAL+™ Program Specialist
<consuella@arl.org>
<http://www.arl.org/libqual/>

Consuella Askew
LibQUAL+™ Program Specialist
<consuella@arl.org>
<http://www.arl.org/libqual/>

Jonathan Sousa
Technical Applications Development Manager for New Measures Initiatives
<jonathan@arl.org>
142nd ARL Membership Meeting
ARL Committee on Statistics and Measurement,
Wednesday, May 14, 2003
8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Marriott Griffin Gate Hotel Calument Room
Lexington, Kentucky

Minutes of the Meeting

Committee Members present:
David Ferriero, Duke University
Joan Gotwals, Emory University
Eileen Hitchingham, Virginia Tech
Ruth Jackson, University of California, Riverside
Diane Perushek, University of Hawaii at Manoa
Carolynne Presser, University of Manitoba
Sherrie Schmidt, Arizona State University
Paul Wiens, Queen’s University
Sandra Yee, Wayne State University
Jennifer Younger, Notre Dame University
Brinley Franklin, University of Connecticut, Chair
Julia Blixrud, ARL
Martha Kyrillidou, ARL

Guests:
Darrell Bailie, University of British Columbia
Jim Cogswell, University of Missouri
Joyce Garnett, University of Western Ontario
Althea Jenkins, Florida State University
Sarah Pritchard, University of California, Santa Barbara
Mike Ridley, University of Guelph
Matthew Saxton, University of Washington Information School
Denise Stephens, Syracuse University
Mark Weber, Kent State University
Duane Webster, ARL
Karen Williams, University of Arizona

Welcome and Introductions

Brinley Franklin, Chair, convened the meeting and welcomed everyone to the “hardest working” committee as evidenced by the summary of activities in the ARL Program Plan. He encouraged everyone to read the document carefully. Committee members and guests introduced themselves. Sherrie Schmidt moved to approve the minutes of the previous meeting, Sandra Yee seconded and the minutes were approved.
Changes to ARL Data Collection

The first item on the agenda was a report from the task group of Brinley Franklin, Sarah Pritchard, Sandra Yee, and Jennifer Younger. Brinley noted that the longer the subcommittee took to complete its task, the more items were added to its charge. He extended his thanks to his colleagues for their hard work and to Martha Kyrillidou and Julia Bliixrud for their staff support.

A. Measuring “Volumes Held”

The first part of the subcommittee’s charge was to how to recognize the participation of ARL libraries in remote, shared collection facilities. Libraries should not be discouraged from the good management practice of making use of these shared repositories versus keeping their volume count high in order to maintain their standing in the ARL membership criteria index. An extended discussion took place among Committee members regarding the brief proposal of how to address this issue. The University of California system has been working through this issue and their experience provided some options. The discussion centered on three different subcomponents of the issue: volumes held by the library “on campus”, access to volumes transferred to a remote storage facility, and volumes that are collectively purchased or electively contributed to a shared facility. Committee members agreed that volumes deaccessioned are those that the library no longer has access to (i.e., they are withdrawn and removed from the collection). However, there are volumes that a library may withdraw from their catalog and move to a shared facility. The library still retains access to those titles. The use of the term volumes held should include both those items the library has in its active collections as well as those items that may be offsite, but not shared. Committee members agreed libraries should not be able to count volumes the library never owned that are part of shared facilities. The prospective category – new shared collection or shared ownership – refers to such things as a single print backset file for the Elsevier titles. Committee members are committed to continuing the traditional statistics in a more modern environment. Several examples and situations were posed and reviewed. As the Committee continued discussion, it was clear that the three categories were still valid and should be addressed. However, definitions need to be clarified. The subcommittee was encouraged to review the comments and suggestions from the full Statistics Committee and come back in October with better language. Also, the Committee will report to the ARL Board that this issue is being addressed.

B. Moving Variables from Supplementary to ARL Statistics

The ARL Supplementary Statistics serve as a testbed for collecting and analyzing new measures. Several of the measures currently have been collected for more than 10 years. The Committee discussed the subcommittee’s proposal to move most of the items, except questions 2a and 2b (which are breakdowns of electronic serials) in the Supplementary Statistics to the ARL Statistics. Questions about electronic resources will remain part of the Supplementary Statistics survey. The Committee also agreed to drop the questions
about inhouse use, the number of records of locally owned materials in local online catalogs, and the percentage of cataloged library holdings represented by OPAC records. Committee members agreed they no longer provided useful information about changes in libraries. They agreed that in reporting this to the ARL Board, they will also provide an alert to the full membership about the changes in order to allow time for libraries to prepare for the changes.

C. Testing E-Metrics

The E-Metrics project has grown and participation in the 2002-03 project is up to 35 members. If after another year of testing the participants agree the data are collectable, it will be time to move e-metrics variables to the supplementary statistics survey. The data analysis expected this year was slowed some as Gordon Fretwell who volunteered to compile the data had personal issues that prevented him from doing so. Libraries previously participating in the project will not be charged if they wish to participate this year. New participants will be charged the $2,000 fee. The Committee agreed with the subcommittee that the data variables should be moved to the supplementary survey a year from now and recommended that the full ARL membership be alerted to the upcoming survey changes.

D. Publish the ARL Membership Criteria Index

At a previous meeting, Peter Graham (Syracuse) had asked the Committee to address whether it was possible for ARL to publish the ARL Membership Criteria Index in *ARL Statistics*. In the past, ARL had been discouraged from including it in the publication because of a concern it would be misinterpreted as a measure of quality. However, ARL is now making it available on the web and the Chronicle of Higher Education publishes it each year, making it widely available. The Committee agreed that by publishing it ourselves and placing it under the right heading (providing the correct context), ARL would have more control over it. Committee members recommended this change be done as soon as possible and it will be reported to the ARL Board as an action by the Committee.

*ACRL Personnel Administrators Request for Changes to Functional Specialist Category*

An important use of the salary survey job categories is to allow salary comparisons among similar positions. Members of the ACRL Personnel Administrators and Staff Development Officers Discussion Group submitted recommendations to ARL for changes to the current functional specialist category. Committee members discussed the recommendations and their understanding of how the category is used. Should reporting relationships be taken into consideration? Should administrative categories be separated from skill sets? David Ferriero, Eileen Hitchingham, and Jennifer Younger agreed to work with members of the ACRL discussion group to develop a proposal that addresses a level of specificity that would satisfy both members of the discussion group and the Statistics Committee.
ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education

Since the Statistics and Measurement Committee was the hardest-working committee, Brinley asked committee members to do an assignment over the break. Mary Ellen Davis had sent ARL a copy of the draft Standards for Libraries in Higher Education asking for comment and possible endorsement. He asked committee members to review the document and think about how best ARL should respond to ACRL. In the past, ARL partnered with ACRL to develop the university library standards, but there was no request from ACRL for ARL to become involved in crafting this document. Although no one from the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee was serving on the ACRL committee developing this document, staff from ARL libraries were on that committee. ARL Committee members noted that the document is clearly moving from numeric standards to a document that provides guidelines for assessment. It is not prescriptive, but rather more of an evaluation guideline. It is a good document and useful in that role, and could be seen in the same light as the standards for information literacy – libraries use them, but ARL did not formally endorse them. Consensus from the committee was that ARL should convey the sense of the committee discussion to ACRL, but refrain from formal endorsement.

E-Metrics

The ARL E-Metrics project is continuing with over 30 libraries trying to collect data for electronic resources. Committee members discussed the challenges of gathering the data, but the important and potential utility of those data. In particular libraries see some of these data critical for negotiating regional or national contracts. Libraries are also using the availability of the COUNTER Code of Practice as a way to positively encourage vendors to provide consistent data.

Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services

Terry Plum (Simmons) and Brinley Franklin are well on their way to extending their easily administered survey to measure in-library and remote web use. It is a short survey – a 30 to 45 second clickthrough of short questions that is set to randomly sample a set of users. It includes gathering information on the classification of the user, their school or program affiliation, their location, and purpose of use of the online resource. Brinley answered questions about how the survey worked. Committee members discussed the problem of too many surveys of users. Libraries will need to decide when and how often to administer various instruments. This particular survey can help provide information for indirect cost studies. They are conducting three studies in the fall that include both electronic service components as well as regular service components and would be willing to develop a project within the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program. For $2,000, they could handle up to 10 institutions. This fee would cover a sampling visit, a sampling plan, and a data summary. This project could be seen as a nice bridge between the E-Metrics project and the beginnings of qualitative usage of
electronic usage. Libraries interested in participating in this project should let Martha know.

LibQUAL+™

Martha reported that LibQUAL+™ continues to be an interesting project. It is noteworthy that many libraries are changing services because of survey results and it is now possible to see the reflection of user perceptions in those changes. Committee members share their own experiences in administering the instrument and their decisions about how frequently they plan to use it. Sherrie Schmidt and Jennifer Younger reported they plan to run it in their libraries every other year. LibQUAL+™ serves as a means for taking the temperature of your library and results often confirm a director’s own thinking, which leads to the ability to take prompt action for change. David Ferriero shared his experience at Duke in which they showed results with various groups and discussed how gaps could be closed. Diane Perushek verified that the comments are very helpful in clarifying concerns from library users. Results from the Spring 2003 administration will be presented to participants in June at ALA Toronto.

National Science Digital Library Assessment Project

ARL and Texas A&M received funding from the National Science Foundation to adapts the LibQUAL+™ survey instrument for use in the Science, Math, Engineering and Technology Education (SMETE) Digital Library community. The survey is being re-grounded by analyzing qualitative data and conducting focus groups at the Math Forum, DLESE (Digital Library for Earth Systems Education), and MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching).

Project SAILS

Kent State University and ARL have signed partnership agreement. Six institutions signed up for Phase I (Arizona, Auburn, San Jose State, Virginia Tech, Washington State, Weber State), with Oregon continuing to serve as another testbed for the instrument. A call has gone out for Phase II participation with the hope that at least 30 institutions will participate. Administration of the instrument is handled as a range from fully proctored to unmonitored. Some smaller institutions with strong information literacy programs are interested in participating but found the fees prohibited. They also may not be able to test as many students as the project team prefers (minimum is 200). As with LibQUAL+™, we are learning about how best to administer the instrument and what the costs are for running this project. We will accept participants who are first willing to pay. The survey is different in that the data analysis depends on the ability to connect the analysis with the attributes of the person who took the test. Therefore, the human subjects process is more complicated. Institutions have to determine if they can use a disclaimer (Virginia Tech was able to develop a clickthrough process on their front end site) or if consent forms are required (Arizona developed an internal process to obtain signatures from both students and investigators). Phase I participants will meet at ALA
to discuss test administration and review draft reports and Phase II participants will meet
to be introduced to the project.

Updates

Learning Outcomes

The ARL Working Group on Learning Outcomes will now be chaired by Karen
Williams (Arizona). The Working Group continues to investigate member campus
activities, external association efforts about outcomes, and development of an overview
white paper that will provide the ARL community with context and references to learning
outcomes work. Several sessions at the recent ACRL conference in Charlotte focused on
the topics related to outcomes, assessment, and information literacy. Committee
members were encouraged to read work done by George Kuh of the Center for
Postsecondary Research and Planning at Indiana University about the CSEQ (College
Student Experiences Questionnaire).

Assessing ILL/DD Services

Over 70 libraries are participating in the Assessing ILL/DD Services Project. This project is expanding the 1997 ILL/DD Performance Measures Study and obtaining
data on both mediated and user-initiated services. Results are expected late this summer.

Impact of Assessment on Library Management Decision-Making

VPO Susan Beck provided a brief report on her investigation of the impact of
assessment on library management decision-making.

Statistics Standards

Considerable is going on at both the national and international levels to revise
library standards.
Information literacy is the ability to “recognize when information is needed and…locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information.” ¹ This skill set is developed through information literacy programs operated by libraries primarily, but not exclusively, for undergraduates in academic institutions. Are these programs successful? Do they advance the skills of students? How can we measure these programs’ success? Kent State University and ARL have partnered on Project SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills), which is developing an instrument for programmatic level assessment of information literacy skills that is valid and thus credible to university administrators and other academic personnel.

Several years ago, librarians at Kent State University Libraries & Media Services realized that, if university administrators were to be persuaded to allocate resources necessary to grow the information literacy program, librarians must be prepared to substantiate the claim that these skills indeed make a difference institutionally. They must be able to answer such questions as: What are students’ entry skills upon admission to the university, and is there a significant change in skill levels from the freshman year to graduation? If there are significant changes in students’ information literacy skills, do those skills then have any correlation to student’s academic success and retention? The librarians conducted a thorough search of the library literature and determined that the profession was not yet in a position to agree upon the best method for assessing information literacy skills, let alone assert that those skills make a difference.

Librarians need a tool to measure information literacy that could be standardized, is proven to be valid and reliable, contain items not specific to a particular institution or library but assesses at the institutional level, can be administered easily, and provides for both external and internal benchmarking. With such a tool, a library could measure information literacy skills, gather national data, provide norms, and compare information literacy measures with other indicators of student achievement. Libraries would be able to document information literacy skill levels, establish internal and peer benchmarks of performance, pinpoint areas for improvement, identify and justify resource needs, and assess and demonstrate effect of changes in their instructional programs.

Using the Wisconsin Ohio Reference Evaluation Project (WOREP) as inspiration, Lisa O’Connor, Instructional Services Coordinator; Carolyn Radcliff, Head of Reference Services; and Julie Gedeon, Manager of Academic Technology Services Evaluation at Kent State University Libraries & Media Services began using the process of systematic instructional design to develop such a tool in 1998. They chose to use item response theory (IRT) as the measurement model on which to create a new instrument.²

A set of questions of varying difficulty level is being produced to measure information literacy. Each question addresses one of the model learning outcomes as identified by the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education.³ Use of these outcomes will maximize the applicability of the instrument to a wide variety of academic institutions for internal and external benchmarking. The questions are tested with individual students, in small groups, and in field trials (which closely emulate actual survey administrations).

While the SAILS survey is intended to be delivered in electronic form over the Web, it can be delivered using paper and pencil. Using the Web, a random set of about 45 questions drawn from the instrument’s data bank of now approximately 150 items are delivered at the time the test is administered to a student. Project participants can choose the most appropriate testing population for their institution as long as the students are undergraduates.
Institutions can test students in one of three situations:

- **Highly monitored:** The test-taking is proctored and the procedures are consistent across all students. Students check in and out of a specified testing site and the proctor is aware of the testing. A variation of this is when students take the test as a group during class time.
- **Loosely monitored:** Students come to a specified testing site, but do not check in or out.
- **Unmonitored:** Students take the test anytime and from anywhere.

The answers are collected and analyzed using WINSTEPS, a modeling program created by researchers at the Mesa Institute at the University of Chicago.

The Kent State University staff received a grant in fall 2002 from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) for Project SAILS. The three-year grant is supporting continued development of the instrument and testing at other institutions. It will also enable project staff to create the foundation of a results database that will address internal and external benchmarking. The grant also includes funding for the commissioning of three discipline-specific assessment modules, which will serve as a model for future development of other discipline-specific modules.

Since there is significant overlap between student learning outcomes and information literacy, ARL’s Learning Outcomes Working Group recommended that the SAILS Project become one of the projects under the ARL New Measures Initiative. The ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee endorsed SAILS and positioned it as an activity within the Learning Outcomes Working Group agenda. As with other New Measures projects, participating institutions pay fees to cover some of the costs of tool development and data reporting.

Project SAILS is a collaboration between the Information Services and the Libraries & Media Services divisions at Kent State University. Mary Thompson, Interim Liaison Librarian for Business, serves as Project Coordinator; Julie Gedeon manages data measurement and statistics; Lisa O’Connor is in charge of test development; Carolyn Radcliff handles test administration; and Rick Wiggins is the Web Programmer. In addition to project participants, an advisory council provides input for the survey items.

ARL is responsible for coordinating and managing participation for all institutions whether they are ARL members or not. This includes calls for participation; making arrangements for planning meetings, training workshops, and follow-up meetings; and marketing and public relations for the project. Julia Blixrud is the ARL liaison for Project SAILS.

The IMLS-funded activities are divided into three phases. Each phase is examining both the survey items as well as test administration. Participants are also closely involved in working with Project SAILS staff to develop data reports. Phase I was conducted in spring 2003 at seven institutions: University of Arizona, Auburn University, Oregon State University, San Jose State University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Washington State University, and Weber State University. Representatives of those institutions met in June 2003 to review the results of data analysis and to share experiences regarding testing situations.

Phase II covers the fall 2003 and spring 2004 semesters and over 40 institutions have agreed to participate.

Phase III is scheduled for fall 2004 and spring 2005, with a projected participation of 100 libraries. A call for participation for Phase III will be issued in January 2004.
The rapidity by which institutions signed up for Project SAILS and the enthusiasm for participation signals that libraries are looking for tools that can help them determine the effectiveness of their information literacy programs. It is another example of how the leadership of one library working collaboratively with other interested libraries can create a useful, standardized tool to benefit the larger library community.

More information on Project SAILS can be found at <http://www.projectsails.org/>.

Project SAILS Phase II Participants

Adelphi University
Auburn University
Bowling Green State University
Brandon University
Brenau University
Case Western Reserve University
Florida Institute of Technology
Florida International University
Glendale Community College
Kent State University
Miami University
North Carolina State University
Ohio University
Ohio University, Lancaster
Oregon State University
Roosevelt University
Samford University
San Jose State University
Slippery Rock University
University of Alberta
University of Arizona
University of British Columbia
University of California, Irvine
University of Colorado, Boulder
University of Connecticut
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Minnesota
University of Montana
University of Nebraska, Lincoln
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina, Charlotte
University of Oregon
University of Texas, Austin
University of Western Ontario
Utah State University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Washburn University
Washington State University
Weber State University
Williams College
Project SAILS Update  
October, 2003  
Kent State University and ARL

Phase I Testing

Web-based testing commenced in March 2003 with 6 institutions. Testing concluded in June, with the test data being collected on the SAILS server and institutions providing matching demographic data. The test data and demographic data were merged and sent to consultants for analysis. A sample report was prepared for team review and shared with the participating institutions at a meeting held in June in Toronto. Based on those comments, further review, and the identification of clusters of skill sets based on the information competencies, the consultants refined the data analysis process. Reports for all phase I institutions are being put into a final format and shared with participants during October.

Phase II Testing

The call for participation was issued in April 2003, with nearly 60 institutions expressing interest in participating. Approximately 18 institutions attended the planning meeting in Toronto in June. 43 institutions agreed to participate, 21 in Fall 2003 and the rest in Spring 2004. Fall testing commenced on August 18.

Other Activities

Project coordinator Mary Thompson continues to handle the bulk of communication about the project, scheduling, reporting, meeting planning, and updating the Project SAILS web site.

Team members Julie Gedeon, Lisa O'Connor, and Carolyn Radcliff have contracted with MetriksAmerique to handle item analysis and validation, developed more 50 more items, regrouped the ACRL standards, indicators, outcomes & objectives into 13 skill sets, worked with the consultant to validate skill sets and format the data reports.

Web programmer Rick Wiggins is overseeing the design and development of the survey system, managing the web server hardware and software, creating end-user technical documentation for the survey system, presenting technical information at project workshops, and providing extensive technical support to participating institutions.

The consulting company MetriksAmerique (consultants Christine Fox and Svetlana Beltyukova) conducted the analysis of the pilot test data for eight participating institutions, collected and presented evidence of skill set validation by evaluating test items, developed an institutional report based on skill sets, and are developing a template for future benchmarking by skill sets. Our Web programming consultant, David Bird, continues to develop administrative tools for collection of data and other internal web processes.
ARL STATISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE, 2003-04

Please do not leave any lines blank. If an exact figure is unavailable, use “-1” (that is, “U/A”). If the appropriate answer is zero or none, use “0.” For non-university libraries, if a question is not applicable in your library, use “-2” (that is, “N/A”). University libraries should not use –2.

Definitions of the statistical categories used in this questionnaire can be found in Library Statistics, ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995. (Bethesda, MD: NISO Press, 1997.) Also, see: <http://www.techstreet.com/cgi-bin/pdf/free/152592/z39-7.pdf>. However, ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995 does not address issues related to electronic resources. ANSI/NISO Z39.7-1995 has undergone a recent revision and NISO Z39.7-2002 Draft Standard for Trial Use is now available <http://www.niso.org/eminetrics/>. ARL has gradually modified the interpretation of the standard definitions to accommodate electronic resources based on conventions described in the ARL Statistics Q&A at <http://www.arl.org/stats/arlstat/arlstatqa.html>. These conventions have been established through discussions within the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee and with the ARL Survey Coordinators who fill in these surveys on an annual basis.

Reporting Institution ____________________________ Date Returned to ARL ______________

Report Prepared by (name) ___________________________________________________________________________

Title _______________________________________________________________________________________________

Email address ___________________________________________ Phone number ______________________

Contact person (if different) __________________________________________________________________________

Title _______________________________________________________________________________________________

Email address ___________________________________________ Phone number ______________________

COLLECTIONS

Volumes in Library: (See instruction Q1-4.)

   (Exclude microforms, uncataloged govt. docs., maps, a/v material.
   Record figure reported last year or footnote adjusted figure on p. 4.) ______________

2. Volumes added during year -- Gross. (See instruction Q2.)
   (Exclude microforms, uncataloged govt. docs., maps, a/v material.) ______________

2a. Volumes withdrawn during year.
   (Exclude microforms, uncataloged govt. docs., maps, a/v material.) ______________

3. Volumes added during year -- Net. (Subtract line 2a from line 2.) ______________

1. Volumes held June 30, 2003. (Add line 1a to line 3.) ______________

1b. Volumes held collectively June 30, 2003. ______________

1c. Volumes held June 30, 2003 (locally and collectively) ______________

Proposed Instructions and Questions for discussion:

Volumes Held Collectively

Include here (a) volumes withdrawn from the local collection because they are held in a "shared" remote storage facility; (b) volumes purchased jointly and held in a remote storage facility.
(c) ebooks purchased jointly and accessible electronically. The defining criterion is that the library has devoted financial resources for the purchase of these items and is taking responsibility for their availability through participation in a cooperative that supports shared ownership; the cooperative exists only to serve the participating member libraries for storing shared collections and it does not exist as an independent library itself that would qualify for membership to ARL; volumes from the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) should not be reported here but membership to CRL may be indicated with a footnote. In case the cooperative gets dissolved every participating member library is the rightful owner of portions of the available collection.

Question: Should the definition be modified to include a 'shared' contractual agreement? For example, in the absence of a separate shared storage facility, two or more university libraries might agree to share their collections, with the requisite understandings for servicing, preserving, etc., thus allowing each library to withdraw volumes from their collections locally because of this shared storage agreement. But, because they don't have a shared facility, each library would store the volumes they have agreed to store in their own library on-site or off-site facilities. Each library would retain ownership of the volumes they are storing and are continuing to be financially responsible for the storage, servicing and preservation, just as if it were being housed in a shared facility. In case of dissolution of the agreement, every participating member library is just as in the case of shared physical facility, the rightful owner of portions of the available collection.

Question: Should the definition be modified to allow for the reporting of CRL volumes under volumes held collectively or is providing a footnote indicating CRL membership adequate?
Date: June 12, 2003

To: Directors of ARL Libraries

From: Duane Webster, ARL Executive Director

Re: Important Changes in ARL Data Collecting and Reporting

Informed by lessons learned from the accomplishments of the New Measures Initiative over the last five years, and with the understanding that the New Measures projects and experiments need to continue to inform our practices, the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee (chair, Brinley Franklin) decided on the following actions during their meeting in May:

(a) In the ARL Statistics, the data category “Volumes held” needs to be revised. A proposal will be developed and presented to the ARL Membership in October to account in the ARL Statistics for the positive impact of collaborative de-duping activities that are taking place as a result of volumes transferred, and/or de-accessioned, to a shared remote facility. As libraries are moving into more collaborative frameworks, we are trying to develop strategies in our accounting practices that would minimize the negative incentives for participation in national or regional book repositories. The proposal will attempt to neutralize disincentives and encourage good management practices regarding the reporting of shared collections.

(b) A series of questions will be moving from the ARL Supplementary Statistics to the annual ARL Statistics starting in 2004. [See Figure 1]. Some data elements will be dropped altogether. The ARL Supplementary Statistics questionnaire serves as a test bed to collect information on prospective new measures and, in the past, has yielded information on public services and government documents that were moved to the ARL Statistics. The items collected currently in the ARL Supplementary Statistics have been tested for over a decade and a majority of ARL libraries are now reporting these figures in increasingly consistent and reliable ways. The data regarding expenditures for electronic resources especially are deemed very useful and important. Looking back, 1994-95 was the last year the ARL Statistics survey tool and its associated publication was revised with new data elements.

(c) The data elements collected through the ARL E-Metrics pilot will be moving into the regular ARL Supplementary Statistics collection cycle for the year starting in July, 2004. Most of these items relate to the accounting of electronic resources and seek to describe emerging digital library operations. This move will begin to test more widely the data collection that thus far has been on a pilot project basis.

In the meantime, during 2003-04, the pilot process will be open to additional participants for the modest participation fee of $2,000. Past participants to the ARL E-Metrics project who have financially supported this project will not be charged any additional fees. A call for participation to the 2003-04 data collection cycle will follow later during the summer of 2003.
(d) To streamline the way the ARL Membership Criteria Index is disseminated, ARL will include this information in the ARL Statistics publication starting with the 2004-05 annual publication. In the past, ARL was discouraged from including the ARL Membership Criteria Index in the ARL Statistics publication because of a concern that it would be misinterpreted as a measure of quality. However, the Chronicle of Higher Education continues to request the data and publicize the Index annually, making it widely available. Furthermore, ARL makes the Index available through its website as well as through the interactive edition supported by the University of Virginia. The decision to publish the ARL Membership Criteria Index among the many other rank order tables included in the publication will be supported with appropriate explanatory information concerning the character and nature of the ARL Membership Criteria Index.

For additional information regarding these changes, please contact Martha Kyrillidou or any member of the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee.

ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee members:

David Ferriero, Duke University
Joan Gotwals, Emory University
Eileen Hitchingham, Virginia Tech
Bob Hudson, Boston University
Ruth Jackson, University of California, Riverside
Mod Mekkawi, Howard University
Diane Perushek, U. of Hawaii
Carolyne Presser, University of Manitoba
Sherrie Schmidt, Arizona State University
Paul Wiens, Queen’s University
Sandra Yee, Wayne State
Jennifer Younger, Notre Dame
Brinley Franklin, University of Connecticut (Chair)

Figure 1: Changes to the ARL Statistics annual survey to be implemented in the survey instrument that will be mailed out in the summer of 2004.

Items to be moved from the Supplementary Statistics to the ARL Statistics:

Expenditures
1. Computer Files (one-time/monographic purchase)
2. Electronic Serials
3. Bibliographic Utilities, Networks, and Consortia
   3a. Library
   3b. External
4. Computer Hardware and Software:
5. Document Delivery/Interlibrary Loan
**Service Hours and Staffed Services Points**
9. Number of staffed library service points
10. Number of weekly public service hours

**Items to remain in the ARL Supplementary Statistics (part of Emetrics):**

**Expenditures**
2a. Electronic indexes and reference tools
2b. Electronic full text periodicals

**Items to be eliminated from the ARL Supplementary Statistics:**

**Electronic Access**
6. Number of records of locally owned materials in local online catalog
7. Percentage of cataloged library holdings represented by OPAC records

**In-House Use**
8. Number of in-house uses of materials (Figure based on sampling? Yes./No)

Duane Webster  
Executive Director  
Association of Research Libraries  
21 Dupont Circle  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
v: (202) 296-2296  
fax: (202) 872-0884  
cell: (202) 251-4431  
e-mail: duane@arl.org
ARL Supplementary Statistics 2003-04 (E-Metrics)

Please do not leave any lines blank. If an exact figure is unavailable, use –1, i.e., “U/A.” 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______________  

Patron Accessible Electronic Resources

1. Number of Electronic Full-Text Journals. ____________
2. Number of Electronic Reference Sources. ____________
3. Number of Electronic books. ____________

Expenditures for Networked Resources and Related Infrastructure

4. Cost of Electronic Full-Text Journals. ____________
5. Cost of Electronic Reference Sources. ____________
6. Cost of Electronic Books. ____________
7. Library expenditures for Bibliographic Utilities, Networks, Consortia. ____________
8. External Expenditures doe Bibliographic Utilities, Networks, Consortia. ____________

Use of Networked Resources and Services

9. Number of Electronic Reference Transactions. ____________
10. Number of Logins. (Sessions to Electronic Databases) ____________

11. Number of Queries. (Searches) in Electronic Databases. ____________

12. Items Requested in Electronic Databases. ____________

13. Virtual Visits to Library’s Website and Catalog. ____________

Library Digitization Activities

   14a. Items. ____________
   14b. Megabytes. ____________

15. Use of Library Digital Collection. ____________

16. Cost of Digital Collection Construction and Management. ____________

Performance Measures

17. Percentage of annual electronic reference transactions to total reference transactions. ____________

18. Number of virtual library visits out of all library visits. ____________

19. Percentage of the number of electronic books available to users (through either an individual licensing contract or other consortial arrangements) to all the library’s monographs. ____________

Footnotes


Please contact Martha Kyrillidou at (202) 296-2296 or martha@arl.org for assistance.
ARL Supplementary Statistics 2003-04 (E-Metrics)

Instructions for completing the Questionnaire

General Instructions

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

Please do not leave any lines blank. If an exact figure is unavailable, use –1, i.e., “U/A.” If the appropriate answer is zero or none, use 0.

Specific Instructions

Question 1: Number of electronic full-text journal subscriptions that the library provides to users either through an individual institutional licensing contract with the provider of journals or through other arrangements (e.g., regional or state consortium) for which the library pays a reduced or no fee for access.

The full-text journals should provide both search and browse capabilities by title and issue. This is different from journal article databases, such as Expanded Academic ASAP in INFOTRAC, that do not provide browsing capability.

This includes electronic full-text journals offered by established scholarly journal publishing houses (e.g., Elsevier’s ScienceDirect and Academic Press’s IDEAL), scholarly societies (e.g., American Chemical Society journals and American Institute of Physics Online), and services which aggregate content from smaller publishers or from those publishers that prefer to use an external delivery platform (BioOne, Highwire, OCLC ECO, and EbscoOnline). This should exclude general-purpose periodicals such as magazines and newspapers.

Question 2: Number of electronic reference sources and aggregation services that the library provides to users either through an individual licensing contract with the content provider or through other arrangements (e.g., regional or state consortium) for which the library pays a reduced or no fee for access.

This includes citation indexes and abstracts; full-text reference sources (e.g. encyclopedias, almanacs, biographical and statistical sources, and other quick factfinding sources); full-text journal and periodical article collection services (e.g., EBSCOhost, ProQuest, Academic Universe, and INFOTRAC OneFile); dissertation and conference proceedings databases; and general-purpose magazines and newspapers. Licensed electronic resources also include those databases that institutions mount locally.

Question 3: Number of electronic full-text monographs that the library offers to its users either through an individual licensing contract with the content provider or through other arrangements (e.g., regional or state consortium) where the library pays a reduced or no fee for access.
This includes electronic books purchased through vendors, such as netLibrary and Books24x7, and electronic books that come as part of aggregated services. It excludes internally digitized electronic books, electronic theses and dissertations, digitally created archival collections (e.g., Early English Books Online), and other special collections. This also excludes publicly available electronic books to which the library provides web links. It does not include machine-readable books distributed on CD-ROM, or accompanied by print books.

**Question 4**: Expenditures for electronic full-text journal subscriptions that the library provides to its users. Include both initial purchase cost, membership fees (such as JSTOR) as well as annual access and service fees paid directly or through consortia arrangements.

**Question 5**: Expenditures for electronic reference sources and aggregate services that the library provides to users either through individual licensing contracts with content providers or through consortia or other arrangements where the library pays some fees. These fees include both annual access fees and other service costs paid to the vendor directly or through consortial arrangements.

**Question 6**: Expenditures for electronic full-text monographs that the library offers to its users. Include both initial purchase costs and membership fees as well as annual access and service fees paid directly or through consortia arrangements.

**Question 7**: Expenditures paid by the library for services provided by national, regional, and local bibliographic utilities, networks, and consortia such as OCLC, RLG, *excluding fees paid for user database access and subscriptions*, which should be reported in questions 4 through 6.

**Question 8**: Expenditures paid by external agencies, such as state government agencies, on the library’s behalf for access to computer files, electronic serials, or search services through a centrally funded system or consortial arrangements. Examples include state- (or province-) supported networks such as VIVA (Virginia), CNSLP (Canadian National Site Licensing Project), and the University of California’s California Digital Library.

**Question 9**: Number of electronic reference transactions conducted via email, a library’s website, or other network communications mechanisms designed to support electronic reference. An electronic reference transaction must include a question either received electronically (e.g., via e-mail, WWW form, etc.) or responded to electronically. Those transactions that are both received and responded to electronically are counted as one transaction. This count excludes phone and fax traffic unless either the question or answer transaction occurs via the described manner. It includes the 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 a member of the library staff.
**Question 10:** Number of user initiated sessions in licensed electronic resources. A session or login is one cycle of user activities that typically starts when a user connects to a database and ends with explicit termination of activities (by leaving the database through logout or exit) or implicit termination (time out due to user inactivity). Licensed electronic resources also include those databases that institutions mount locally.

**Question 11:** Number of user initiated queries (searches) in licensed electronic resources. 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.

**Question 12:** Number of items requested in all of the library’s licensed electronic resources. These resources may include journal articles, e-books, reference materials, and non-textual resources that are provided to the library’s users through licensing and contractual agreements. The user requests may include viewing, downloading, emailing, and printing to the extent the activity can be recorded and controlled by the server rather than browser.

The items reported depend on the type of content. Examples include citations, abstracts, tables of contents, and full-text articles (ASCII, HTML, PDF, or PS).

**Question 13:** This is defined as user visits to the library’s website or catalog from outside the physical library premises regardless of the number of pages or elements viewed. If a user looks at 16 pages and 54 graphic images while at a website, that user registers one visit on the web server. All visits to the website should be counted regardless of repetition by one user. 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.

**Question 14:** Library digital collection refers to digital materials (texts, images, and audio-visuals) created in or converted from different formats (e.g., paper, microfilm, tapes, etc.) by the library and made available to users electronically. This includes electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs), special collections materials, maps, sound recordings, films, and other digital materials that are not purchased or acquired from outside through individual or consortial licensing agreements. It also includes the number of items (titles) added during the reporting period and includes the number of titles and size (in gigabytes) by sub-categories (ETD, visual materials, texts, multimedia), and as an aggregate at the end of the reporting period.

Examples of visual materials include photos, maps, and postcards. Examples of text include books, journal articles and pamphlets. Examples of multimedia include audio, video, and other interactive materials. However, this statistic does not include any back up copies or mirror sites. Items should be counted only once.

**Question 15:** Number of times library digital collection titles and physical files were accessed and the number of searches (queries) conducted (if there is such a capability) during the reporting period.

**Question 16:** 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, 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 consortial licensing agreements.

Question 17: Percentage of annual electronic reference transactions to total reference transactions. An electronic reference transaction must include a question either received electronically (e.g., via e-mail, WWW form, etc.) or responded to electronically. Count excludes phone and fax traffic unless either the question or answer transaction occurs via the described manner. It includes the counts accrued from participation in any local and national projects, such as DigiRef and the Library of Congress’s CDRS (Collaborative Digital Reference Service).

Total reference = Traditional reference counts (include face-to-face reference transactions, telephone and fax reference counts) + electronic reference transaction counts.

\[
\frac{U1}{P1} = \frac{100}{\text{TOTAL REFERENCE TRANSACTIONS}}
\]

Question 18: Number of virtual library visits out of all library visits.

A virtual library visit is when a user visits the library’s website or catalog for any length of time or for any purpose from outside the physical plant of the library, regardless of the number of pages or items viewed or requested. The term “virtual visit” excludes in-library visits where a patron or a staff member uses electronic resources. If a user looked at 16 pages and 54 graphic images while at a website, that user registers one visit on the web server. A visit is usually determined by a user’s IP address. Due to various server management issues and differing software, this measure is an estimate of the visits to the library site.

All library visits is the total of the number of virtual library visits plus the number of physical visits to the library including branches.

\[
\frac{U5}{P2} = \frac{100}{\text{TOTAL LIBRARY VISITS}}
\]

Question 19: Percentage of the number of electronic books available to users (through either an individual licensing contract or other consortial arrangements) to all the library’s monographs.


Please contact _______ at (202) 296-2296 or ______@arl.org for assistance.
I've got two minor suggestions.

Regarding R1, "Number of Electronic Full Text Journals" (on p. 6 of Data Collection Manual Dec. 2001), it says to exclude "general-purpose periodicals such as magazines and newspapers" from the list.

1. We don't do this for print magazines, right?
2. Not all vendors provide a way to discriminate "general-purpose" titles from the rest.
3. Not all librarians would discriminate the same way (vive la difference!)

So I suggest removing that language entirely.

Secondly, also regarding R1, same page, I would like to suggest removing the exclusion of free government publications and free electronic journals. I say, if it has a fully cataloged record in the library's catalog, we should include it. Particularly the gov docs.

Jody Fagan

At 04:48 PM 1/31/03 -0500, Ladner, Sharyn J wrote:

>We are looking forward to hearing what others think about R3 and other >e-metrics data items. Let the discussion begin!

-------------------------------
Jody Condit Fagan
Reference Librarian
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
jfagan@lib.siu.edu
Currently Reading: Cryptonomicon, by Neal Stephenson
---- Original Message ----

Subject: Re: Problematic definition/scope of e-metrics data item R3  
Date: Sun, 9 Feb 2003 14:41:29 -0600  
From: Sue Phillips <s.phillips@mail.utexas.edu>  
Reply-To: arl-emetrics@arl.org  
To: Multiple recipients of list <arl-emetrics@arl.org>  
References:<Pine.OSF.4.10.10302071824520.23810-100000@lessing.oit.umass.edu>

Gordon & colleagues --

I agree with the suggestions Jody made. It's important that we measure new resources and services, but also keep the relationship to the regular data collection practices in mind.

I included both "free" government document serials (print and/or electronic) as well as the "free" e-journals that we have chosen to catalog in our count of "non-purchased" serial subscriptions for the regular ARL statistics survey. I don't see a logical reason to exclude them from E-metrics measures.

Sue

*************************

At 6:28 PM -0500 2/7/03, gordon.fretwell@library.umass.edu wrote:
> Regarding the two suggestions from Jody Fagan- Are not these suggested
> changes directly in line with the counting practice for resources as
> called for in the Association's Library Statistics survey? I believe they
> are, and would be a valuable link/comparison between "old" measures and
> the new measures. I would be grateful to hear what disadvantages might
> crop up from such a change.
> > Gordon Fretwell
> > University of Massachusetts
> > DuBois Library
> > Amherst, MA 01003-4710
> > 413-545-0284 Office
> > 413-545-6873 Office Fax
> > or
> > 413-367-9573 Home (answering machine, no fax)
> > PO Box 177
> > Leverett, MA 01054
Dear Martha,

Our Digital Initiatives Steering Committee (DISC) at the Ohio State University Libraries reviewed sections D1, D2, and D3 of the E-metrics Recommended Statistics and Measures and considered the implications for three new digital projects that we are working on. (I am co-chairing this group along with Wes Boomgaarden, our Preservation Officer.) We had a few comments/questions that I am passing along to you in the hope that they will be useful to those who are developing the guidelines.

D1
"It includes the number of titles and size (in gigabytes) by subcategories ... and as an aggregate ...."
"It also includes the number of items (titles) added during the reporting period."

We thought that clarification was needed on the definition of "items" and how this relates to "titles" (just as we think about titles vs. volumes for printed materials). "Titles" might apply to some collections (such as ETDs) but not to others.

For example, one of our current projects involves digital images of a collection of buttons. For each button, there could be a view of the front and a view of the back. We also have a ceramics collection that would involve up to 3 images per piece. Should we count each image or each original object that was digitized or both? Should we count the entire collection as just 1 title?

The note at the end of D1 suggests this statistic might be used only locally due to wide variations in the nature of digital collections. If that is the case, then I suppose each institution can come up with its own definitions (with consistency year to year being important); but doing so seems contrary to the purpose of the E-metrics project.

D2
(Under "special considerations") "To the extent possible, exclude accesses by web search spiders."

One of the members of our group noted that the number of spiders accessing a site (as opposed to the number of hits initiated by spiders) might serve as a measure of its usefulness.
D3
Just an observation -- with budget cuts and shrinking staff resources, we aren't sure how realistic it is to expect that a staff member can be assigned to coordinate the collection of cost information for this purpose. Some costs will be easier than others to collect. For example, one of our projects involves outsourcing the digitization and metadata creation so that cost is easy to identify. However, we concluded that we would need to calculate a figure to represent the cost of having the 7 people on our steering committee coordinate the 3 projects that are currently underway -- essentially a composite "salary" and "FTE" for the group as a whole.

We would be interested in knowing the status of the development of these sections of the guidelines.

Sally Rogers
--------------------------------------------------------
Sally Rogers
Assistant Director for Information Technology
Ohio State University Libraries
1858 Neil Ave. Mall
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-292-9204
Fax: 614-292-7859
email: rogers.19@osu.edu
--------------------------------------------------------
On 4/16/03 4:32 PM, Martha Kyrillidou <martha@arl.org> wrote:

> I partly agree too but fundamentally we do need some measure of the
> web
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
> > traffic on a library's web page. Whatever the unit of measurement of
> this
> > traffic is (visit/hits ... in whatever way the various software
> packages
> > define it and configured locally), it is not unlike any of the other
> output
> > measures we have traditionally collected in libraries (circulation,
> reference
> > transactions, gate counts, etc. etc)....

I concur. We do need to do some sort of measuring. I believe it was
Francis Bacon who said, "If you can't measure it, then you can't understand
it."

Instead of measuring "visits", it might be a better idea to count how
many times a Web server's HTML pages were viewed excluding gratuitous image
files, style sheets, robot/spider crawls, page reloads, and views by
library personnel. This is essentially a hit count sans the supporting
documents, just the content.

--

Eric Lease Morgan
University Libraries of Notre Dame

(574) 631-8604
A new initiative now being considered by the ARL Statistics & Measurement Committee is a Web-based survey that a library could administer to collect reliable data on the usage of networked electronic services from both within the library and remotely through the Web. The idea is to build on the experience of studies conducted at five academic health science libraries and two main libraries between 1999 and 2003. In those studies, more than 15,000 library users were surveyed as they accessed their libraries’ networked electronic services. The survey documented why patrons were using electronic resources in those libraries and tracked the differences between in-house and Web usage, comparing the location of the user and their status (graduate student, faculty, undergraduate, etc.) with the purpose of the use.

The methodology measured both in-house and remote usage in a way that allowed the costs of providing networked electronic services to be distributed among the university’s primary functions. In this study, those functions were defined in four categories: sponsored (funded) research, instruction/education/departmental research, patient care, and all other activities. The survey is a pop-up screen administered randomly to users of networked electronic services throughout the year using a statistically valid sampling plan.

The study, now called “Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services” (or MINES), was designed and undertaken by the authors. The researchers concluded that although the computing environments and survey implementations in each library were different, the methodology and overall approach was workable at each library. As a result, they are confident that the data collected are somewhat comparable, recognizing that there will always be distinguishing characteristics driven by the local user population and institutional characteristics.

Experience also led the researchers to conclude that the most effective means to meet the Web survey criteria was to run all access for networked electronic resources through a gateway that authenticated access and passed on the request. Such an arrangement prevents lost data due to bookmarks, non-library Web pages, and other non-library routes to access library networked electronic services.

Initial use of the methodology produced a number of findings useful for guiding decisions on how to manage networked electronic resources. For example, results from the first four academic health science libraries showed that:

- There were approximately four remote networked electronic users for every in-house user.
- Remote users were demographically different from in-library users; the 4-1 ratio was even higher for the category of users who identified themselves as faculty/staff/research fellows.
- The purpose of use reported for remote usage of networked electronic resources was significantly different from in-house usage. For example, those using networked electronic resources to conduct sponsored research do so most intensively from on-campus but not from in the library. Those using these services for instruction/education/non-sponsored research were more likely to be in the library than people using the resources for other purposes.
- Patrons using electronic services for sponsored research represented 34% of the usage in the health science libraries, as compared to 16% in the two main libraries.
The study also found that, despite proxy servers, modem pools, and similar remote enabling services, the patrons being surveyed went to the university to use their library’s networked services. That is, when they used these services they were either on campus or in the library many more times than off-campus. However, the users’ purposes for using electronic resources ranged significantly among the four libraries, underscoring the need to consider local conditions as libraries have different characteristics and user populations.

The authors concluded that MINES’s Web-based survey methodology employed at the seven libraries could serve as a model for similar user studies at other libraries. The discussions now underway within the ARL Statistics and Measurement Committee focus on how to take a next step to apply this methodology to the networked electronic services offered by a more complete complement of research libraries.

A full description of the research project and its findings was first delivered at the Northumbria Lite conference, part of IFLA in Glasgow in 2002. See Brinley Franklin and Terry Plum, “Networked Electronic Services Usage Patterns at Four Academic Health Sciences Libraries,” *Performance Measurement and Metrics* 3, no. 3 (2002): 123–133, <http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/emetrics/Franklin_081102.pdf>. Subsequent findings were recently presented by the authors in September 2003 at the Conference on Users in the Electronic Information Environment in Espoo, Finland.
Networked Electronic Services
Library User Survey

This survey is being conducted by the University in order to assess usage of the Library’s electronic services.

All responses are confidential.

After completing the survey, you will be connected to the service you selected.
Thank you for your help.

Patron Status: Select Patron Status
Affiliation: Select Affiliation
Location: Select Location
Purpose
  ○ A. Sponsored (Funded) Research -- Definition
  ○ B. Instruction/Education/Departmental Research--Definition
  ○ C. Patient Care-- Definition
  ○ D. All Other Activities -- Definition
Resources:

Please fill out Status, Affiliation, Location, and Purpose Fields.

Submit Response

—Copyright 2003 Brinley Franklin and Terry Plum