

**NCES Academic Library Survey
Advisory Committee Meeting
Midwinter Meeting 2004
San Diego, CA
Minutes**

Meeting: Friday, January 9, 8:30-12:30 a.m., San Diego Marriott, Irvine Room

Present:

Committee Members:

Susan Anderson	Bill Miller
Brinley Franklin	Carolyn Norman
Marthas Kyrillidou	Leland Park
Leslie Manning	

Ex Officio:

Bob Molyneux (NCLIS)	Jeffrey Williams (NCES)
Patty O'Shea (Census)	Kat Bork (ALA)
Hugh Thompson (ACRL)	Gerald Hodges (ALA)

1. Preliminaries
 - a. Chair Denise Davis was unable to attend the meeting due to a sudden ice storm closing the Portland airport. Jeffrey Williams chaired the meeting in her stead.
 - b. Introductions
 - c. Minutes of meeting in Toronto – The committee approved the minutes.
 - d. Agenda review – Jeff added an item to the agenda concerning information literacy.

Information Items

2. Status of 2002 data report (Jeff Williams and Patty O'Shea)

Jeff began by informing the committee that OMB has new requirements that will affect the 2002 report. The center has new standards, so no more informally produced reports, as rigorous standards are in effect. Jeff also showed the committee the cover for 2000 report. The 2000 ED Tabs report was released in November. Bob Molyneux wanted to know when the 2002 data would be available, Jeff said the first release will be the peer comparison tool and he is planning for it to be up at the end of February. On the ED Tabs front, Jeff announced that Patty O'Shea and her Census colleagues are handling this report this year, which should speed it up. Patty stated they are looking to have the report ready by early June, maybe before Annual Conference. Robert Lerner is new commissioner of NCES, made by recess appointment by the White House because the Senate was on long winter recess. Jeff was able to meet him this week. Robert has a background in the academic world, and was recently a co-partner in a research firm in the Washington area. Bob will send some information he has on Robert Lerner to the committee.

Patty reported on the status at Census. Census gave the *unimputed* file to NCES in November and they are still working with file. This is the first year Census is responsible for ED Tabs. They have also redone the website. It has been a challenging year. Hopefully 2004 will prove smoother. Patty hopes to finish testing the imputation programs by end of January. Kaleen Vaden is the survey director and is absent due to bronchitis, but sends her apologies.

3. Other surveys and projects that do or could have an impact on NCES/ALS
 - a. ACRL (Hugh Thompson)

Brinley asked for clarification on the survey instrument. Several committee members explained that there are several overlapping surveys, but ACRL and ARL use same form. Further, Hugh explained that ACRL's contractor had technical difficulties, which delayed everything. They are also planning to change contractors. The print version will be available in about three weeks. ACRL is preparing new ways to get the data ready for publication. The 2003 year will be going for data collection in February. Susan asked about the response rate, which Hugh gave at about 50%. He thought the lower response rate was due to the contractor problem causing the survey to be delayed until summer, and people just weren't in their offices to fill it out. Hugh wants to work to get more credibility in producing timely data, for which ACRL has a bad reputation.

b. ARL (Martha Kyrillidou)

1. ARL made several changes this year. As chair of the ARL statistics committee, Brinley brought up the need to change the ARL form. ARL will be making the changes next summer. The changes include adding an item about volumes held jointly in shared storage facilities to the main survey. Who should claim the right to count the volumes in a shared facility has been an issue. It was decided to break down the volumes owned into two categories: volumes owned onsite and volumes owned in a shared storage facility that an institution has owned at one time. If a volume was shared from the purchase point then both libraries can claim ownership and count it. Martha went on to explain that the E-metrics survey on identifying electronic resources will move into supplementary collection on electronic resource data. This instrument will be a part of the regular survey as supplement. Brinley said that having people keep an eye on each other prevents problems. Bob wants the data organized so more people, besides Ph.D.s, can use it, such as students. The data would be of use as something going on from the library field, so individuals would not just rely on COUNTER.
2. Martha said Mary Jo brought the committee's attention to issue 230/231 of ARL newsletter, detailing new measures. Leslie asked Martha about the LibQUAL+™ results, which she participated in this year. Military libraries have the highest rate of user satisfaction. There is infrastructure in place to produce the survey. This needs to be maintained to keep the survey going.
3. At International Library Statistics this year, they will have libraries from several European countries. They want to bring attention to the need to have input-output statistics in international libraries. Martha is aware of "U 21," that is small coalition of libraries and describing environments. France wants to see closer contact with ARL to bring their data collection in sync.

c. Oberlin Group (Leland Park)

The questionnaire was sent out in September. They had the results by November. These results are not available outside the Oberlin Group.

d. NCLIS (Bob Molyneux)

Bob has been working on the NCES public library data that begins in 1987. He has the imputations down to look at raw data (he hopes). This is difficult because libraries have undergone name changes over the years. Bob hopes to finish in three months, after which he will give a report on public libraries in U.S. He also passed out a rough version of series of ARL, ACRL, ARL, etc. over several years of working with ALA. This data will not be available in the public domain. Bob wants this series to be

completely available to everyone. Martha suggested using the term “open access” instead of “public domain” when Bob is speaking about this data.

- e. NISO (Denise Davis)
Denise was not able to be present. NISO is looking for a maintenance agency.
4. Gerald Hodges arrived and passed around the job ad for the position of Director of ORS. He doesn't want to lose the position's national credibility, so ALA is conducting a national search for this position. ALA hopes to have someone hired by 2004 Annual Conference. They plan to begin interviewing in March, so any committee member with knowledge of a suitable candidate is encouraged to get this person to apply. ALA has already heard from some quality applicants, but Gerald would like a larger pool. Brinley brought up the issue of the low salary. Gerald said that ALA is willing to go higher, but he defers to HR on this matter. ALA is also willing to extend the search to locate the right candidate. Jeff stated that NCES plans to continue the Advisory Committee, as it is beneficial, and commented that there are plans to look into having just one meeting a year. The committee is encouraged to relay any possible candidate names to Gerald or Kat. Gerald then left to attend another meeting.

Action Items

5. 2004 Form and definitions: confirm changes decided on in Toronto
- a. Expenditures, Bullet 3
The committee decided to include the phrase “Exclude institutional expenditures for new buildings and building renovation.”
 - b. Collections, Bullet 4, Line 22
Consider changes for 2006.
 - c. E-books, Bullet 4, Line 23
The committee agreed to make the changes determined in Toronto. Discussion commenced on an explanation of the changes. The language to be used is “include e-books you have purchased individually or collaboratively.” Delete the sentence in the instructions stating, “Do not include e-books that belong to a consortium.” Leslie asked if the committee wants to separate those volumes bought separately with those bought jointly. Bill reminded the committee that this statistic is always merged in a counting. Jeff suggested that from 2004 the change is inclusive, but discussion on the separating issue will be considered for 2006. Brinley noted that ARL statistics separate journals subscribed to vs. journal received free (i.e. access provided by the state). Leslie noted that Colorado voted to never purchase such things for all state libraries. Patty suggested splitting it now for comparability, to separate those paid for individually and consortially. The committee eventually decided to confirm the 2004 changes as they stand, but this topic will be further discussed in 2006.
 - d. Audiovisual, Bullet 4, Line 25
The phrase “include audio books” will be added after “audio materials”.
 - e. General circulation, Bullet 5, Line 34a
Add to the instructions “Do not include e-book circulation”.
 - f. Reserve circulation, Bullet 5, Line 34b
Patty said she and Kaleen found that there was some confusion on this issue. It has been edited, so it should be clear for the next survey. Leslie wanted to clarify the instructions by changing them to read “report reserve transactions, including electronic.” Martha thought this count might never be accurate as long as it combines print and electronic. Jeff suggested adding no changes in the definition for 2004 and tabling this discussion until 2006. The committee wants survey participants to understand that electronic is included. The language agreed upon was “report reserve transaction of all types, including electronic.”
 - g. Gate counts, Bullet 6, Line 38

The only issue is making sure it's a true zero for electronic libraries. The committee confirmed the change. No change to the form question or instructions. The zero gate count could be edited against the new Part D section to check the box "If the library collection is entirely electronic".

- h. Part G, Bullet 7
The committee confirmed the change to add to the instructions "If the answer was "Yes" at any time during the academic year, respond "Yes".
6. 2004 Form and definitions: matters left open in Toronto.
- a. Survey eligibility
There were four possible changes, three involving electronic libraries. The proposal was to have two questions for survey eligibility. Jeff said the 2004 survey will not be altered, but the committee does want some report for the electronic libraries. Susan thought it might be interesting to have someone from an exclusively virtual library talk to the committee so they can have a better idea on how to address this issue in the future. Patty wasn't worried because there aren't that many virtual libraries out there yet. However, she was concerned libraries who are not entirely electronic will think they have to be, if this type of question is an eligibility question. Carolyn suggested adding a question somewhere else in the survey to determine if a library is virtual. Carolyn thinks Letter A on the form should remain as it is. The term "paid" should be added to "staff" to clarify Letter B. Then a line of "Please check here if the library collection is entirely electronic" could be included in later part of survey, likely the beginning of Part D. In the end, the committee choose only change make one change to the four survey eligibility questions; to add "paid" to Letter B. Patty observed that one has to be very careful about changing historic eligibility questions.
 - b. Current serial subscription, Bullet 4, Line 26
The issue was whether to split current serials into a separate category for electronic. The committee wants to make this split for 2004 because it's a big enough issue at present. Line 26a has not changed. The committee will add a line 26b, as was done in Attachment 2 with editing done by Bill. The line will be change to read "...and general-purpose magazines and newspaper aggregations (e.g. NEXIS)."
 - c. Hours open, Bullet 6, Line 37
The decision was made to change the language from "Hours open in a typical week" to "Number of weekly public service hours". This terminology makes it clear that hours open does not include periods when the library is open only to staff. This is the ARL wording and the definition will be replaced with the ARL definition. Leslie and Bill wanted to specify on line 10 that this entails a physical library, not a virtual. The committee consented to add "physical library" to the wording. Otherwise this question is fine.
7. 2004 Form and definitions: matters that are continually troublesome.
- a. Staff count, see Item 5, Bullet 2.
The committee makes no changes.
 - b. Government documents, see Item 5, Bullet 4, Line 22.
The committee decided to accept Mary Jo Lynch's recommendation to remove all sentences after the fifth to avoid confusion. Government documents are counted only if they are accessible from the library's catalog.
8. 2004 Form and definitions: consider adding item(s) on Information Literacy
See handout from Jeff and Barbara Holton for recommendations. Carolyn recommended dropping the first question because it isn't a priority. Martha proposed adding all the ACRL yes/no questions to the survey. Jeff said they don't want to make such big additions to the 2004 form. Carolyn asserted that all references to "freshmen" should be changed to "students." Other members believed that better questions are available; such as from ACRL

form A & D and should be added to 2004. For example, using questions of Barbara Holton's, 2-4, then adding A & D for ACRL. The committee concurred to not add any information literacy items from the NCES draft list for 2004. This issue will be revisited for 2006. The committee will look at ACRL's yes/no questions and then format some questions for themselves by February via email. Do libraries play a role in providing information literacy? Leslie recommended that teaching the faculty is as much or even more important than teaching the students. The committee selected 5 questions from the ACRL Academic Library Trends & Statistics Information Literacy Questions: Section A question 2, Section B question 1, Section C question 2, Section D question 1, and Section D last question about if students are information literate. Jeff will see what he can do about getting these added.

Note: Per discussion and confirmation at the meeting, all FY 2004 changes to item questions/definitions are comparable to FY 2002 items for editing and imputation purposes except for the following:

E-books (line 23) - now includes e-books purchased individually or collaboratively.

Electronic reference sources and aggregation services (line 26b) - new item.

Information Literacy (Part G) - adding 5 new questions.

9. Leslie brought up Mitch Freedman's email on salary information inclusive on NCES. This is a substantial discussion, so the committee decided no action would be taken in 2004. This will be added to the agenda for Annual Conference.
10. The committee discussed Mary Jo Lynch's former position as Director of ORS. Jeff explained how that position relates to his office. The issue was raised of only meeting once a year in Washington D.C. instead of being dependent on ALA conferences. All expenses could be paid by NCES. The committee wants to ask Gerald about having the new Director of ORS based out of Washington D.C. Leslie mentioned Keith Curry Lance as a possibility for this post. Leland questioned the committee's funding. Jeff explained that funding comes from NCES, NCLIS, and ALA.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:28