

**NCES Academic Library Survey
Advisory Committee Meetings
Orlando, FL
Minutes**

Meeting: Friday, June 25, 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., Orange County Convention Center, Room 221D

Present:

Committee Members:

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

Ex Officio:

Kat Bork (ALA)	Patty O’Shea (Census)
Barbara Holton (NCES)	Hugh Thompson (ACRL)
Bob Molyneux (NCLIS)	Kaleen Vaden (Census)

Guest:

Keith Curry Lance

1. Preliminaries

- a. Introductions done by all. Patty O’Shea chaired the meeting.
- b. Logistics – There was a short break at 10:30
- c. Minutes of Meeting in San Diego – No changes made were made to the minutes.
- d. ORS Situation

Gerald Hodges stopped in to give the committee an update on the Office for Research & Statistics. ALA has interviewed and offered the position of ORS Director to a candidate. Gerald acknowledged Kat Bork’s work at ORS since Mary Jo’s retirement. Kat will be leaving ALA on July 6th. Letitia Earvin will be helping with administrative duties when she leaves. The new Director will be able to form his/her own staff if the position is accepted. Gerald has contracted with Keith Curry Lance to represent ORS at various national meetings. If the candidate will not accept the position, the search will be reopened. Gerald explained that this year’s *Survey of Librarian Salaries* questionnaire included a supplementary question regarding support staff job titles for use in future surveys at ALA. Gerald would like the new Director to broaden the definition of research at ALA and have more research coming from the office. Gerald then left for an Executive Committee meeting.

- e. Agenda review – No additions were made at this time.

Information Items

2. NCES update

Barbara Holton reported for NCES. The 2002 data will be available on the Peer Comparison Tool in a week on NCES site. The library website has been redesigned. There will be password access to data by library representatives who have submitted data. The LRs will have access to everyone’s data when they submit their own. OMB cleared the 2004 survey.

3. Census update

Patty reported that everything was redesigned from scratch for 2002. Census is contracting with Pinkerton to design public access tools. This would be a big advance for accessing data. NCES has the 2002 data and is currently going through the adjudication review. Census is focusing on the 2004 survey planning. The letters and calendar have been updated. They are working with Pinkerton to update the web application to receive data. 2004 would be the first year of data to be accessible on web immediately following submission. Susan Anderson asked if any changes will be made to ensure greater data accuracy. The committee discussed including information on where to find the updated data in the letters to library representatives. It was noted that people are more likely to fill out a survey if it will benefit them. By having the data available, they would attain benefit and therefore more readily fill out the survey. Bob Molyneux brought up the issue that NCES has been very slow in making the data ready for availability. Barbara will look into this and locate where the data is found. Bob is very interested in historical data, but it isn't available yet. He suggested showing the benefit of this data so people will fill out survey more readily.

4. Other surveys and projects that do or could have an impact on NCES/ALS

a. ACRL

Hugh Thompson reported that the 2002 results were published in mid to late February. They immediately started collecting the 2003 data. He just sent the printed results to press, and expects a proof to be delivered in the next few days. The response rate was better than the previous year. ACRL will print the results in a three-volume set as usual and will make it available online. The online sales are good. Bill Miller voiced the opinion that having the print volume is good and he wants it to remain available. Hugh Thompson said that this would be possible because he now has on-demand printing. ACRL plans to move up the schedule for collecting the 2004 data this fall. The Library Research Center at the University of Illinois has done an excellent job in collecting the data.

b. ARL

Martha Kyrillidou informed the committee that the major issues this year are the changes in instruments. Moving the supplementary statistics into the ARL instrument will dramatically increase the size, so a new supplementary survey will be issued. It will be called the ARL E-Metrics Survey and will cover electronic resource issues. On the salary survey, there are changes concerning the functional specialist position because it has increased over the years. ARL wants to get better handle on the functional specialist position. Other new measures projects are the Grant Funded Activity with NSDL and the MINES project, focusing on electronic resources that survey those who access articles. Brinley Franklin mentioned that Martha Kyrillidou made data available quickly on the website to ARL participating libraries. These libraries could compare themselves to peer groups. The fact that the data was available so quickly was remarkable.

c. Oberlin Group

Leland Park said they keep on keeping on. No changes were made this year and it is going well. No changes will be made for 2004. Leslie Manning questioned if changes should be considered, because many other surveys are making changes for 2004. Leland feels that this is unnecessary because they are doing well for now. An inquiry was made

if there are any movements to conduct the NCES survey annually. Patty said the NCES budget is tight, so no. Bob noted that the government gets interested in these statistics and then drops it. This causes difficulty in continuity because they don't have the skill set. The fact that ACRL has stepped up to the plate is a good thing.

f. NCLIS

Bob Molyneux reported that the big thing is the trends, essentially 1990-2001, in which all good things went up. NCLIS is having budgetary discussions. Their money might be cut for next year, including the money providing for this meeting. Therefore, Bob might not be here in January. In government library agencies, a more comprehensive strategy is evolving. There was a discussion over the data of the 1970's and how expenditures were positively affected by Sputnik.

g. NISO

Denise Davis gave this update in a document issued prior to Annual Conference and distributed as Attachment C. Bill Miller wondered how the agency that will keep the new NISO standard updated would be funded. Will it be a volunteer group? Martha said an agency will develop some cost recovery program to do this. The committee stated that NISO standards need to be revamped.

Action Items

5. Mitch Freedman's email on salary information inclusive on NCES

This was a request to NCES to collect salary data by staff category and those that comprise FTE staff. Having data on this will help organizations that encourage raising librarians' salaries, such as ALA. Leslie got the impression that Freeman was requesting a detailed breakdown of librarian and clerical staff salaries, but Martha had a different interpretation of this request. Bob said it would be very difficult to work out the definition categories for such a project. The positions and how they are compensated is very different in academic and public libraries. Support staff positions are quite dissimilar to professional library staff positions, because in the former, national searches are not utilized to fill these positions. If these questions are included in the surveys and cause respondent confusion, then they will not respond and the response rate will be terrible. On the subject of support staff questions, Leslie said the ALA salary survey supplemental question was almost impossible to answer. Kat promised to inform ALA.

The committee felt that Freedman requested this data because he has a political point to make, not for purely intellectual curiosity. The collection of this data would take at least three years to properly complete and the purpose of these statistics is not clear. Martha noted that increasing salaries is related to the perceived value of the positions. The associations need to encourage the perception that library positions are valuable. Carolyn said that taking libraries out of the IPEDS survey made them seem less valuable. Bob said that the high salaries being paid in libraries are not paid to employees who graduate from library school, but to employees with high computer skills. The world has changed in what it requires and how much it values certain skills. Brinley supposed that opportunities to have librarians improve their computer skills are becoming more available, especially to library students. The committee will look into adding lines on the salaries of professional staff to the 2006 survey. This would be done by adding a column 2 on wages to lines 02 and 03. Bob thought these questions could not be included in this survey because it is an institutional survey. Leslie suggested asking for the range of salaries in a

particular library, instead of an average of salaries. Carolyn recommended coming back to this topic in January, or considering a supplemental form for 2006 or 2008. So the discussion on wages was tabled until Midwinter.

6. Review of draft documents for 2004 reflecting decisions made at Midwinter 2004 in San Diego.
 - 2004 questionnaire

There will be a change to Part D (by adding a question if a library is entirely electronic). There is a new Part H, the Information Literacy questions from NCES, adding questions numbers 49-52. Leslie brought up a fifth question on information literacy that was considered, but rejected at Midwinter. Barbara explained that these four questions were chosen after receiving feedback from information literacy people and an expert on question wording. The fifth question dealt with conducting workshops. Leslie stated that these questions were aiming for the wrong information by asking about an “institution” instead of a “library” in the wording. The majority of respondents would answer “no” to these questions as currently worded. The committee noted that these are not the same questions they discussed at Midwinter; there have been significant changes. Barbara said that the questions are to grade if there is institutional support for information literacy. These questions will not get the information the committee wanted. So, the committee asked why the changed questions were not returned to them for review. Barbara did not know why the committee was not consulted in the follow-up. Carolyn asserted that the responses to these questions would not enable policy decisions, which was the questions’ purpose. The committee decided to drop these questions as they are now written for this survey, because they do not reflect what the committee originally requested. Barbara felt there could be a problem with the OMB clearance concerning the questions the committee does want to ask, because similar questions are asked on another survey. The OMB does not want to have duplicate surveys. In the committee’s opinion, they should have been consulted, instead of ACRL, with the final draft of the questions. Leland wanted to know why an advisory committee exists if it is not consulted after additional input has been soliticited. Mary Ellen Davis at ALA had expressed that people in information literacy should have input in the questions. The committee is fine with Mary Ellen’s and other groups’ involvement, but was disappointed that they were not further consulted when changes were made to the questions. Barbara said that 2006 is a new ballgame because there will be new OMB clearance, so changes can be made. Patty and Barbara agreed to remove last sentence in the information literacy questions and to change “campus-wide” to “institution-wide” in question 52 before the survey is sent to respondents. Carolyn would like to see the time schedule for OMB approval for 2006. Barbara explained she would be turning in clearance for 2006 in February/March 2006.
 - 2004 instructions

The instruction changes begin with the first page, with an added Part H to number 3. In Part H, the instructions are new and the last sentence will be removed. In Part D, Collections, on the second page; the definition is changed and ends with online catalog. In Audiovisual materials, Line 25, the phrase “include audiobooks” was added. The definition in Part F, Line 37 was changed to match ARL definition. The committee decided to renumber to make the division of 26A and 26B apparent. The changes to 26a will read:
“Current serial subscriptions. Report the total number of subscriptions in all formats. If the subscription comes in both paper and electronic form, count it twice. Count each individual title if it is received as part of publisher's package (e.g., Project MUSE, JSTOR, Academic IDEAL). Report each full-text article database such as Lexis-Nexis, ABI/INFORM as one

subscription as in 26b. Include paper and microfilm government documents issued serially if they are accessible through the library's catalog.”

- 2004 ALS Calendar

The alert to the LRs needs to go into the *C&RL News*. It should be sent to Stephanie Orphan at ALA for publication. Keith Curry Lance will look for other publications Mary Jo used to alert the LRs, besides *C&RL News*. Patty will draft a version and send it to the committee for review. Brinley wanted to know the logic behind sending a letter to the Chief Academic Officer. Answer: to facilitate response by putting pressure on library directors from their bosses. Keith suggested inserting more recommendations in the calendar for LRs to check the status of the response in their state, not just on December 14th. The committee agreed. Carolyn thought the reminder on Dec 14th will be sent too late. The committee concurred and chose to send the second reminder two weeks after first. Keith recommended including the date when notebooks go out on calendar. Patty said NCES will be looking at specifications for the universe and will review it closely.

- Letter to CEO of institution

The first line will be changed to read the same as in first sentence of the Library Director letter and the name on the signature will be changed to Robert Lerner.

- Letter to Library Director

Jeff Williams's title will be changed to survey director.

- Letter to Key Holder

Jeff Williams's title will be changed to survey director. No changes will be made to Attachment A and Attachment B.

7. State Library Representative list for 2004 ALS

Finding replacement LRs will be the job of Keith Curry Lance. He said he would have this task written into his contract with ALA. An email needs to go out to the LRs asking if they wish to participate again this year. This was job of the ORS Director. Keith volunteered to do it until a new Director is hired. Any broadcast message to LRs might be labeled SPAM. The plan is to break up the messages into small groups to avoid SPAM filters. Patty said they will try to have the email come from the NCES server to look official, but this might not work.

8. Keith repeatedly recommended that committee members strongly voice our concern to NCES about how long it takes for data to be made available. The response rate would improve with more readily available and faster data. The committee felt there should be a NCES deadline of when the data will be available and this date should be listed in the letter to institution CEOs and Library Directors.

9. Leland recommended that the survey return to being a required part of the IPEDS family, therefore making it mandatory. The committee approved. Keith suggested asking CORS and NCES to approve this resolution. Patty said if this happens, Census would no longer be involved because they lost the IPEDS contract. The committee will discuss other options to make this survey mandatory at Midwinter.

Meeting adjourned at 12:32 p.m.

