9th FSCS Training Workshop
March 18-20, 1996
Summary Minutes

Revised DRAFT
4/17/96

Attending: 41 States, DC and 3 territories.

Monday, March 18:

Alan Zimmerman called the meeting to order and introduced the new State Data Coordinators, introduced current members of the Steering Committee, described the operation of the Steering Committee, and introduced State Data Coordinator candidates for the Steering Committee. Each candidate spoke to their credentials for being elected to the Steering Committee. Al also gave a brief history of FSCS development.

Jeanne Griffith, Acting NCES Commissioner, spoke to the group about NCES reorganization, commended the FSCS program on the progress that had been made over the past nine years, and stressed the importance of data quality to the NCES programs.

Walt Terrie made his annual analysis presentation on the quality of the data submission for 1994. He gave the Source of Zip+4 information:
HTTP://www.usps.gov/ncsc/lookup/lookup_zip+4.html

When they return home, State Data Coordinators are to send copies of their state Data Collection Forms with instructions to John Lorenz as soon as possible.

Mark Smith presented the following issues that would be addressed during this Workshop: Output measures for electronic service, Census report on Structure and Organization and, other Census report issues remaining to be addressed.

The proposal to delete Data Items #14 - Total Librarians, and Data Item #15 All Other Paid Staff was presented. Twenty-eight (AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IN, KS, KY, MA, MD, MI, MS, NC, ND, NJ, NY, OH, OK, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VI, VT, WA) endorsed the proposal. State Data Coordinators will be invited to submit issue papers in support of or in opposition to the proposal and the proposal and the issue papers will be mailed to State Data Coordinators for vote.

The Panel (Andrew Magpantay - Director of Information Technology, ALA Washington Office), Jane Goodwin - Office of Measurement and Evaluation, Fairfax County (VA) Library) (**notes attached**), and Denise Davis (Public Library Consultant, Division of Library Development & Services, MD Department of Education) addressed Electronic Data Collection issues.

Data items identified by the panel included:

- Number of people accessing electronic services
- Level/type of connection (text, multimedia access, WEB publication)
- Number of access points (input)
- Number of reference transactions using electronic resources
- Number of searches on a local server
- Number of searches on a remote server
- % of time in use
- Number of successful retrievals (by staff, by public)
- Impact:
    - Who are users?
    - Why using?
    - Kinds of questions
    - Length of Time - sessions
    - Demand - length of wait
    - Value of resources
    - Improvement/enhancement to service

Four Focus Group meetings were held to address Electronic Measures and other definitional and data collection concerns. Below is a summary of the group reports.

1. Based on what you heard during the panel discussion, is there an output for electronic services that you could support?

- Concerns expressed were related to the need to state the purpose/use/need of data to be collected, identification of a clear definition of the data item(s) to be collected, methodology for collecting the data consistently and with a minimum financial burden (staff time and other cost). What it is going to cost is the most important factor.
- There was a general agreement that data on electronic services needs to be addressed, but uncertainty regarding exactly what should be collected.
- People are using libraries differently. What matters is that they are getting information in a different way. The reason libraries are moving to automated resources is because publishers don't offer the information in any other way.
- Why do we need to measure? This is a big ticket item and Boards and Funding Agencies are asking questions which need to be answered. We have to be able to respond. We need the information.
- The central question is "How many people are accessing information at the library."
- Do we care where the gateway is? OPAC, etc... The system can measure this but the staff can't.
- We can't delay our efforts to measure use of technology by/through libraries (or drop it). Next year, more will be possible.

- There is a real concern about the amount of time needed to count more items; a burden on library staff. They have been sent so many technology/Internet surveys all asking pretty much the same thing. Libraries are already overburdened.
- There is concern about the cost of collecting so many items, especially those that don't have clear-cut definitions;
- Concern with cost of training staff to collect complicated measures.
- There are over 200 telephone companies. Getting state data will be very difficult. Must be highly justifiable to ask for new data.
- We should consider sampling and imputing. Can sampling work in this situation? Is it practical?
- One State agency tried to survey surrounding states to see where they were with Internet use and response was bad. (2 of 10 replied)
- The speakers didn't talk much about Output Measures. There is too much variation to pick one output now. We should watch and wait. We are all so different in what are doing. FSCS is carrying the ball on this. We have to start somewhere.
- There is a problem with convincing the Librarians and Boards of the importance of INTERNET; most think that it is sales catalogs and pornography.
- NET censoring is going on.
- Items to be considered include:
  - How many people are accessing Internet at the library
  - Number of library outlets connected to the Internet
  - Number of work stations available to public and staff and available to public through mediation of staff
  - Is there access through the library by users from home or business
  - How many reference questions did they answer that they HAD to go to the Internet to answer
  - What is the level of connectivity
  - Important to count 'in-house use'
  - Number of terminals/population? (Terminals will not reflect use.)
- AK Reference questions answered with on-line services
- WA # of access points
- WA How much time and expense training the public
- WA Let the machine count usage/access
- AL 'In house use' is important. Need information on direct impact library has on users.
- WA How many libraries served this year?
- Fast response survey rather than annual items? Consensus agreement.
- AL suggests analysis of shifting budgetary resources. Budget categories may need to be reformed to allow electronic access to be separately measured.
- AK How many users use the lib as access point to the net. How many hits to your "home page".
- People - Log
- Searches - Log #s
  -comparable to ref. hash marks

- Online/CDs
- Subscriptions -
- CD ROMs
- # instances of accessing online databases
- Branch level data
- How many branches have how many terminals?
- Have an automated circulation system?
- How many lib/people have Internet access?
- Does staff have access v. pub access in the lib.
- Adopted IPEDS expenditure categories
- Access to OPAC + how provide access - in-house v. online

2. From your knowledge of the status of Internet connections in your state, do you feel any of the measures can be collected using automated means?

- Only if you can do it with a machine. Electronic counting is not offered as standard by vendors. Data collection occurs on vendors equipment and you have to purchase it. Can libraries afford to pay for counter at every machine and is the data collected by each machine consistent. May be easiest to count when people log on to the computer.
- There will be major problems because each vendors will be different. A sign up sheet won't be easy for librarians to use. We aren't convinced we can reliably count these things; there are too many variables.
- A = not at this time
- Problems: software, hardware, cooperation of Internet provider, training

3. What, if anything, should the steering committee be doing in this area?

- Do some work on 'new use of technology' definitions and pilot them in states that are ready to ask these kinds of questions. Work with those states to refine definitions. We need REALLY clear definitions.
- Coordination of surveys on technology. There are too many people asking the same questions. If someone else is measuring these things, do we need to? Libraries are tired of the number of surveys.
- Where are the states on Internet?
- Beacon Press is going to do an Internet survey of states.
- We should share ideas with other groups doing surveys. We must start doing something in this area.
- We just added several questions on automation. Local needs will drive local collection.
- The Steering Committee needs to look at the items being collected in each state.
- Be careful about too many NEW data elements - result may be overkill and result in invalid data. Interesting questions were raised by the panel but does FSCS need to get that detailed? Let libraries/states ask what they want to locally. Identify what data is really needed at the national level.

- WA Write up some of the recommendations and run them by people. What are other groups using a measures (academics?)
- OR Look at instructions we give now and include instructions on how to measure the switch to new definitions. Look at all the existing definitions.
- Maybe we shouldn't be pursuing form or method but rather emphasis should be on function.
- Most of this may not be relevant to national census of libraries. Would we be asking many of these questions about books?
- FL we should assure that all our definitions encompass electronic formats? Is the media so important?
- OR Is there some new word we need to create for this new kind of library use. Alternative access.
- Information on # of home page hits for libraries with homepages? How many libraries have "home pages."
- AL maybe we should have rotating items which change year by year.
- OR what is the ANSI standards committee doing in this area?
- How many are receiving pressure to supply information on electronic access? (AK, WA) yes. Others no.
- Measures of connectivity. Can you get in from outside? can you get out from inside?
- Emphasis on looking at all definitions from electronic point of view.
- Have meeting panel look at how to easily collect electronic items.
- Measure to coll. man.
- Yes on typical week

4. What are states doing in this area? Are they planning to add any questions? Is there any pressure on them to collect in this area?

- Number of technology outlets (NY)
- Number of workstations (NH)
- Which libraries offer:
  - e-mail accounts (MD)
  - Slip connections (MD)
  - Remote or walk-ins (MD)
- Find vendors with acceptable rates
- Finding federal money to make changes
- Think ahead/push ahead
- Sample surveys - - use libraries or states as test sites before adding to survey (FSCS)
- In house use to justify budget
- Electronic circulation
- Statewide telecommunication bill
  - -- how many
  - -- what
- Internet trainer
  - -- equipment setup
- Leg. expectations, responses

- In house use
- CD ROMs
- Microfiche/film
- Salaries, benefits, longevity pay

5. Other issues:

- Source of Funds: State/Federal funding confusion is not a problem.
- Operating Expenditures: What do we mean by *operating expenditures*? Could it be clarified.
- Capital Funds: There is confusion as to 'allowable capital expenditures' and what is 'operating'. What is spent on library buildings. No place for capital income. Everyone has a different definition of capital cost. True picture of expenditure for electronic access has to include capital costs. Major cost of electronic services are often in capital (LANs for example). SDC's want the Steering Committee to investigate breakdown of capital income. Note: Capital income and expenditure in any one year will never balance. Reporting capital income could result in more error messages.
- Salary: Salary information would be good. Director's salaries maybe. NJ doesn't adjust for 40 hour work week because of States' 40 years of longitudinal published data.
- Subscriptions: How to count subscriptions on CD-ROM, On-Line Services, etc. If full-text subscriptions for current periodicals are available regardless of format or source and users have access to these should they be counted? If full-text is available from the State, does each library count all titles since their users have access? If this become the NORM, then isn't the question simply whether the users/libraries have access to full-text services rather than the number of subscriptions?
- There is confusion regarding the difference between the 'expenditure for collections in electronic format' vs. the 'expenditures for electronic access'.
- Programs: Are 'art exhibits' considered 'programs' and all the people who view them 'attendees'? Does an exhibit count as one program even through it runs for several weeks?
- Optional data could be collected and published. Have some optional data items to get around the fact that some states can't submit data in some categories.
- Square footage would be useful.
- Duplicate population and Unserved are very important. Reporting Unserved Population number is very important.
- Imputation at the bottom line only. Leave the library records alone.
- Element Prep
- Go through regular procedure
- Define electronic resources, electronic access
- Training for lib staff
- # of people graduates of training program
- CE--elect, tech, costs
- Use of volunteers in libraries

- Volunteer coordinator
- Trustees/government officials
- Funding
- Interpreting statistics
  --trustees
  --librarians.
  --paraprofessionals
- Replication of booklets (TX, UT)
- Additional child. services. questions
  -- staff
  -- budget
  -- circulation.
  -- size of coll.
- Why collect size of total collection?
  --weeding
  --special collections

Tuesday, March 19

Caucus of SDC's:

- A proposal was made to run Steering committee candidates at large and take the two highest vote-getters. The Steering Committee is to present the by-laws change for a vote at the next annual meeting.

- A mechanism was discussed for identifying SDC's interested in serving on the Steering Committee. It was noted that the Northeast had never been represented. The Library Statistics Program Memo will invite State Data Coordinators to nominate themselves or others, Mentors will encourage SDC's to indicate interest, a form was made available during the workshop for individuals to indicate interest in serving and/or nominate others, and SDC's will be encouraged to indicate interest and/or nominate others on the List Serve.

- Information about the job of the Steering Committee, workload, etc. was requested (later information provided indicated that it involved approximately 20 days each year)

- Concern was expressed regarding the high cost of the airline tickets, some problems with dealing with Omega and financial savings by not using Omega.

- The question of whether the annual workshop can be held outside of the Washington area.

- Brief discussion of some data element and definition concerns which are included above.

Data Use:
Philip Clark, St. Johns University, Division of Library and Information Science presented mapping techniques and there were Small Group Sessions using available FSCS and other data to address three case studies: Local Scenario, State Scenario, and Federal Scenario.

Keith Lance reviewed the status of the library inflation index.

Eckard Award:
Keith Lance presented the Eckard Award to: Thomas J. Waldhart, Professor, School of Library and Information Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY
for: exemplary use of FSCS data in a July 1995 Public Libraries article on Resource Sharing by Public Libraries. Mr. Waldhart was unable to be present. His letter of appreciation and commendation of the FSCS was read to the group.
(John you have copy of e-mail/letter)

Keppel Award:
Mary Alice Hedge presented 37 Keppel awards for FY94 data. She was assisted by Diana Young (NC) and Liz Gibson (CA).

States receiving five Keppel Awards to date are: Iowa, Ohio; and Washington.
States winning for the fourth time are: Delaware, New Hampshire; Pennsylvania; Rhode Island; South Carolina; Tennessee; and Utah.
States winning for the third time are: Arizona, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, Oklahoma; Texas, Vermont, and Wisconsin.
States winning for the second time are: Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Virginia, and Wyoming.
And, the first time winners are: Alabama, Indiana, New Mexico, and New York.
Four States have not yet received the Keppel Award.

An honorary Keppel Award was presented to Mary Jo Lynch, Director, ALA Office of Research and Statistics, on the tenth anniversary of the pilot project (Church Basement) which later became The Federal-State Cooperative System for Public Library Data.

Technical Issues:
Ellen Thompson and Beth Burrows reviewed a number of technical issues related to the FY94 data submission. One state has still not submitted data. Edited submissions are currently available on-line through the NCES Gopher.

A draft copy of DECPLUS v. 2.2 was distributed and changes reviewed.

Alternate Data Submission:

FY95 submissions will be possible through Internet as well as DECPLUS.

State Data Coordinators indicated that they are interested in alternative ways of submitting data, however they wish to maintain the data-checks process.

e-mail address to reach Ellen Thompson, Beth Burrows, John Medina, and Dawn Pennell: PLS@census.gov

Concurrent Sessions:
- IMPS Startup/Questions - Liz Gibson, Kathy Chamberlain, and Carol Ann Desch
- General Assistance with DECPLUS - Beth Burrows and Ellen Thompson

Wednesday, March 20

List Serve:
Keith Lance encouraged State Data Coordinators to subscribe to and use the Public Library Research and Statistics ListServe. To subscribe send an e-mail message to: majordomo@csn.net reading: subscribe plrsnet (your e-mail address)

Uses for the list serve include: communication regarding definitional issues, questions for the steering committee, LSP memo's focus group notes, minutes, etc.

NCES Gopher:

Carl Schmitt provided information about customer service and NCES. NCES products are accessible through their Web site and through their Gopher.

http://www.ed.gov/NCES -- this is case sensitive
FTP.ED.GOV
Gopher: ed.gov:10000

He also presented information about the National Data Resource Center (NDRC). Services are available at no cost.

Business meeting:
Election of new Steering Committee Members was announced:

Denise Davis
Maryland State Dept. of Education Div. of Library Development and Services

Sandi Long
Utah State Library Division

Mark Smith presented the objectives for 1996. (These were included in the meeting packet and distributed.)

Joe Shubert presented a report from COSLA and addressed the importance of the public library, how much it is changing and the data needed to document the changes and for planning services for an increasing diverse population.

Transformation of Public Libraries:
Deanna Marcum, President, Council on Library Resources and President, Commission on Preservation of Access presented information about a meeting at the Library of Congress on "The Transformation of Public Libraries." She also reported on the Kellogg Foundation program that is providing assistance to CLR, ALA, and other library organizations. Democracy requires an informed citizenry. Access/equity is essential for an informed citizenry. Libraries are struggling to survive. It is critical for libraries to continue to have a central role in meeting the information service needs of communities.

attachment