

April 11, 2002

**Notes on Meeting
Steering Committee for the Survey of State Library Agencies
March 27-28, 2002**

The Steering Committee for the Survey of State Library Agencies met on Wednesday and Thursday, March 28-29, 2001 at the Ritz Carlton Hotel, Pentagon City, 2000 N Street NW, in Washington, DC. Mr. Shubert called the meeting to order at 1 p.m. on Wednesday.

Present were: Denise **Davis** (NCLIS, Statistics and Surveys Director), Suzanne Dorinski* (Census), Michele **Farrell** (IMLS, Office of Library Services), Patricia **Garner** (Census), **Bruce Kingma** Syracuse University), Elaine **Kroe** (NCES), Libby **Law** (Data Coordinator, South Carolina State Library), (Mary Jo **Lynch** ALA Office for Research and Statistics), Kim **Miller** (NCLIS/LSP), Suzanne **Miller**, State Librarian, South Dakota State Library), Kate **Nevins** (ASCLA, SOLINET), Jeffrey **Owings** (NCES, Associate Commissioner for Library Surveys, Longitudinal Studies, and Elementary/Secondary Studies Division), Joannell **Porter** (NCES), Cindy **Sheckells*** (Census), Joseph F. **Shubert** (New York State Librarian *Emeritus*), Barratt **Wilkins** (COSLA, State Librarian, Florida State Library) Robert S. **Willard*** (NCLIS, Executive Director), Jeff **Williams** (NCES), and Alan **Zimmerman** (Data Coordinator, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction). *(All listed here were present for the entire meeting, except for Mr. Owings and Ms. Dorinski, who were present on Wednesday, March 27, and Mr. Willard and Ms. Sheckells who were present only on Thursday, March 28).*

Also present were Amanda **Yeoh** (Syracuse University) and Barbara Holton (US Dept of Education).

Excused were Johnny **Monaco** (Census), Amy **Owen** (Utah State Library Director), Diana Ray **Tope** (FSCS Steering Committee, Georgia), and Lamar **Veatch** (Director, Alabama Public Library Services).

(1) Introductions

Members and guests introduced themselves.

Mr. Shubert noted with regret that Liz Gibson had resigned from the Steering Committee because of the press of other responsibilities and her retirement plans.

(2) Chair's Remarks

In brief comment on the agenda, Mr. Shubert noted that this is the third meeting in which the Steering Committee is spending significant time in discussion of the use of StLA data for public policy question research. He noted that, in December 2000, we discussed a paper on public policy research and StLA data. In March, 2001, we discussed "Working Paper 1 – Governance." In December 2001, the Steering Committee agreed to preparation of "Working Paper 2" to focus on StLA data useful for public policy research in the areas of funding, Federal impact, and change – a testing of our fiscal data.

Following that decision on December 6, 2001, Denise Davis, Bruce Kingma, and Joseph Shubert began work on a plan for the paper. By January 25, we had an agreed-upon plan that included a “project advisory group” consisting of appointed members of the Steering Committee (Kingma, Shubert, Wilkins, and Zimmerman) and Federal members Davis, Kroe, and Williams.

On February 5, the project advisory group established the policy questions. Dr. Kingma, with the help of Amanda Yeoh and Donald King, produced a first draft of the report on March 14. Following a March 19 policy advisory group meeting by phone, Dr. Kingma provided a revised draft for discussion at this March 27-28 meeting – nine weeks from the starting point!

(3) Recent Developments and Plans in NCES

Mr. Owings described several recent developments. Gary Phillips is now Deputy NCES Commissioner. The budgets for FY2002 and FY2003 look good.

Mr. Owings described plans to include 23 library-related questions in the October 2002 Current Population Survey conducted by the Census Bureau. The Household Survey reaches 60,000 households. He also described the ways in which the Longitudinal Study begun in 2002 will provide information on library use (both school and public) by 10th grade students. Mr. Owings also described improvements in and plans for the NCES website.

Mr. Williams reviewed the status of the several surveys and plans for this year and for next year, including web-based publication of school library media data collected in the 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey. Ms. Holton is editing the data for NCES publication.

NCES does not yet have a contractor to produce the report of longitudinal data for the six-year period, 1995-2000 longitudinal data for income and state aid expenditures, as agreed on December 6, 2001. The data, when available, are expected to be presented in tables and summary comments on the data, prepared in a format rather like “Highlights” in the StLA E.D. Tabs. Mr. Williams promised early follow-up on this long-delayed project.

(4) Working Paper 2

Dr. Kingma introduced Amanda Yeoh, who has been working with him on Working Paper 2 (*StLA Data and Public Policy Questions Data – Working Paper 2: The Impact of Federal Funding on State Library Agencies: The LSCA to LSTA Transition*). She is an Information Management graduate student in the Syracuse University School of Information Studies. She came to the Working Paper 2 project as part of the I-Launch Pad program at Syracuse. She prepared tables and graphs for the report. Dr. Kingma expressed appreciation to her, and to Donald King, who reviewed data and commented

on draft findings. He also expressed appreciation to the members of the Working Paper 2 Project Advisory Group.

Steering Committee discussion began on Wednesday afternoon and continued on Thursday morning.

Dr. Kingma and Ms. Yeoh had provided copies of the March 25 draft for inclusion in the packet for the StLA meeting. Dr. Kingma and Ms. Yeoh proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation, inviting questions on and discussion of the draft. Dr. Kingma emphasized that the report is an economic analysis, using the data that appeared in the E.D. Tabs for the six years, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000.

At the end of the Wednesday afternoon portion of the discussion, Dr. Kingma enumerated a number of points on which he and Ms. Yeoh will pick up and discuss further on Thursday morning. These included:

- Questions on definitions – The final report will make clear that fiscal data in Working Paper are entirely based on data in the E.D. Tabs. (The exceptions are population data for such tables as Table 20.) Working Paper data therefore include only data that the states submitted to NCES in the six-year period. For a complete understanding of data questions, users should use footnotes and definitions in the Appendix (the survey form, and the instructions) of each E.D. Tabs. The final report will include some notes of definitions.
- Working paper 2 will have a note explaining the reason for comparing LSTA income and expenditure data with Titles I and III of LSCA data.¹ (This practice ensures that comparisons are based on the state-based formula grants and exclude competitive grant funds from other LSCA titles and from LSTA National Leadership grants.)
- Based on Steering Committee interest in additional data on how LSCA and LSTA funds translated into “statewide services,” the final report will include some additional tables on personnel, library materials, and services.

Steering Committee members expressed appreciation to Dr. Kingma and his associates for his work. Before leaving the meeting on Wednesday, Mr. Owings emphasized the value of the undertaking and indicated his interest in seeing the final report.

Dr. Kingma expects to have the report completed the week of April 15 for review by the Project Advisory Group in a phone conference call.

¹ In the course of this part of the discussion, questions also arose on changes in definitions and instructions for reporting Federal income over the six years. Mr. Shubert pointed out that the Steering Committee discussed Federal income reporting in several meetings in 1998, 1999, and 2000. These discussions were largely related to a then-ongoing analysis of income and expenditure data, with particular attention to LSCA and LSTA. The analysis was conducted by Laura Riley Aneckstein and published as an NCES Technical Report, *Evaluation of the NCES State Library Agencies Survey; An examination of Duplication and Definitions in the Fiscal Section of the State Library Agencies Survey*. Inasmuch as this background is central to understanding the principles for the StLA Survey, attached to these Notes are (1) an excerpt from the Notes of the March, 2000 StLA Steering Committee and (2) a March 13, 2000 memo from Shubert to the Steering Committee.

Following that, Ms. Davis will send the report to Steering Committee members the week of April 22. Mr. Wilkins will share the report with COSLA and discuss it at the May 3 COSLA meeting. Ms. Davis will transmit copies of the final report to each Chief Officer in time for the May 3rd meeting.

(5) COSLA Research and Statistics Development

Mr. Wilkins reported on the current concerns of the COSLA Research and Statistics Committee, other research relating to StLAs, and the progress in LSTA reauthorization. He commented favorably on the draft of Working Paper 2 and the anticipated usefulness of the report.

He commented on the interest that StLAs have in the several NCES surveys in the context of LSTA, which calls for improving services in libraries of all types. He expressed pleasure at the prospect of having reasonably current school library data that will be available as a result of Ms. Holton's work.

He also directed attention to the new StLA profiles on the COSLA website and its URLs connecting to NCES data.

(6) Recent Developments and Plans in the NCLIS Library Statistics and Surveys Office

Ms. Davis reported on developments in NCLIS-sponsored research on library use of the Internet and Internet-based services. With Howard Harris no longer on contract with NCLIS as a consultant, and no other contracts being issued for studies, Ms. Davis has added research responsibilities (e.g., the "services to person's with disabilities study" is on indefinite hold).

Ms. Davis continues to chair the NISO Library Statistics Standards Committee. She reported revisions underway in the base standards, inclusion of more technical and electronic metrics, and significant support from Dianne Carty of Massachusetts and John Bertot of Florida State University to profile standards and guidelines developed by various other groups. She commented on changes taking place in NISO and ISO. She indicated the revised standard will be released as a dynamic website tool that would help researchers planning or conducting surveys identify the most current definitions and measures, and provide a crosswalk between US standards and those of other nations. She also raised a question about the increased maintenance necessary on the revised standard and online format.

(7) Status of the 2001 Survey

- a) **Timeliness:** Response to the 2001 survey was satisfactory. Ms. Sheckells' StLA Control Log dated March 27, 2002 showed that all states met the FY 2001 Survey close-out date of February 15, 2002. Twenty-one states were still resolving edit problems on March 27.

As a result of earlier discussion under Agenda item 4 regarding per capita calculations, Mr. Zimmerman recommended, and the Steering Committee concurred, that NCES add a sentence to Appendix A of the 2001 E.D. Tabs, (Survey Methodology), explaining the basis for calculating per capita expenditures in Tables 19 and 20 and any others in which per capita data appears.

b) Editing Problems and Progress: Ms. Kroe reported that edit problems are being resolved. Few imputations were required for the 2001 data. Mr. Shubert raised a question on the Hawaii data. Hawaii initially submitted for the StLA survey the same data that it submitted for FSCS public library data. After consultation with Mr. Wilkins, Mr. Shubert, and Mr. Williams, Ms. Kroe obtained a revised StLA data file, which is still being reviewed.

c) Discussion of **Possible Definition or Item changes** as a Result of Problems: Arizona reported **kiosks as branches**. A kiosk does not meet the definition of a branch. If rapid expansion of kiosks operated by StLAs is expected, it may be useful to add a question regarding kiosks and their placement, but the Steering Committee does not recommend doing so at this point. It would be useful to have the advice of Mr. Wilkins and the COSLA Research and Statistics Committee on this matter.

The Steering Committee reviewed a problem identified when New Hampshire reported **telnet access** under 2 items (cells 233 and 236) in question 32.

After discussion, the committee decided that the current definition for item 233 (Telnet gateway) was sufficient.

However, this led to a review of all items in question 31, via a task force headed by Denise Davis, with final agreement that item 232 (OCLC participation) and item 235 (Z39.50 gateway) should be deleted, as they are means of access to Web-based union catalogs, which is item 234. The definition of item 234 was expanded to reference OCLC and Z39.50 gateway access. The Steering Committee agreed that the wording of question 31 for FY2002 StLA is as follows., along with the following revised definition for item 234:

31. Does the StLA facilitate or subsidize electronic access to the bibliographic records or holdings of other libraries in the state in any of the following ways?

Specify <Y>es or <N>o for each item.

231 CD-ROM union catalog

233 Telnet gateway

234 Web-based union catalog (international, national, statewide, multistate, regional)

236 Other type of electronic access

237 Specify _____

The definition for 234 would read:

Web-based union catalog (international, national, statewide, multistate, regional). A Web-based union catalog makes the aggregated electronic holdings of libraries in a nation, region, a multitype system, or a state available via the World Wide Web. Holdings and indexes for a Web-based union catalog are mounted on a server that is connected to the

Internet. Access to the bibliographic information in a Web-based union catalog is available to any user with an Internet connection and a standard Web browser. National union catalogs include The Library of Congress and OCLC. OCLC also provides the holdings of libraries outside the United States. Note: Report access to a Web-based union catalog via a Z39.50 gateway in this item, as it is a Web-based protocol.

d) **Anticipated Date of Releasing FY 2001 Data:**

Ms. Kroe reported that the FY 2001 E.D. Tabs should be on the website by November 2002.

(8) Preparations for the 2002 Survey

The 2002 Survey dates parallel those for 2001. They are:

October 15, 2002 - Registration/data collection begins

February 15, 2003 - Survey "close-out" due date

January 15, 2003 - Eligibility for Lorenz Award date.

(9) Review of the "Prospectus" for the StLA Survey

Mr. Shubert noted that the "Prospectus" for the StLA Survey (*The Survey of State Library Agencies: The Survey and Its Steering Committee*) has not been updated or revised in four years. He asked that Steering Committee members examine the copy in the packet for this meeting, and send suggestions for revision to him by May 15th.

(10) Report on Legislative and Appropriations Work for NCLIS and Other NCLS Developments that May Impact on the State Library Agencies

Mr. Willard indicated that he would report "good news" and "bad news." He pointed out that the Commission is operating this year with two-thirds of the funds it operated with in FY 2001. There have been no appointments to fill vacant Commission seats in the past 15 months.

He provided copies of NCLIS testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Committee on Appropriations; Questions for the Record on Elimination of the Commission on Libraries; and the NCLIS FY 2003 Appropriations Justification, February 2002.

He described steps taken to reduce expenses during the current fiscal year, including his volunteering for two weeks and taking that time off the payroll.

(11) New Business and the John G. Lorenz Award

Thirty-three states qualify for the John Lorenz Award on the basis of having met the NCEJ January 15, 2002 lock-down date. Several of these states, however, were still working on responses to one or more edit questions on that date. The Awards will be presented at the COSLA meeting in Boston in October 2002.

Mr. Zimmerman, noting StLA questions in Part O - Public Policy Issues, suggested a

review of the phrasing and definition of such questions in light of IMLS definitions and expenditure reporting. The objective of the review would be to identify crosswalk elements that would facilitate consistent reporting by the states. This would not be a case of duplication of reporting between IMLS compliance reports and NCES reporting.

Following discussion confirming that this is not intended to lead to duplicate reporting, but to provide practical input for NCES definitions, the Steering Committee agreed to have a task force to keep in touch with IMLS developments in reporting categories and inform the Steering Committee's awareness of developments that might impact on the StLA survey.

Members of the task force are Mr. Zimmerman (Chair), Ms. Farrell, Ms. S. Miller, and Mr. Wilkins.

Adjournment and Confirmation of the Dates of the New Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 28, 2002. The Committee will meet next on September 11-12 2002 in Washington, D.C

J. Shubert, April 11, 2002
StLA Notes on Meeting Mar 2002/ A NCES III

ATTACHMENT 1

Excerpt from the Notes of the March 25, 2000 StLA Steering Committee Meeting
Regarding the Complementary Nature of IMLS and StLA Data

Concluding Discussion of the 1999 Aneckstein Report

The Steering Committee discussed a March 12, 2000 memorandum prepared by Mr. Shubert summarizing the history of the September 1999 NCES Technical Report, *Evaluation of the NCES State Library Agencies Survey; An examination of Duplication and Definitions in the Fiscal Section of the State Library Agencies Survey* by Laura Riley Aneckstein of the Bureau of the Census. The memorandum described four key points and findings. These related to possibilities for duplication of data collection, confusion about key “income” data elements, concepts of “income” and “expenditure,” and consolidation of IMLS and NCES data collection. Following discussion, the Steering Committee approved the following conclusions:

- 1) The report and the length of time it took to complete it resulted in appropriate changes in the StLA survey in 1998 and 1999. The report should be useful as the Steering Committee continues to review data elements and definitions.
- 2) On the matter of the fiscal year reporting period for the StLA survey: It makes sense for IMLS to collect and report data on the basis of the federal fiscal year. However, the StLA survey is more than a financial report on federal funds. Policy makers at state and local levels and other customers expect state library agency data to be reported by the fiscal year of the state.
- 3) The StLA survey reports should continue to include both Federal “income” and Federal “expenditures.” Inasmuch as tables 15-17 intend to provide a full picture of state, federal and other income and tables 18-22 do so for expenditures, it appears that federal “draw down” funds should be reported as both income and expenditure. It *would* be possible to report the “draw down” funds only as expenditure, but not reporting them as income would cause great inconvenience for users of the StLA data who expect state library agency data to be reported for the fiscal year of the state.
- 4) The Steering Committee is impressed with the data collection and reporting systems IMLS has instituted and is committed to continuing cooperation with IMLS in this arena. We do not support the consolidation of data collection inasmuch as the reporting periods for IMLS and StLA are different and because the financial data are only two of the ten parts of the StLA Survey, and the financial data cells are some 30 of 230 data cells. NCES and IMLS reports are complementary and each is important.

ATTACHMENT 2

MEMO TO THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES SURVEY STEERING COMMITTEE

FROM: Joseph F. Shubert

DATE: March 13, 2000

RE: Concluding Discussion (for now) of the Aneckstein Report
Agenda Item 8 for the March 25, 2000 Meeting

At our September 1999 meeting, we received copies of the NCES Technical Report, *Evaluation of the NCES State Library Agencies Survey; An examination of Duplication and Definitions in the Fiscal Section of the State Library Agencies Survey* by Laura Riley Aneckstein of the Bureau of the Census.

Background: The Technical Report was prepared over a period of two years. Its purpose was to evaluate Parts K, L and M of the 1997 StLA survey relating to income and expenditures, with particular attention to LSCA. The evaluation had two objectives: (1) to check for duplication between the NCES StLA survey and “compliance reporting” to the former Office of Library Programs in the U.S. Department of Education; and (2) to analyze selected definitions. In March 1999, Mr. Planchon provided copies of two pages from a later draft of this report in connection with a Steering Committee discussion.

The final report was on the agenda of the September 22-23 meeting of Steering Committee but copies of the report were not distributed to the Steering Committee until September 22. Therefore, Mr. Shubert asked members of the Steering Committee to examine the report and send comments to him by the end of November 1999 in preparation for the spring 2000 meeting. Comments were to focus on the possible need for additional changes in the income/expenditure sections for the FY2000 survey. The report is divided into the following chapters, which comprise three “Parts” of the report:

1. Introduction
 - Part I ...Duplication of income and expenditure data between NCES and OLP.
 2. Comparisons of income from LSCA funds
 3. Comparisons of expenditure data from LSCA titles I and III
 4. Findings and recommendations of Part I
 - Part II Examination of definitions in selected financial items
 5. Examination of income and expenditures definitions in the StLA survey
 6. Examination of statewide services, grants, and other selected expenditure definitions in the StLA survey
 - Part III Methodology
 7. Methodology
- Appendices A (Excerpts from StLA survey questions) and B (OLP materials)

Key Points in the Report and the Situation in 2000: The report was initiated before enactment of the Library Services and Technology Act. The LSCA income and expenditures reporting findings therefore are now dated. The author acknowledges this fact in her reporting and recommendations. Other key points and findings are: *(The sentences preceded by ** are my observations.)*

- 1) The author found that there was not duplication of income data in the NCES StLA report and the Office of Library Programs (OLP) data. In part, this is because the two agencies collected the data for different purposes – NCES for statistical and policy analysis, and OLP for regulation and administration of LSCA. The author recommended that the Steering Committee consult with IMLS on the possibility of coordinating data collection. **By design, the Steering Committee includes the IMLS Deputy Director for the library program as a full member of the Committee.
- 2) The author found some definitions unclear and “confusion on the parts of some StLAs regarding which measure of income should be used: the federal allotment, or the amount drawn down from the U.S. Treasury account controlled by the OLP.” **The StLA survey now requires the amount drawn down be reported. **The Steering Committee has also revised several other definitions which the author found “unclear,” such as “state aid” “carryover,” etc.
- 3) The author found that the Federal Cash Management Improvement Act (CMIA) has “affected the applicability of traditional concepts of income and expenditure because the grantee must expend the money immediately...Thus, there is little temporal difference between income and expenditures, and many StLA have come to view them as one and the same.” **In March 1999, Mr. Planchon raised the question on this: should we continue to include both Federal “income” and “expenditures? ** Inasmuch as tables 15-17 intend to provide a full picture of state, federal and other income and tables 18-22 do so for expenditures, it appears that federal “draw down” funds should be reported as both income and expenditure. It *would* be possible to report them only as expenditure, but not reporting them as income would cause great inconvenience for the StLA data user.
- 4) The author suggests that NCES and IMLS consolidate of data collection of financial data and also notes that this could require presenting all data by federal fiscal year. **The fiscal year of most states is July 1-June 30. Exceptions are Alabama, Michigan, New York, Texas, and DC. Only Alabama, DC and Michigan use the federal fiscal year as their state fiscal year.

Conclusion. The report and the length of time it took to complete it resulted in appropriate changes in the StLA survey in 1998 and 1999 and it should be useful as the Steering Committee continues to review data elements and definitions. We note the following:

- A. On the matter of the fiscal year reporting period for the StLA survey -- It makes sense for IMLS to collect and report data on the basis of the federal fiscal year. However, the StLA survey is more than a financial report on federal funds. Policy makers at state and local levels and other customers expect that state library agency data be reported for the fiscal year of the state.
- B. The Steering Committee is impressed with the data collection and reporting systems IMLS has instituted and is committed to continuing cooperation with IMLS in this arena. We do not support the consolidation of data collection inasmuch as the reporting periods for IMLS and StLA are different and because the financial data are only two of the ten parts of the StLA Survey, and the financial data cells are some 30 of 230 data cells. NCES and IMLS reports are complementary and each is important.
- C. The telephone surveys that the author conducted with respondents pointed out uneven understanding of StLA data elements and definitions and inconsistent reporting. The data

the phone surveys provided are helpful and such brief surveys may be useful again for data elements/definitions, which appear to be troublesome.

- D. The Steering Committee affirms its concern for quality data and expresses its appreciation to NCES, The Bureau of Census, and Ms. Aneckstein for this report.
- E. The telephone surveys that the author conducted with respondents pointed out uneven understanding of StLA data elements and definitions and inconsistent reporting. The data the phone surveys provided are helpful and such brief surveys may be useful again for data elements/definitions that appear to be troublesome.
- F. The Steering Committee affirms its concern for quality data and expresses its appreciation to NCES, The Bureau of Census, and Ms. Aneckstein for this report.