NCES/ALS Academic Library Survey
Advisory Committee Meeting
Annual Conference 2003
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Minutes

Meeting One: Thursday, June 19, 2:00 – 5:30 p.m., Fairmont Royal York, Nova Scotia Room
Meeting Two: Friday, June 20, 9:00 – 12:30 a.m., Fairmont Royal York, Nova Scotia Room

Present:
Committee Members:
Susan Anderson
Brinley Franklin
Martha Kyrillidou
Bill Miller (present at second meeting only)

Ex Officio: Mary Jo Lynch (ALA), Bob Molyneux (NCLIS), Hugh Thompson (ACRL), Jeff Williams (NCES), Kat Bork (ALA)

1. Preliminaries
Mary Jo Lynch passed out copies of Denise Davis’s email and Jeff Williams distributed copies of a report from Census (Patty and Kaleen).
   a. Introductions – Deemed unnecessary because everyone attending already knew each other.
   b. Logistics (breaks, other)
   c. Minutes of Meeting in Philadelphia - Jeff will investigate possibly getting Excel files for earlier years, but the priority is on current years. Regarding deletion of salary data, Census has completed work on 1998, and they are working backwards.
   d. Agenda review – Agenda approved.

Information Items

2. Status of 2000 data report (Jeff Williams)
Jeff reported that they have gotten through internal technical review, but there was a problem because the chief statistician wanted something different in the table describing respondents. The bottom line is that the report will be released in August, with Carolyn Norman and Martha Kyrillidou lined up as outside reviewers. Mathmatica is doing the report. Data for 2000 has been in the peer tool since November of 2002.

3. Status of 2002 data editing (Patty O’Shea)
Patty O’Shea and Kaleen Vaden were not present, but a Jeff distributed their report to the committee. One-third of the edit review is done. Jeff is cautiously optimistic.
4. Other surveys and projects that do or could have an impact on IPEDS and ALS
   a. ACRL (Hugh Thompson) – Hugh reported that the ACRL survey for 2002 had just started last week, so it is very late compared to previous years. He expects to deliver the database by mid-August. He should have the final summary tables by mid-September. Hugh wants a more rigorous schedule. The final published results will be later than Hugh desires, but not by much.

   b. ARL (Martha Kyrillidou) – The 2002-2003 survey mailing will go out within the next month. The interactive peer tool will be ready in a month. Brinley Franklin is new chair of the ARL Statistics Committee. Changes will be made to the ARL form and take effect a year from now. Items from the “supplemental survey” will be moved into the main survey, mainly items dealing with expenditures for electronic access. Also, items from the e-metrics project will become part of the supplemental survey.

   Note from MJL: At Midwinter, we should consider this matter in more detail. Specific items and definitions will be provided.

   ARL’s two other projects are SAILS and the LIBQUAL. The LIBQUAL is closed for 2003. It is a huge data set. The FIPSE Grant is finished in August and from then on the project will become self-sustaining. Mary Jo asked about the SAILS project, concerning putting a value in staff in libraries. Martha says they are still regrounding the items.

   c. Oberlin Group (Leland Park) – Leland was not present at the meeting so there was no report

   d. NCLIS (Bob Molyneux) - Bob said he has nothing to tell that relates to this committee. He spoke of other projects he is working on that are challenging.

Action Items

5. Form and definitions: edits/changes for 2004
   Jeff stated that finalization of changes has to be done by Midwinter 2004 in San Diego.

   • SURVEY ELIGIBILITY: Possible changes are as follows:
     a. Add words in italic type: “Do you have or offer electronic access to an organized collection of printed or other materials or a combination thereof?”
     b. Add “compensated” before “staff.”
     c. Drop it completely.
     d. Drop the last nine words (necessary to support such a collection, staff, and schedule).

   Also, somewhere in this sequence add a question something like this: “Are library resources available entirely electronically?” Respondents who answer “yes” will be instructed to answer as many of the questions as they can. The committee is not entirely clear on how to do this. Mary Jo and Jeff will try to find out more about institutions in
the IPEDS file where library resources are entirely virtual (e.g. University of Phoenix, institution mentioned in report from Census).

Note from MJL: At Midwinter, we need to determine which items can logically be answered by respondents whose library resources are entirely virtual. This will have an impact on edit checks.

- Part B – Library Staff
  Note from MJL: we did not discuss this point, but I want to remember to do it at Midwinter. Several respondents objected to reporting salaries for FY02 and number of staff as of Fall 2002 (beginning of FY03). Do we need to rethink this?

- Part C – LIBRARY EXPENDITURES
  Instructions for lines 10-21 will be modified slightly by adding the word in italics to the last sentence so that it reads: “Exclude institutional expenditures for new buildings and building renovation.” This would allow the reporting of money spent from the library’s own budget on renovations.

- Part D – Collections
  Line 22 - “Books, serial backfiles and other paper materials (include government documents).” Two problems came up with this item (volume count):
    - Serial backfiles. In many libraries, bound volumes of serials are being replaced by access to an electronic archive. Therefore, libraries have a lower volume count – which looks bad unless they have a way to report on the access provided via the electronic archive. It was decided that the NCES/ALS can ignore this issue in 2004, but will need to deal with it in 2006. Meanwhile, ARL is dealing with this issue and will probably come up with language we can use.
    - Shared storage facilities. More and more libraries are pooling their collections of lesser-used materials and keeping only one copy of a title. Who gets to count it? Again, ARL is working on this and will probably come up with language NCES/ALS can use – by the 2006 survey.

Note from MJL: As I was editing a draft of these minutes, Patty called with a question about government documents. It seems to me that our instructions (really ARL’s) lacks clarity and needs work at Midwinter.

Line 23 – E-books. The second sentence will be changed to read, “Include e-books purchased by a consortium to which you belong.”

Line 25 – Audiovisual materials. The phrase (include audio books) will be added after “audio materials.”

Line 26 – Current serial subscriptions. This line will be expanded into two lines following the example set by the new NISO standard on library statistics, lines will cover:
  - print serials and electronic serials purchased individually
- databases of two kinds: abstracting and indexing databases and aggregated full text databases

*Note from MJL: NISO will finalize their document this summer. I will use that work to prepare a draft for consideration at Midwinter.*

- Part E – Library Services, FY
  Line 34a – General circulation. Add this sentence: “Do not include e-book circulation.” This may need to be changed in 2006.

  Line 34b – Reserve circulation. The committee wants to keep this line, as reserve circulation is definitely different from general circulation. We may need to modify the instructions to specify both print and electronic, depending on what Patty and Kaleen learn as they complete the edit of 2002 data.

- Part F – Library Services, Typical Week
  Line 37 – Hours open. The definition will be modified to clarify that we are talking about a physical space that is staffed. The ARL definition will be considered at Midwinter.

  Line 38 – Gate count. This is a count of people who enter a physical building. Hits on a website do not qualify as gate count.

- Part G – Add to instructions “If the answer was “yes” at any time during the academic year, respond “yes.”

6. The universe for ALS.
   The IPEDS file is used (degree granting institutions, eligible for federal aid). There was some discussion of “marginal” institutions that are unwilling to admit that they don’t have a library because of accreditation requirements. It was agreed that in 2004, the LRs would be asked to report to NCES/Census if an institution is ineligible rather than told to persuade the institution to go online and report their ineligibility. Also, LRs will be told which institutions in their states were ineligible in 2002 as schools are not dropped by NCES until they are ineligible for two ALS cycles.

7. Many library directors did not get the letter from NCES asking them to appoint a “key holder” and providing the necessary ID number. Mary Jo heard this often from LRs and Hugh reported getting calls about it. Jeff reported that the letter went to the institutional address with the line “Library Director” added. That will be done again in 2004. In addition, notices will go to the following stating that the letter has been sent and what to do if the letter does not arrive.
   - email address of 2002 key holders
   - as many electronic lists as are appropriate in ALA, ACRL, ARL
Bob warned of SPAM issues and noted that many changes were likely in the months before the 2004 data collection. It was suggested that NCES rent the list ACRL uses for its survey. That list began with the NCES list years ago, but has been refined.

8. Help desk in Jeffersonville Indiana. The committee considered several suggestions from the Help Desk, but none indicated that need for change. In response to a question Jeff replied that this place was near Louisville, KY. Someone suggested that staff take a field trip to the University of Louisville library before “helping” on the 2004 survey.