NCES Academic Library Survey  
Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday, June 23rd, 9am-noon, Morial Convention Center, Room 263, New Orleans, LA.

Present: Denise Davis (chair), Patty O’Shea (Census Bureau), Susan Anderson (Community Colleges), Shawn Calhoun (guest), Brinley Franklin (ARL), Victoria Hanawalt (Oberlin Group), Neal Kaske (NCLIS), Martha Kyrillidou (ARL), Rita Pellen (Universities), Mary Jane Petrowski (ACRL), Pat Profeta (Community Colleges).

1. Preliminaries
   a. Introductions (review and update roster)
   b. Logistics (breaks, other)
   c. Approve Minutes of meeting in San Antonio
   d. Agenda review

Information Items

2. NCES update (sent by email and text included below)

2004 ALS
The 2004 data were placed on the Compare Academic Libraries Web Tool on May 8, 2006. The 2004 ED Tab report is in review at NCES for target publication in August. The final 2004 data file with documentation will be released on the NCES web site soon after the release of the 2004 ED Tab report.

2002 ALS
The final data file and documentation were released on the NCES web site on December 14, 2005. NCES plans to release the 2002 tables along with the 2004 state tables as Supplemental Tables on the NCES web site separate from the 2004 ED Tab report.

The 2006 and 2008 ALS OMB clearance package was submitted by NCES in April 2006 with OMB approval expected in August 2006. Clearance for small changes in the 2008 survey can be requested from OMB by a memo.

NCES decided that the consortial items would have to be discontinued for 2006 after much discussion and analysis of the data by NCES, Census, and one of our contractors.

Reasons for dropping the consortial items (items 44 thru 48 on the 2004 survey):

- An overarching problem is that consortia (networks/cooperatives) are not defined. If we can’t be clear about what we are asking, we can’t have confidence in the respondents’ answers.
- The results from the first question produce conflicting results with some libraries within a sector reporting that there are no state-subsidized consortia in their state, and others reporting that there are state-subsidized consortia in their state.
• It isn’t clear whether we are asking whether a consortium is state-subsidized directly by the state, or indirectly through the postsecondary institution.
• After asking about one or more state-subsidized consortia in question 44, we ask about participation in the consortium in question 45. If a library participates in more than one, we don’t know for which consortium they are providing answers for in questions 45-47. These questions assume that there can only be one consortium.
• The last question asks about participation in “any other consortia”. That probably means not state-subsidized, but it isn’t clear.

The only published data on these items are response rates from the ALS 2000. Due to the definitional and wording problems, we have no confidence in the data on consortial services for the 2002 or the 2004 survey.

The committee expressed concern that the items were removed after their agreement at the Midwinter Meeting 2006 to modify the items for the 2008 survey (see minutes for that meeting for detail).

NCES response after the meeting: “Adding new consortial services items to the 2008 survey might be possible, from an OMB standpoint. Adding the items to 2010 can definitely be done, because they would be included in a new OMB clearance package.” Barbara Holton.

Jeff Williams is planning to retire from the US Dept. of Education in early January 2007.

3. Other surveys and projects that do or could impact NCES-IPEDS and ALS
   a. ACRL (Mary Jane Petrowski)
      The 2005 survey period was mid-January – April, 2006; ACRL used the old Carnegie classifications. The print and online publication will be available in late July 2006; the 2006 survey had an increase of 13% in the universe and a response rate of 40% [3077 responses] with an overall increase in responses of 8-10% over the 2004 survey.

   b. ARL (Martha Kyrillidou)
      ARL is in the process of closing out the 2006 (FY2005) survey, with a final close by the end of June 2006. E-resources continue to be an issue, with a decision to capture E-book counts as volumes held. A decision made was made to disallow reporting of E-book packages in the unit cost analysis. E-serials (Lexis Nexis vs. traditional E-serials) are being investigated in the supplementary statistics. Sessions/searches/downloads have been realigned with Project Counter definitions, but it remains difficult to capture meaningful data (the reporting burden is significant). LibQUAL+ project is going well, with continued strong representation in the international arena. MINES for libraries protocol will be implemented at the University of Iowa in 2007-2009.
c. Oberlin Group (Victoria Hanawalt)
   Web survey was completed in 2006. The group hasn’t met since the last survey, but plan to review the instrument for the next survey.

d. NCLIS (Neal Kaske)
   Collaboration with Federal–State Cooperative System for Public Library Data (FSCS) steering committee and the State Library Agency Survey (StLA) steering committee, National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), and the Census Bureau on matters related to library surveys of school, academic, public and state library agencies continues.

   Additional collaborations continue with:
   Z39.7 NISO Standards Committee
   Public Libraries and the Internet 2006: Moving Beyond Connectivity Study Group
   Networks and Cooperatives Project Advisory Committee
   Mary Jo Lynch Award co-sponsored by NCES, NCLIS, ALA, PLA, and FSCS for Library and Information Science Students. The purpose of the award is to encourage library school students to conduct research using public library data collected at the state and national level. For deadlines and additional information about the award see http://www.nclis.gov/statsurv/surveys/fscs/awardsFSCS/MaryJoLynchAward.pdf

   Library Assessment Initiative – this new project is to encourage informed use of library assessment tools and the development of new library performance measures. Content for this part of NCLIS Web pages is being developed to provide information on library assessment via informative descriptions of current tools, methodologies, studies, data sets, research report, journal articles, texts, and more. The content should start appearing in late 2006 and is expected to be an ongoing cooperative endeavor. The development of new measures for demonstrating libraries add value to their parent organizations and society as a whole will be done though a verity of means such as papers, journal articles, and presentations.

e. NISO Z39.7 (Denise Davis)
   The committee met and is suggesting a revised balloting process for the standard, and is reviewing the standard for improvements.

f. ALA ORS (Denise Davis)
   A detailed handout was provided, and the Diversity Counts project was highlighted.
Action Items

4. Survey process updates (Census staff, Davis)
   a. Status of 2004 survey data analysis (Patty O’Shea)
      Patty confirmed that the consortial questions will be dropped in the 2006 survey, but do appear in the 2002 data file.

   b. 2006 Survey
      i. Screen shots
         The online form is being tested, edit checks have been updated, and a revised calendar for the 2006 survey was reviewed. The committee suggested adding an email step in October to those who responded in 2004. Census staff will investigate the feasibility of adding this step.

         The letters will be revised to reflect the appropriate NCES staff (given Williams’ pending retirement). Committee endorsement language will be revised in the letters as a result of NCES’ ongoing decisions to remove or modify items without the review or support of the committee.

         Screen shots were distributed to the group for review, but they may change before the web form is finalized. Suggestions were made to Census, including lines 10-14 (access fees) in the E-books and E-serials definitions; confirm eligibility questions have imbedded jumps based on responses.

      ii. Library Representative confirmations
          ALA is finalizing the LR list.

      iii. Mailing procedures: initial mailing, manual, director’s letter, keyholder info, etc. were discussed. The process will largely follow that for 2004.

Meeting adjourned at noon.