Committee members present: Laura Hardesty (Census, on phone), Mary Jane Petrowski (ACRL), Rita Pellen (university), Pat Profeta (college), Charles (Chip) Stewart (college), Bob Fox (ARL), William Miller (at large), Kim Miller (IMLS)

ALS Convenor: Dr. Kathy Rosa (ALA)
ALA/ORS Staff: Norman Rose
Kit Keller (ALA Consultant)

Guests: Denise Davis, Sacramento Public library; Rick Uttich, Roosevelt University; Algir Soni, Library of Congress; William Wallace, Library of Congress

Kathy Rosa called the meeting to order, after which meeting participants introduced themselves. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 2013 meeting at Midwinter (Seattle). The motion passed unanimously.

Information Items

ACRL Report (Mary Jane Petrowski): Mary Jane reported that the 2012 Academic Library Trends and Statistics Survey is closed. This survey uses the ARL survey instrument, with trends questions added. This year the trends questions related to awareness and use of our new ACRL standards for libraries in higher education. The response rate this year was slightly lower than last year’s, but additional responses may still be accepted. The data received is available in the online product, ARL Metrics. When it is available we will add the data from 105 ARL libraries that gave permission for their data to be included. This should be completed in August of 2013, and our publication should be available in the ALA bookstore in September if the ARL data are received on time.

The Committee will be meeting here at Annual to finalize questions for the 2013 survey which will likely be related to space since there is a lot of interest in that topic. We had feedback on questions that people struggled with. This has been shared with Bob Fox, who chairs the ARL Statistics and Assessment committee.

NCES Report (Tai Phan): Tai’s written report indicates that NCES has finalized its reorganization. IPEDS will be part of the Administrative Data Division, under the direction of Ross Santy. Tai’s current projects include the School Services Area Boundary Collection, designing a new locale code assignment tool, and getting the Schools Feeder System online.
The 2012 Academic Library Survey (ALS) collection is complete, with the last school’s data submitted on April 12, 2013. There are more schools in the universe this year than there were in the 2010 survey. Tai is in the process of reviewing the preliminary *First Look* and supplementary tables. The 2012 ALS data is scheduled to be available on the compare tool in late July or early August 2013. IPEDS staff are working on the screens for the 2014 ALS collection as a part of IPEDS. When the work is complete IPEDS staff will likely ask for help from the academic library community to review the screens for any chances which might be generated through feedback from OMB. IPEDS is a large, mandatory survey and likely generates considerable feedback from both OMB and the public.

**Census Update** (Laura Hardesty): Laura provided the report on behalf of Census on the FY2012 ALS survey process, and elaborated on the written report submitted by Tai Phan of NCES. The survey closed on April 15. There are more libraries in the universe this year because of the procedure for determining eligibility. If a library answered “no” to the eligibility questions for two years in a row, the library is eliminated from the universe for a year; after that the library is added back in so there were about 300 that were added back in in FY2012. Micro-level editing was completed on May 31, with macro level editing completed on June 14. The un-imputed file was sent to NCES on June 19 and was approved by Tai this week. They are currently working on the Compare tool and hope to have that available August 1. The imputed file and the report should be sent in August or September. It is scheduled for release on the NCES Web site in December.

In reviewing the tables for this year, Census staff noted a huge increase in ebooks; circulation is down slightly and the number of documents from commercial services went way down at the national level.

A question was asked about the 300+ libraries that were re-introduced to the universe. Does this number represent a lot of marginal libraries that really should not be included? Laura indicated that she did not scrutinize whether or not those reintroduced libraries actually reported, although she noted that the reporting numbers went up about 150, based on the publication tables. She would not expect that these libraries would impact national data, and, if anything, they might impact the FTE category, in the less than 1,000 category. Census routinely does a comparison of tables from one reporting year to the next, looking for significant changes, and then go back and try to see what caused it. We did not find much that was not explained in the edit process.

Denise Davis reported that Tai used to do a comparison table of ALS respondents, year-to-year, to track when a library dropped out and when it came back into the universe. She asked if that table has been updated. Laura was not aware that this table existed and so did not know if Tai has maintained a current version of this data. The table included IPEDS numbers for libraries (institutional number) and tracked whether or not an institution submitted data each year. The one that ORS has is three years old. Laura indicated that if Tai shares the file with her, she
would be able to update it. The table showed who started and who ended, so it would show who dropped out each year. Denise indicated that the table was used internally for analysis because ORS was concerned about who was dropping out, that we were not retaining libraries so we would not have strong longitudinal data. Mary Jane indicated that this information would be very helpful to her work.

**Action item:** Kit will ask Tai about this table and if it has been updated. Once this is determined the file will be shared with the committee.

**Question for Census:** Chip Stewart asked about a possible universe of about 7,000 institutions of higher education of one sort or another. He asked if that large number is theoretically part of this total universe. Laura responded that the total universe that Census pulled out of IPEDS started out at 4,737 institutions. Laura offered to send to the committee how these are identified. For example, they have to be degree-granting, Title IV eligible, and offer at least a two-year degree. For ALS, if you respond “no” to the eligibility questions, you are knocked out for that year. The 7,000 figure is the IPEDS number, and includes non-degree-granting institutions, and institutions not eligible for Title IV funds. Of that 4,737 number, 854 are identified as ‘out of scope’ or children, which means their data is combined with another unit. The remaining 500+ number responded ‘no’ to one of the eligibility questions this year, so the potential respondents were then 3,883. Census staff called every one of the newly-eligible institutions, with mixed results.

Kit asked about these numbers and the reintegration of the library questions back into IPEDS. Will the library questions be seen by all 7,000 participants, or will be the 4,737 institutions that make up the 2012 universe? Laura said she thinks that, based on the outcome of the Technical Review Panel #35 (TRP), all 7,000 will see the new eligibility question, related to expenditures. Many of that number have not been included in the ALS because they don’t have libraries (i.e., are non-degree-granting). So many of these will likely respond ‘no’ to the new eligibility question, and thus not be included in responses to the library questions. Laura reported that Census staff told IPEDS they would be available for questions and/or help during the transition period, and have not yet heard from any IPEDS staff.

Kit reported that she asked for an IPEDS update in preparation for this meeting. There was nothing new reported; our contact remains Tara Lawley for IPEDS information. In Tai’s report he indicates that IPEDS staff will ask for help from the academic library community to review the library screens. Kathy reported that she will continue to be in contact with IPEDS once the reorganization is complete. Additionally, the OMB process is not yet completed since the comment period just ended. It was clear from the TRP in the future updates would be accomplished through additional technical review panels, and not through committee work. Kathy recommended that once the reorganization is complete,
we contact IPEDS staff with another letter about the publication, and offer for advisory help.

**Action item:** Kathy Rosa will monitor IPEDS reorganization and, when appropriate, contact staff concerning the First Look publication and other possible issues.

Regardless, this is the last official meeting of the Academic Library Advisory Committee. Kathy reported that the contract ends in January 2014, but the work will be completed before that, unless something changes in the fall.

There will be another 30-day comment period on the IPEDS survey after the questions generated in the 60-day comment period, which just ended. Laura indicated that the responses should be published when the 30-day comment period is open. After the 30-day questions are answered, questions posed by OMB officers are addressed.

**ARL Update (Bob Fox):** All LibQUAL data has been received and tables are being reviewed. The 2013 survey will remain the same as 2012. In the salary survey, some new salary classifications were introduced this year and we got some feedback on those. We are trying to break down some of the categories for additional specificity and changes in emerging areas. A task force is working on this. They also just completed a separate task force on facilities. They had received feedback from member institutions that more statistics in the area of facilities and special collections would be helpful. The facilities task force is making a report to the ARL board; we will recommend some type of facilities survey that will likely be updated as people update facilities. With regard to special collections we asked two questions on this survey for the first time. One question was about the total number of staff devoted to special collections and what was the budget for that area. We’ll look at that information and see if it is a benchmark. We are getting a lot of feedback from our institutions on this topic. Special collections really do define research libraries so we are still looking at this issue.

The question was asked if numbers are going to be added to some of the salary tables. The response was yes, numbers would be added where possible. Some with only a few will be masked.

**Oberlin Group Update – No report**

**IMLS Update (Kim Miller):** IMLS is currently hiring a Program Analyst/Evaluation Officer. The FY2011 Public Library Data was released this week and the report should be released in early fall. The FY2012 PLS process is underway now. One new data element has been added for FY2013, which is annual circulation of all electronic materials. The State Library Agency Survey is now bi-annual, starting in 2012. The date should be released at the end of August.
The Public Demand for Library and Museum Services National Household Survey is now going through OMB clearance. The report on the Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program should be released within two weeks. A new reporting tool is being developed for LSTA grants, which should facilitate sharing of data and collaboration.

A question was asked about reporting procedures for dual-purpose libraries (academic/public combination). The example given was San Jose State and San Jose Public Library. This group also includes a K-12 facility. Denise reported that the collections are distinct and each reports their own data for their appropriate survey instrument. Pat Profeta reported that at a Florida shared facility they report data based on who pays for each item – materials, staff, etc. There are ways to parse the hybrid collections. The data is not double-reported.

**ALA Update** (Kathy Rosa): ORS is administering a three-year IMLS National Leadership grant, Public Libraries as Providers of Digitally Inclusive Services and Resources: A National Survey Redefined. This will be distributed in early fall of 2013. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Grant (PLFTAS) has been extended to July 15, 2013, to allow for a seminar meeting. A meeting was held in May to take a broad look at data collected about public libraries and the group is looking at ways of sharing data among the research community. This group is still under development and not working at the data element level. The goal is to share more broadly and provide broader access to raw data sources.

The ORS office is getting more involved in ALISE, which is a new focus. The office also is shifting away from contracting for studies to be done, and instead going out to library-related conferences to inform people about what data exist at the national and state level, and how to use it to advocate for libraries. The Committee for Research and Statistics is co-sponsoring a conference session, and hosting a panel discussion on assessment. Kathy also reported on both external and internal publications, surveys and studies. There was some discussion of affiliation with Counting Opinions. PLA and ACRL both partner with Counting Opinions. Kathy reported that she represents all library types when giving presentations and representing ALA.

*New business:* There was a brief discussion of whether this group would meet in January 2014. Denise reported that was likely because of the release of the 2012 data. The data will of course be released but there will be no meeting. Laura indicated that she will be mailing the report to committee members in January.

Following the introduction of guests, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kit Keller
ALA Consultant