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This report brings to the ARL Board recommendations for how to implement the ARL System of Action (SoA) proposed in the “Report of the Association of Research Libraries Strategic Thinking and Design Initiative August 2014”¹ (hereafter, the August 2014 SoA Report). In making the following recommendations, the Transition Team has considered carefully the reports requested of and received from all of ARL the committees (included as Appendices 5-9 of this report). We hope that the spirit of the recommendations that follow is seen as reflecting those important member contributions to this process.

I. Principles and Assumptions That Guided the STaDTT

- With the Board’s concurrence, the implementation plan should be in place before the end of 2015, and we should start to implement some parts of it as soon as possible.
- Members need to see themselves in the new structure and be able to identify the role/roles that they might play—receptor, facilitator, leader, etc.
- We should be transparent and open, with explicit descriptions of—and defined charges for—the various bodies that might be formed, including: standing committees, initiative design teams, and an oversight group for the transition.
- Standing committees will no longer be large committees. Intended to enable the work of the Association broadly, they will comprise ARL member representatives appointed by the ARL Board based on their expertise, experience, and interests, and will be supported by ARL staff who are charged with getting things done and assessing progress towards objectives.
- The SoA will be reviewed on an ongoing basis, with a complete review in 2018
- The transition plan will include a lightweight structure with enough coordination to provide support at the appropriate times and where needed.

II. Goal of the Proposed Organizational Restructuring of ARL

As articulated in the August 2014 SoA Report, the vision of the research library in 2033 is one in which it “will have shifted from its role as a knowledge service provider within the university to become a collaborative partner within a rich and diverse learning and research ecosystem.”²

² Ibid., p. 6.
The organizational restructuring proposed below is intended to position ARL to foster library innovation within this ecosystem, and to be more agile, flexible, and adaptable in a rapidly changing environment. The proposal below is for a looser, networked structure that facilitates the conception and sharing of new ideas and encourages collaborations across institutions and sectors, while at the same time providing some structured support that will help transform ideas into concrete projects and outcomes.

ARL's proposed organizational framework has been designed according to the following principles:

- **Agility**: there will be short-term design teams and project groups supporting brainstorming and new ideas (instead of standing committees for determined strategic directions);
- **Intentionality**: the activities of the groups will be aligned with the vision articulated in the August 2014 SoA Report, in coordination with the Board. Those activities that are aligned with ARL’s vision and intent will receive resources from and/or the imprimatur of ARL;
- **Coordination**: organizational layers and processes will be minimized, but there will be clear pathways for communication and decision-making through a coordinating committee and/or the Board;
- **Engagement**: all ARL Members will have opportunities to engage in the framework and actions, whether in the role of receptor, informer, participator, facilitator, or leader;
- **Excellence**: groups charged with a particular portfolio of responsibilities will be populated by those most engaged and knowledgeable to carry out those responsibilities; and
- **Support**: there will be standing Board committees relating to the “essential capacities” enumerated in the August 2014 SoA Report that enable both collective and individual action. The new structure will leverage ARL program staff and their strengths.

And, it has been designed to enable the Association’s success in playing any or all of the following possible roles: inspire, broker, facilitate, shape, or manage.⁴

### III. Recommendations

#### A. Establish SoA Initiative Design Teams (Design Teams) for each of the five SoA initiatives proposed as a focus for the near future in the August 2014 SoA Report.

**Purpose and Scope of Responsibility**

SoA Initiative Design Teams are short-term groups charged to develop the scope and contextual framework for each of the System of Action Initiatives. This scope and contextual framework will define the breadth, focus, and type of projects that could fall within a particular initiative. The Design Teams can propose projects, as appropriate, as part of their design work. Design Teams will be created for these five initiatives:

---

³ Ibid., p. 9.
Possible work for Design Teams includes the following:

- Meet in June 2015 to develop draft scope and contextual framework for the assigned initiative.
- Facilitate discussion with other stakeholders and content experts, as appropriate, to complete draft framework for presentation to the Board of Directors in July 2015. Refine framework based on Board feedback and finalize for Board review in October 2015.
- Define the breadth, focus, and type of projects or structures that could fall within the framework.
- Identify current projects and activities of the Association and member libraries that fit within the framework.
- Conduct landscape review external to ARL and member institutions to determine whether relevant projects could be incorporated/endorsed from elsewhere.
- Via announcement, RFP, or some other mechanism, solicit projects that would promote critical aspects of the initiative.
- Develop criteria for review and approval of projects, including scope, scalability, sustainability, funding, and role of ARL.
- Develop a process (or processes) for supporting the implementation of projects in the first year.

Composition

Design Teams should consist of 8-10 ARL member representatives with an assigned chair appointed by the ARL Board. ARL member representatives will be invited to join one of the teams with the expectation that they are able to actively contribute to its work within a one-year timetable (May 2015-April 2016). The assigned chair will serve on the Coordinating Committee (see “B. Establish a Coordinating Committee” below) and attend the July and October 2015 ARL Board of Directors meetings. Following the dissolution of the Design Teams, their Chairs will serve staggered terms on the Coordinating Committee through 2018. ARL senior staff (Executive Director, Deputy Executive Director, Program Officers, VPOs, consultants) will work with the Design Teams and Coordinating Committee (see B. below).

B. Establish a Coordinating Committee from the leadership of the Design Teams. This Committee will be responsible for fostering the development of new activities through the creation of Project Teams (see Appendices 1 and 2 below), and for overseeing projects and determining how they are related to one another. It will report to the Board.

---

4 The ARL Board of Directors requested that the STaDTT add to this report a statement, or restatement, of ARL’s values to serve as the context for evaluating possible directions that Design Teams and Enabling Capacity Committees (described below) might be considering. To its surprise, the STaDTT has found that ARL has no formal statement of values as such, a statement the STaDTT is uncomfortable creating itself. Instead, in Appendix 3, the STaDTT reproduces two statements of “ARL Guiding Principles” the Board might wish to consider using in evaluating proposed initiatives.
C. **Assign to the Board the role of overseeing member institution recruitment/retention in the Association.** Rename, reconstitute, and re-charge the Membership Committee (see below).

D. **Revise current committee structure.**

1. **Sunset the Advancing Scholarly Communication Steering Committee** and dissolve it, with thanks, before the April membership meeting (see Appendix 5). 
   **Rationale:**
   - Work of joint ARL/AAU Task Force is well-launched and can continue without a committee, under the guidance of the Coordinating Committee.
   - Work on Lyrasis can become a continuing ARL administrative staff function.
   - Requests to sign on to various issues/developments should be handled by the Advocacy and Public Policy Committee.
   - Work to advance discussions with University Presses can be [re]assigned to the Scholarly Dissemination Engine Design Team.

2. **Sunset the Transforming Research Libraries Steering Committee** and dissolve it, with thanks, before the April membership meeting (see Appendix 6). 
   **Rationale:**
   - The ARL Position Description Data Bank (PDDB) is a service that can become a continuing ARL administrative staff function.
   - The Accessibility Working Group can become a project team in the Libraries that Learn initiative.

3. **Sunset the e-Research Working Group** and dissolve it, with thanks, before the April membership meeting (see Appendix 6). 
   **Rationale:**
   - The e-Research Working Group suggests re-positioning its diverse agenda and outcomes within the broader context of higher education; the best solutions are more likely to come from collaborations among key stakeholders and partners within the local university setting.
   - Discussions of critical issues could be better suited in Collective Collections focused on research data and the Scholarly Dissemination Engine by promoting new forms of research, particularly in the humanities.

4. **Sunset the Special Collections Working Group** and dissolve it, with thanks, before the April membership meeting (see Appendix 6). 
   **Rationale:**
   - Work to advance discussions regarding special collections can be advanced through the Collective Collections Design Team.
   - Individual projects related to special collections can be advanced through the SoA’s Collective Collections and Scholarly Dissemination Engine initiatives with crossover to other SoA initiatives as appropriate.

5. **Establish the following four committees as Enabling Capacity Committees (ECCs)** to focus their attention across all five of the SoA initiatives. Each committee chair will be selected by the Board and will liaise with the Board.

5 “Enable = to make able; give power, means, competence, or ability to.” (Dictionary.com)
a) **Rename, reconstitute, and recharge the current Influencing Public Policies Steering Committee as the Advocacy & Public Policy Committee** (see Appendix 8).

**Purpose and Scope of Responsibility**
The Advocacy and Public Policy Committee (APC) is a standing committee that develops and oversees ARL’s role in monitoring legislation that affects the research community and the development of policies and position statements that benefit research universities and their libraries. APC develops strategic and timely communications to keep the membership informed on key issues; develops position statements that support ARL members individually and collectively; and helps members mobilize and respond to pending legislation, policies, and budgetary considerations affecting ARL, its members, and the research community. APC seeks ways to connect with like-minded organizations in developing effective ways to shape opinion and communication concerns and support.

**Possible work includes the following:**
- Define a legislative plan including a set of values for the Association and a watch list for issues the Association should keep an eye on in the U.S., Canada, and internationally.
- Facilitate and advise SoA Initiatives on advocacy and policy issues in design work and projects.
- Assume role for entire Association to consider when to “sign on” to issues.
- Consider various ways to accomplish its agenda, including:
  - Taking out ads in the *Chronicle* or elsewhere;
  - Thinking about when it is best to speak with one voice or with multiple voices;
  - Creating templates for letters when directors need to respond in a timely manner;
  - Creating a quick way for adding signatories; and
  - Provide quarterly updates (or more frequently as needed).
- Engage the full membership in a forum-type program at membership meetings.
- Maintain link to SPARC.
- Develop ways to measure the impact of the committee’s efforts.

**Composition**
The Advocacy and Public Policy Committee should consist of between 5-7 members, appointed by the ARL Board, one of whom is appointed Chair, plus ARL Program Officer Prue Adler, who will liaise with the Coordinating Committee. Committee members will serve 2-year terms on a staggered basis. The CARL Executive Director will be invited to serve on the committee. The APC Chair will liaise with the Board.

---

6 The STaDTT wishes to draw to the Board’s attention the fact that some of the ECCs have, since forming, revised their charges slightly from those described in this section. We also note that there is now, as a consequence, some amount of redundancy between and amongst some of the ECCs and some of the Design Teams.
b) **Rename, reconstitute, and recharge the Statistics and Assessment Committee as the Assessment Committee** (see Appendix 9).

**Purpose and Scope of Responsibility**

The Assessment Committee (AC) is a standing committee that develops and oversees ARL’s program for assessment. This program should be responsive to the changing roles and needs of ARL members while maintaining longitudinal data that promotes effective comparison across time and institutions. A key goal will be to empower members in decision-making by the agile use of timely and relevant data, their ability to mine data in new ways and to integrate it with other data used by parent institutions and professional organizations. A clear focus for the future will be on developing assessment strategies and approaches that are less library-centric and more focused on how library resources and services are cost-effective, promote university priorities, and impact the success of faculty, students, and the academy.

AC seeks ways to connect with other statistical and assessment entities that underpin university rankings, provide benchmarks, identify strengths and weaknesses, monitor performance, and measure productivity. Similarly, AC will monitor what such academic indicators can suggest about library direction and involvement. For instance, learning analytics tools used to assess trends and patterns from student-related data sets can be mined to create more supportive learning environments and services within libraries.

**Possible work includes the following:**

- Develop plan for the ongoing collection of data, the creation of dashboards, and data mining to support ARL and member institutions. Consider hiring assessment consultant to advise on this plan.
- Facilitate and advise SoA initiatives on assessment/impact in design work and projects.
- Monitor and establish links with National Center for Education Statistics and other such entities, including university research and planning offices.
- Consider means for integrating library data and questions into their collecting and reporting on university level metrics and academic indicators.
- Engage the full membership in a forum-type program at membership meetings.
- Provide quarterly updates (or more frequently as needed).
- Maintain close ties with the annual library assessment conference.
- Develop ways to measure the impact of efforts and member satisfaction.

**Composition**

The Assessment Committee should consist of between 5-7 members, appointed by the ARL Board, one of whom is appointed Chair, plus ARL Program Officer Martha Kyrillidou, who will liaise with the Coordinating Committee. Committee members will serve 2-year terms on a staggered basis. The AC Chair will liaise with the Board.

c) **Rename, reconstitute, and re-charge the current Diversity and Leadership Committee as the Diversity and Inclusion Committee** (see Appendix 7).
Purpose and Scope of Responsibility
The Diversity and Inclusion Committee (DAIC) is a standing committee that promotes diversity within ARL and among member libraries. Its purview is broadly defined, encompassing diversity in all its dimensions: race, gender, ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, physical abilities, political and cultural affiliations, and the like. DAIC articulates the value of diversity within ARL’s goals and priorities and embraces a culture of inclusion in the belief that the organization is strengthened by multiple opinions and perspectives. DAIC works closely with other structural units of the organization to conduct its work.

Possible work includes the following:
- Engage with the ARL Academy to educate and promote a diverse leadership.
- Coordinate with the Membership Engagement and Outreach Committee to engage member representatives on diversity issues broadly, including articulating both U.S. and Canadian perspectives on diversity as well as emerging global contexts, and promote programs that encourage diverse points of view in membership meetings.
- Collaborate with the Advocacy and Public Policy Committee in developing position statements and responses to legislative mandates promoting diversity and equity (e.g., compliance with ADA).
- Encourage the Assessment Committee to develop benchmarks and measures, diversity dashboards, best practices, and case studies for member institutions on recruiting, hiring, retaining and valuing a diverse workforce. Mine the Position Description Database and other data for inherent biases.
- Inform Board’s thinking regarding financial strategies for funding Diversity Programs.
- Engage Collective Collections Design Team and subsequent project teams on the importance of documenting and collecting materials that represent the breadth of diversity in scholarship and the historical record.

Composition
The Diversity and Inclusion Committee should consist of 5-7 members, appointed by the ARL Board, one of whom is appointed Chair, plus ARL Program Officer Mark Puente, who will liaise with the Coordinating Committee. Committee members will serve 2-year terms on a staggered basis. The DAIC Chair will liaise with the Board.

d) Rename, reconstitute, and recharge the current Membership Committee as the Membership Engagement and Outreach Committee (see Appendix 5).

Purpose and Scope of Responsibility
The Membership Engagement and Outreach Committee (MEOC) is a standing committee that develops and oversees ARL’s role in connecting and engaging with members in the work and future of the organization. MEOC articulates the various ways in which member representatives can benefit from and participate in ARL. It serves as a proxy for members as it engages with and supports other structural units of the organization. Its purview extends to issues that affect the membership writ large as it promotes ARL’s mission, vision, values, and important news around membership, volunteering, events, and more.
Possible work includes the following:

- Plan membership meetings and other programming and communication means that support the membership, promote participation, and increase membership value, benefits, and satisfaction.
- Support the orientation of new directors/deans and their continuing involvement in the work of ARL.
- Facilitate and advise SoA initiatives on engagement and outreach in design work and projects.
- Ensure that all matters of the Association are inclusive of both Canadian and U.S. members and their contexts.
- Create dashboards on diversity, other statistics related to research libraries, etc.
- Provide a written report annually to each member on the impact of the association and its value to members.

Composition

The Membership Engagement and Outreach Committee should consist of between 8-10 members, appointed by the ARL Board, one of whom is appointed Chair, plus ARL Deputy Executive Director Sue Baughman, who will liaise with the Coordinating Committee. Committee members will serve 2-year terms on a staggered basis. The MEOC Chair will liaise with the Board.

Each of these committees could develop Expert/Advisory Groups to assist them and the ARL staff that work with them. These groups would be informal and principally charged with providing input by reacting to proposals and questions from the committees, bringing issues to the attention of the committees, and offering suggestions on membership meeting sessions. The groups would primarily interact virtually, although there may be times when attendance at a membership meeting or other meeting may be warranted. Advisors would be drawn from the ranks of ARL member institutions. They should be knowledgeable about standing committee purviews and responsibilities and willing to weigh in on issues in a timely fashion.

IV. Membership Roles and Meetings

A. Programming for Membership

The membership meetings will change as a result of the proposed restructuring and should evolve into active and informative gatherings with attributes of the flipped classroom, the unconference, and forums for exchange of information. The Membership Engagement and Outreach Committee should take on the restructuring of the meetings as its first assignment. Suggestions for how the meetings might be organized include:

- Offer “birds of a feather” opportunities at Membership Meetings (e.g., by topic, by type of institution, by location).
  - Schedule blocks of time when groups—who will have been conducting their work between meetings—can present their work. Enabling Capacity Committees could use the time at the meetings to inform the membership through guest speakers, interactive programs, question and answer sessions, etc.
The Coordinating Committee and/or Project Teams (e.g., SHARE) could report on progress made in continuing projects, discuss prospects for projects and interested member representatives under consideration, or hold an incubation session, like an unconference, in which new ideas are considered.

- The informal non-programmed time of the meetings would be maintained or increased—the ability for member representatives to interact with one another in a safe space continues to be an important role for the organization to provide.
- Invitation lists, especially to the Fall membership meeting in Washington, could be enlarged to include not just extant partners, but also new partners with whom ARL wishes to build relationships.

B. Specific Member Roles

This new organizational structure’s success will hinge upon the membership individually and collectively seeing itself in multiple engaging roles that promise success for themselves, their libraries, and their parent institutions. This new structure contemplates that there would be at least five ways in which the member representatives and their staffs can use the Association to advantage their work, none of which are mutually exclusive and collectively offer many more ways into the shared work of the Association. A member’s role will vary depending on interest, expertise, and availability, but will not be restricted to one area:

- **Receptor**: this is the role one can play if one wants to know what is happening in a certain initiative but does not necessarily at that moment want to devote time or resources to the initiative. A receptor would be interested in receiving communications on various issues, attending informational forums or meetings, and listening to project teams’ updates.
- **Informal Collaborator**: this is the role one can play if one is willing to review or respond to proposals or projects, otherwise share her/his knowledge or expertise with a committee or project team as needed, or volunteer expertise from his/her library to a project. The informal collaborator contributes time on an ad-hoc basis.
- **Participator**: this is the role one can play if one is interested in actively engaging in one of the initiatives by pledging time, financial support, and/or staff resources to a project, or active membership on one of the three EECs.
- **Facilitator**: this is the role one can play if one is interested in taking on an organizing role in a new initiative, or a design role in one of the areas of the System of Action, or a program development role for the membership meetings. The facilitator could bring a group of member representatives together around a project.
- **Leader**: this is the role one can play if one has a vision for a particular project or initiative and the commitment and skill to see the project or initiative accomplished. The leader role requires a commitment of time and resources for a particular project.
Appendix 1a: Proposed ARL Organizational Framework, Days 1-365
Appendix 1b: Proposed ARL Organizational Framework, Day 366+
Appendix 2: Project Teams (PT 1-n)

Once the SIDTs have completed their work, ARL will foster the development of new activities through the creation of Project Teams that engage members and other experts. Ideas for activities can be brought forward by any ARL member, a group of members, the ARL Board, the Executive Director, or ARL staff. Ideas may also come from outside of ARL (“External Partners”), but should be brought forward by an ARL member or staff.

Steps to move an idea forward might include:

1. Group of ARL Member Directors and/or ARL Staff forms organically, brainstorms idea, decides if moving forward is feasible:
   a. If NO, group dissolves
   b. If YES, Project Team (PT 1-n) is formed, approaches BoD, which evaluates idea (directly or by assignment to Coordinating Committee or Staff) in order to decide whether it fits within the ARL SOA
      i. If NO, alternatives are suggested
      ii. If YES, Project Team charter is developed and approved by BoD, which appoints chair/Staff/VPO
         a. Project Team invites ARL members to participate, develops plan, and gets to work
         b. Coordinating Committee assesses project on a regular basis
         c. When project is complete, Project Team is dissolved

-AND/OR-

2. External Partner(s) approach(es) ARL Member Director(s), ARL Staff, ARL ED, or BoD with idea
3. BoD (directly or by assignment to Coordinating Committee or Staff) evaluates idea in order to decide whether it fits within the ARL SOA
   a. If NO, alternatives are suggested
   b. If YES, Project Team (PT 1-n) is formed, charter is developed and approved by BoD, which appoints chair/Staff/VPO
      i. Project Team invites ARL members to participate, develops plan, and gets to work
      ii. Coordinating Committee assesses project on a regular basis
      iii. When project is complete, Project Team is dissolved

Depending on scope, capacity, and resources required, these steps may occur in quick succession or take more time to plan and consider. ARL’s role in projects and activities will vary depending on the activity.

A plan will be put in place at ARL to inform, track, and provide updates on projects, and to provide projects with tools they might need to accomplish their work.

---

7 In consultation with the ARL Innovation Lab or others, as appropriate.
Appendix 3: Statements of “ARL Guiding Principles”

1. **From**: “Report & Recommendations for ARL Strategic Plan 2010-2012” (October 21, 2009)  
   ARL Strategic Plan Review Task Force; Marianne Gaunt, Chair

The following principles guided the ARL Strategic Plan Review Task Force in its work. The “we” in these statements refers to the Association.

Distinctive Mission
- We complement and build on the strengths of other organizations.
- We rethink historic assumptions.
- Our policy positions guide our strategies.

Community
- We are a member-driven organization.
- We are accountable to our members.
- We provide opportunity for full engagement by all member representatives.
- We respect the diversity of our membership.

Intellectual Freedom and Scholarly Communication
- We promote and advocate barrier-free access to research and educational information resources.

Collaboration
- We build relationships with other higher education and scholarly societies, and associations that share our common goals.
- We work closely with other library-related associations, councils, federations, etc.

Diversity
- We encourage and support our members as they strive to reflect society’s diversity in their staffing, collections, leadership, and programs.
- We strive to employ a diverse staff.

Operational Effectiveness
- We are focused on the needs of our member libraries.
- We allocate our resources wisely and practice sound fiscal management.
- We promote continuing staff development and growth.
2. **From:** ARL Program Directors, with input from ARL Staff (June 15, 2015)

These principles guide the Association in advancing its strategic Framework to support the work of ARL members and the broader research community.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion for the Library Workforce

- Instill respect for the full range of human characteristics and experiences.
- Achieve excellence through a more diverse and inclusive workforce by promoting opportunity, interaction, and communication.
- Ensure equitable access to knowledge resources, information spaces, and community connections for all individuals.

Barrier-Free Access to the Full Range of Information Services

- Advocate for access that is free of all barriers (e.g., physical, economic, and technological, etc.) to research and educational information.
- Champion academic freedom, confidentiality, and privacy.
- Promote open access, open scholarship and data, and open educational resources.
- Partner in actions that promote the creation of an international digital platform for access by all.

Long-Term Preservation of and Access to the Scientific and Cultural Record for Use by Future Generations

- Champion investment in scalable, collaborative, preservation infrastructures.
- Promote best practices and innovative services in the creation and long-term management of research library collections.
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Appendix 5: Transition Reports
Advancing Scholarly Communication and Membership Committees

Advancing Scholarly Communication

Members of the Advancing Scholarly Communication Steering Committee recommended that the Committee be sunsetted based on the following points:

- Work of joint ARL/AAU Task Force is well-launched and can continue without a committee.
- Work on Lyrasis can become a continuing ARL administrative staff function.
- Requests to sign on to various issues/developments should be handled by the Advocacy and Public Policy Committee.
- Work to advance discussions with University Presses can be [re]assigned to the Scholarly Dissemination Engine Design Team.

Membership Committee

A. The activities your committee is currently engaged in:
   1. How do they map to the ARL Strategic Framework for 2015+ and the Essential Capacities and System of Action it includes)?
      Membership is an essential capacity of the organization.

   2. For those that do, which can be completed in the next six months? Which will require additional time for completion, and how much time?
      We have recommended by-laws changes for consideration by the membership. We want to reserve the right not to embargo memberships for three years. We recognize that it is not business as usual and we would work closely with the Executive Committee and Board before proposing a new member, but there may be a situation in which a new member would be a major contributor to advancing our strategic aims.

   3. For those that don’t, how and on what schedule do you recommend sunsetting them?
      n/a

B. Your committee itself:
   4. Does it make sense in the context of the new framework?
      Yes, the Membership Committee is important for the corporate memory of the organization, for continuity and history. No matter what the strategic vision for ARL is still reliant on the capacity of its members to make the vision a reality.

      If so, as is? Or, does it need realigning?
      The committee would encourage a larger conversation around membership, so meetings should not always be closed to members. The committee would welcome a broader role in examining aspects in support of the ST&T, including greater agility, engagement, various membership categories, partners, and member roles.

   5. If not, should it be replaced? Merged/Reassembled? Sunsetted?
      Continuing.
Appendix 6: Transition Report
Transforming Research Libraries

December 15, 2014

To: Strategic Thinking and Design Transition Team (STADTT)

Re: Transforming Research Libraries Steering Committee and related working groups

Per your memo of September 21, 2014, please accept this report from the Transforming Research Libraries Steering committee and its working groups: Transforming Special Collections in the Digital Age and the E-Research Working Group. The questions posed in the September memo were discussed at the TRL and working group meetings on October 14th. Based on the outcomes of those discussions, we respectfully submit the following recommendations. This document is framed to follow the “Transforming Research Libraries Priorities for 2014” document shared with the membership at the October ARL Membership meeting (labeled Attachment 16b).

TRL 2014 Goals

Expand ARL participation (among and within ARL libraries) in a targeted suite of courses from SAA’s Digital Archives Specialist (DAS) curriculum. Of the eleven total DAS workshops, two are yet to be held (NYPL and Boston College in spring and early summer 2015). The ARL-DAS partnership will then be considered complete. The ARL may want to co-sponsor similar professional training programs under the “ARL Academy” of the System of Action; therefore it will be important to capture the lessons learned and assessment of impact from the ARL/SAA partnership. The Transforming Special Collections in the Digital Age Working Group will provide a report about the program to the ARL Board by its July 2015 meeting, with a particular emphasis on the attributes that ARL should seek in a successful professional training program partner and curriculum.

Augment previous work on special collections mainstreaming and mission alignment. The Transforming Special Collections in the Digital Age Working Group has proposed to the ARL Board the idea of a program that would bring together ARL directors with the heads of their special collections for a discussion on mission alignment. The format of the program would be similar to that of successful CNI Executive Roundtables. Working Group chair Tom Hickerson will be writing a formal proposal for the program, which will be submitted to the board via the TRL chair, Jeff Horrell. Tom is tentatively planning that this meeting would be held on at the end of the ARL spring meeting, on the afternoon of April 30th and the morning of May 1. This program might fall within the “Essential Capacities” category of “Issue Incubator” because it is exploring what is perceived to be a current tension and disconnect at some libraries between the mission of a research library and the mission of special collection departments within a research library. Alternatively, the program could be billed more positively as an exploration of where special collections fit within the new 2015+ strategic framework writ large, with an outcome to identify leadership within the association for defining this work. On December 12 Tom and Jeff presented the proposal to the Board. There was concern that the program as proposed would be perceived as ARL dictating to institutions what they should be doing, rather than ARL supporting the directions of special collections programs. There were also concerns about the selection process of director/head of special collections teams. With only 30 pairs, many institutions would not be able to participate. Expanding the numbers would hinder the ability to have a constructive program. After discussion of these points and others, the Board agreed not to move forward with the proposal at this time.
Expand ARL-sponsored Position Description Data Bank (PDDB) to select consortia. The PDDB has been successfully rolled out to ASERL and is currently being expanded to the non-ARL members of CARL. An Advisory Group [Tiffany Allen, UNC Chapel Hill; Kathleen Delong; Alberta; Peggy Fry, Georgetown; Quinn Galbraith; BYU; Brian Keith, U Florida; Judy Russell, U Florida; Mark Puente and Judy Ruttenberg, ARL] handles questions regarding the use of the PDDB data and the strategic direction of the PDDB. Presumably, the PDDB would fall within the “ARL Academy,” and, if the position data is mined for research, also within “Libraries that Learn.” A question for STADTT is whether the PDDB Advisory Group the correctly weighted governance structure for something like PDDB? Is it too heavy or too light?

A finding of the PDDB project experience to date is that libraries are hesitant to deposit position descriptions that are not current and up-to-date. Unfortunately, many librarians are working with job descriptions that have not been updated in years and this is limiting participation in the PDDB. The PDDB Advisory Group recommends that ARL tie the free use of the ARL job posting website (http://www.arl.org/leadership-recruitment/job-listings) with PDDB. In other words, if a job is posted on the ARL Job posting website, the library is agreeing to have the job posting harvested into the PDDB. The next steps are 1) explore whether there is an easy way for an ARL job posting to be automatically, or with little human effort, harvested into PDDB and 2) what minimal informed consent information needs to be added to the ARL job posting website so that users are aware that the job posting will be automatically added to PDDB. These next two steps could be completed within two months, if the ARL staff has the time to explore how the harvesting could be accomplished. The PDDB Advisory Committee could draft a short informed consent statement for the ARL job posting website.

Another consideration to enhance the research and operational value of the PDDB is to clarify that “annual assignment” documents could be posted to the PDDB in lieu of position descriptions, as virtually all organizations have updated annual assignments even as position descriptions are untouched. This is a marketing and communications issue and should be taken up by the PDDB Advisory Group and conveyed to the ARL membership.

Explore new, lighter weight format for “New Roles for New Times,” with a pivot in focus to new work, rather than new roles. The “Workforce Transformation Stories” blog was launched in June 2014 (http://www.arl.org/focus-areas/workforce/workforce-transformation-stories). To date, there have been five workforce transformation stories posted, and there are another 8 ideas or proposals in the pipeline. The Workforce Transformation Stories series has been promoted as a professional development opportunity for senior library administrators and that appears to be resonating with authors. Each author is partnered with a volunteer library director editor, and that partnership can be leveraged into a mentoring opportunity.

The interest in the blog, as evidenced by the number of stories in the pipeline and the hits on the blog would suggest that the blog is currently successful. The stories have been in the 50 most-visited pages on www.arl.org and web analytics show that people are staying on the workforce story pages for several minutes—longer than on section landing pages across the website, for example. However, its impact and return on invest for the work effort by ARL staff should be regularly revisited. Judy Ruttenberg runs the series, with minimal guidance from an ad hoc group of ARL directors. Assuming that the Workforce Transformation Stories fit under the “ARL Academy,” a question for STADTT is whether the current ad hoc governance is the correctly weighted governance? Is it too heavy or too light?

With Public Policy, defining next “at-scale” agenda items for the Accessibility and Universal Design Working Group. On October 1, 2014 the ARL appointed Katya Pereyaslavska as a visiting program officer (VPO) for accessibility and universal design. Her at-scale efforts are best
summarized in the announcement of Katya’s appointment (http://www.arl.org/news/arlnews/3408-katya-pereyaslavska-named-arl-visiting-program-officer-for-accessibility-and-universal-design). The ARL Accessibility and Universal Design Working Group, led by Ed Van Gemert, has been a very strong and active working group that includes ARL deans and directors, front-line library staff, an LIS educator, and a computer science researcher. The Working Group, like the Task Force that preceded it, is anchored in Public Policy and Transforming Research Libraries because it is public policy (copyright exemptions, the Americans with Disabilities Act, section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, the Marrakesh Treaty, HathiTrust court decisions, etc. that defines what’s required and what’s possible in the provision of services to people with disabilities; and how those services are organized within and among libraries falls within the TRL realm of workforce transformation, teaching and learning. This is extremely important work for ARL to be involved with and it would appear to fit under the “Essential Capacities” of “Advocacy and Policy” but the STADTT should consider how to make Accessibility and Universal Design more visible within the entire 2015+ framework.

*Work with other ARL program areas to raise awareness and support work of SHARE initiative on research university campuses.* Although the SHARE project cuts across TRL, Advancing Scholarly Communication and Influencing Public Policies, its activities are reported in the TRL activities rubric. SHARE is a multi-year project with activity and funding partners beyond ARL.

The coordination of SHARE is currently at the Executive Director level, and therefore sits above, or alongside, the current strategic direction steering committees. SHARE has had a Steering Group (now Advisory Board) of its own. SHARE was identified in the “Report of the Association of Research Libraries Strategic Thinking and Design Initiative” (page 20) as being in the “Collective Collections” portion of the System of Action. Recently SHARE has shifted into a more formal structure, with the appointment of Tyler Waters as director for a two-year term, the designation of an operations team of Judy Ruttenberg and Rikk Mulligan from ARL, and consultants Eric Celeste and Greg Tananbaum, and active business planning with consultant Hannah Rasmussen, Coherence Scholar. A question for the STADTT is whether the various aspects of the SHARE project, such as the current governance structure, communications plan, membership involvement, steering committee structure, partnership (AAU and APLU) relationship, are currently set up in a way such that SHARE can be a model for future ARL large-scale projects? If SHARE is to be an early example of ARL playing the role of “shape/design/influence/build” or “manage/run and/or spin off” (and perhaps we should clearly indicate which of these two roles ARL is currently playing with SHARE), then is SHARE set up in a way that exemplifies how ARL imagines future projects to be handled within that type of role? Can we now create an ideal roadmap for other projects to follow based on SHARE’s current status and some of the lessons we can draw from it? For example, in the post-steering committee association, how will major projects such as SHARE be effectively championed at the Board level, and effectively embedded within the membership?

Following the list of the TRL 2014 Goals in Appendix 16b is a chart of TRL Activities, Projects & Priorities for 2014. There are a few TRL issues/initiatives that are only expressed in this chart and are detailed below:

*Liaison Program:* At ALA Midwinter and Annual, 2014, approximately 50 supervisors of library liaison/subject librarian programs at ARL libraries met under TRL sponsorship to consider opportunities to bring effective change to their respective programs through collaboration and the sharing of best practices. Several leaders emerged from this process, including Rita Vine, University of Toronto, Barbara Rockenbach, Columbia, and Karrie Peterson, U Penn, among others, and TRL again convened a follow-up meeting of 12 people in early October, including
Anne Kenney and facilitated by DeEtta Jones. Broad themes that have emerged over these meetings include a need to define new ways of engaging with the university community (beyond reference, instruction, and collection development) and developing associated tools for defining that work, carrying it out, and assessing its impact. Following the October meeting, Cornell, Columbia, and the University of Toronto have begun planning for a pilot “liaison institute” to be held at Cornell University in June 2015. Judy Ruttenberg will participate in the planning effort for this, with potential participation from members of TRL as well. The outcomes from this institute are currently being defined, but it could lead to a program focused on the transformation of liaison programs which would fit within the “ARL Academy” of the System of Action.

**e-Research Working Group:** At the October (2014) ARL Meeting, members of the e-Research Working Group concluded that due to the rapidly evolving and pervasive changes experienced in today’s research environment, the Working Group’s diverse agenda to “define the library’s role in a 21st century research infrastructure” could be better addressed and more directly shaped through means beyond the scope of the Working Group, and possibly even beyond ARL. Specifically, the Working Group suggested re-positioning the locus of this important set of conversations and outcomes within the broader context of higher education, with particular emphasis on members’ individual campuses. The Working Group also noted the need to remain aware of related policy issues, especially in regard to governmental and funder mandates in the U.S. and Canada.

While acknowledging that the wide range of e-research issues remains vitally important to research libraries and that we must continue to make a concerted effort to both become and remain an integral part of these critical discussions, decisions, and actions, the Working Group agreed that the best solutions are more likely to come from collaborations among key stakeholders and partners within the local university setting, including (but not limited to) libraries, campus information technology organizations, vice presidents for research, offices of sponsored research, grants management, and high performance computing. Results from these broader discussions could have an impact on ARL’s newly defined “Collective Collection” of research data and potentially enhance the “Scholarly Dissemination Engine” by promoting new forms of e-research, particularly in the humanities. The “ARL Academy” might also play an important role in retraining some librarians to become data scientists, for example.

Believing that ARL needs a strategy to deal with emerging research support issues that exceeds the capacity of the current working group, the e-Research Working Group agreed that it would be willing to disband. In so doing, the Working Group emphasized that the problem space is filled with increasingly complicated, high stake issues that require actions at both the micro and macro-level. The Group encouraged ARL to consider what might be the most appropriate path for supporting and motivating its membership in the changing research environment. Whether through establishing a more structured approach within ARL or encouraging individual libraries to pursue these matters locally, the Working Group remains concerned that research libraries remain part of the discussion and the solution to the evolving methods and needs of research.

**TRL Steering Committee:** The TRL steering committee has been an umbrella committee under which several terrific, impactful programs have flourished. However, TRL itself, as a steering committee, has not had a clear purpose or role for the last couple of years. This is not for lack of effort on the part of Judy Ruttenberg or the TRL chairs. Rather “Transforming Research Libraries” is simply too broad in scope, and consequently the committee has not had a clear focus. TRL efforts seemed to only flourish when the initiatives were spun into a working group, such as special collections, PDDP, Workforce Transformation series and e-Research’s early
collaborations around the e-Science Institute. Consequently, the recommendation is that TRL be disbanded in place of much more focused initiatives.

Other issues that emerged in TRL and its working group meetings that ARL should consider:

- As the Mellon Foundation and CLIR shifts the “Hidden Special Collections” program to focus on digitization, what, if any, role should ARL play?
- Where do special collections fall within ARL’s “Collective Collections” initiative? Should ARL play a larger role in helping to develop tools, best practices, and protocols for libraries to reveal their special collections to the world? There was a strong sense from the Transforming Special Collections in a Digital Age Working Group that special collection issues could get lost in the new ARL Framework. It is not immediately clear where the types of issues the working group has taken up to date will fit in the new framework, and Tom Hickerson concludes that a group focusing on Special Collections is needed going forward. Critical elements in realizing research libraries’ role as a trusted steward insuring enhanced and equitable access to record of human experience are unlikely to be adequately addressed and promoted without focused assignment of responsibility. Illustrative of this is the need for a group to be working in partnership with the CLIR/Mellon Digitization Initiative.
- The MLA Future of the Print Record Working Group will bring additional attention to the problem of a national or international print retention strategy. Where, along the spectrum of possible roles, does ARL see itself? Broker, facilitate, shape or manage?

Respectfully submitted by: Susan Gibbons (former TRL chair), Jeff Horrell (current TRL chair), Harriette Hemmasi (chair of e-Research Working Group), Tom Hickerson (chair of Transforming Special Collections in the Digital Age Working Group), and Judy Ruttenberg, ARL Staff.
Appendix 7: Transition Report
Diversity and Leadership

December 31, 2014

To: Strategic Thinking and Design Transition Team (STADTT)

From: Diversity and Leadership Committee, Joyce Backus, Chair; Mark Puente, Staff Liaison

Role of the ARL Committee on Diversity and Leadership

The ARL Committee on Diversity and Leadership believes that our current programs map most clearly to the “ARL Academy.” While the ARL Committee on Diversity and Leadership has engaged in substantive conversations and activities over the past several years, much of our work has been focused on the tactical aspects of the portfolio, i.e. selecting candidates for the ARL Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce (IRDW) and the Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP). In addition, the committee has monitored or been directly engaged with assessment efforts for the ARL Leadership Fellows program (formerly, the Research Libraries Leadership Fellows Program). Lastly, the committee has served in an advisory capacity to other projects in development, i.e. the new directors’ institute.

The committee recommends that, in the new ARL Framework, a smaller core group of four to five ARL member representatives provide Diversity and Leadership coordination and policy setting, as well as explore substantive ways to engage the membership, including enhancing the engagement of our Canadian members. This coordinating group will recruit other member representatives as appropriate to serve in specific roles such as selectors or advisors for programs and initiatives, for example. This structure will provide opportunities for direct involvement by more member representatives, and serve as an opportunity to educate about the programs’ needs and accomplishments.

The Committee believes that the new Strategic Framework does not yet adequately reflect the need for ongoing commitments and investments in Diversity and Leadership, nor does it reflect the opportunities for advancing these strategic agendas that may surface from working in new ways. The exception is this text from the “Academy” section,

ARL will foster the development of an agile, diverse workforce and the inspiring leadership necessary to meet present and future challenges. Requisite expertise and skills will come from new as well as traditional domains, stimulating opportunity and challenging existing research library culture. Coordinated action within ARL will continue to focus on critically important diversity initiatives and leadership programs. To ensure the development of the talent and expertise necessary for future success, ARL will seek partners in establishing a formal, potentially credentialed curriculum for library professionals and for those new to libraries.

It is a conviction of the Committee on Diversity and Leadership that ARL efforts in the diversity recruitment arena have effected positive, albeit incremental change in minority representation of US ARL member libraries, (similar advances could be reflected within the Canadian ARLs but some data collection would be necessary to ascertain that fully). Moreover, the Committee recognizes that no other organization is engaged in this type of work in research libraries as comprehensively or systematically as ARL. A program review and additional research could help determine ways to bolster the reach and efficacy of these programs.
Review of Existing Programs

The attached timeline provides the schedule for six of the ARL diversity recruitment and leadership development programs. Three out of four of the diversity recruitment programs are funded by the IMLS and, to continue them, ARL would need to identify new funds from external sources or ARL. The Committee recommends incorporating four of the programs into the Academy and sunsetting two of the programs when they end.

1) The ARL Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce (IRDW)
The ARL IRDW is the premiere diversity recruitment program for the Association. Established in 2000 by voluntary contributions from 52 ARL member institutions, the program was subsequently funded from 2003 to 2010 by three IMLS grants. Since 2013, the program has been funded by contributions from 62 ARL member libraries. Current funding will support one more cohort of IRDW Diversity Scholars, to be awarded in spring of 2015, which means that members of this cohort will complete coursework in spring of 2017 at the latest. The current program budget can support the MLIS education and other professional development activities of up to 15 students annually. The Committee recommends the Academy as the home for the IRDW, or similar program, to introduce diverse library school candidates to ARLs and interest them in careers in research libraries. In its current design, the IRDW provides direct student support in the amount of $15,000 per student.

2) The ARL Career Enhancement Program (CEP)
The ARL Career Enhancement Program is an IMLS-funded diversity recruitment program whose core component is a paid 6–12 week internship in an ARL member library. IMLS funding for the program will conclude in June of 2015, but to accommodate the 2015 summer internship schedule, ARL will request a one year no-cost extension extending the program until June of 2016. The Committee recommends the Academy as a home for a program like the CEP to introduce diverse library school candidates to ARLs and interest them in careers in research libraries. In its current design, the CEP offers $10,800 per person in direct student support.

3) The Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP)
Established in 1997, the LCDP is the longest standing leadership development program offered by ARL and has been offered biennially. It focuses on the development of mid-career librarians from traditionally underrepresented racial and ethnic minority groups. This past July, the eighth iteration of the LCDP concluded the 18-month fellowship. The recently appointed Visiting Program Officer for Diversity and Leadership is reviewing the LCDP and the report will inform the future of the program. The LCDP is run on a cost-recovery basis; tuition fees cover most of the expenses. For the last ten years, the LCDP has operated with modest commitments of ARL staff time and resources. The Committee recommends the Academy as a home for a leadership program such as the LCDP to develop leadership skills among underrepresented groups. The Committee recognizes that the timing of the LCDP assessment and report may be not be ideally aligned with the implementation of the new ARL strategic framework.

4) Leadership Fellows Program (formerly the Research Libraries Leadership Fellows Program)
ARL established the Leadership Fellows Program in 2004 responding to the need to recruit and develop the next generation of directors of large, complex, research libraries. The program is currently in its fifth iteration, slated to conclude in May of 2015. During the October 2014 ARL Membership meeting, the ARL Committee on Diversity and Leadership made the recommendation to the ARL Board of Directors that the schedule of the program remain as projected, with a new class to be recruited in summer of 2015 with a program kick-off in fall of 2015. The ARL Board suggested that data be collected about the design of the program looking, specifically, at the duration, selection process, and possible strategies for diversifying the
cohorts. Plans are underway to assemble a group of ARL directors, including some former program participants, ARL staff, and other program alumni for a day and a half focus discussion on these issues. Currently, the Leadership Fellows Program is operated on a cost-recovery model, with less than 4% of the budget used for salaries of executive staff, and more significant amounts used in support of administrative staff salaries and one external consultant (DeEtta Jones). A key question related to the transition to the new strategic framework is whether the funding and staffing model is the most effective structure to support a program with these high-level objectives. Changes to the program design (methodology) and other factors will affect these needs and may provide opportunities for efficiencies in the future.

5) The ARL/Music Library Association Diversity and Inclusion Initiative (DII)
The ARL/MLA DII is a collaborative diversity recruitment program with the Music Library Association (MLA). The DII was recently awarded a one-year, no cost extension from IMLS. The program is in its third year and funding will conclude in March of 2016. There is no plan to seek funding for any further iterations of the program. The MLA board has discussed how they might provide limited financial support for an ARL Diversity Scholar with an academic background in a music-related discipline rather than support an independent program. The committee recommends sunsetting the DII program at completion.

6) The ARL/Society of American Archivists Mosaic Program
The ARL/Society of American Archivists (SAA) Mosaic Program provides significant financial support and leadership development to students from historically underrepresented racial and ethnic minority groups who are pursuing master’s studies in archival studies or special collections librarianship. The effort is funded by the IMLS and the second of three cohorts was selected and announced this fall. The program will support one additional cohort of five participants who will complete their paid internships during the 2015–2016 academic year. Students selected in the spring of 2015 will be eligible to receive tuition support through May of 2017 pending the submission and approval of a one-year, no cost extension from the IMLS. The committee recommends this program sunset at that time.

7) Other programs and initiatives
Although not currently part of the Diversity and Leadership portfolio, the new directors’ institute has been in the queue for development since October of 2013. Visiting program officer and former ARL director, Paula Kaufman, conducted interviews with new and established directors to identify curricular needs and to address ways of staffing and sustaining the program. The project has been on hold pending the strategic design. If the project is to be developed, it will need an implementation team and a funding strategy.

Diversity and Leadership Programs have an informal relationship with the statistics and assessment team in support of the ClimateQUAL® protocol. This lightweight bond is achieved through participation of the program officer in the ClimateQUAL project team. The transition into the new strategic framework will provide opportunity for exploration into other substantive ways to address organizational culture as it relates to diversity and inclusion in libraries and archives.

ARL Career Resources have, historically, been the responsibility of the ARL program officer for diversity. These programs have been streamlined considerably over the last five years and now consist of the Jobs/Residency/Internships listings on the ARL webpage.
http://www.arl.org/leadership-recruitment/job-listings#.VIDW1t62SK8. The job postings create a modest stream of revenue for the organization, largely utilized by diversity programs. The new ST&D could provide opportunities for discussion about other services or products that might support recruitment efforts for member libraries and archives. Although a separate
product and process, there have been preliminary conversations about the possibility of the ARL website interfacing with the Position Description Databank http://www.arl.org/leadership-recruitment/arl-position-description-bank#.VIIdaJN62SK8. These programs should continue under the auspices of the ARL Academy.

Conclusion

The Committee on Diversity and Leadership sees a logical home in the ARL Academy Initiative for the programs that we recommend to continue including the ARL Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce (IRDW), Career Enhancement Program (CEP), and a mid-career leadership program derived from the experience with the Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP) and the outcome of the workshop on the Leadership Fellows Program. Although these programs would be logically centered in the Academy, there are clearly aspects of them that should be connected to the Libraries that Learn and Innovation Lab Initiatives. The Committee looks forward to working with the Strategic Thinking and Design Transition Team on transitioning the programs in a way that will best serve the current and future members and partners of ARL and ensure that our profession is diverse in the traditional sense. This framework will ensure that the ARL Academy also supports the development of well-prepared leaders who will allow research libraries to become the collaborative partners we envision in the research ecosystem.
Appendix 8: Transition Report
Influencing Public Policies

To: Strategic Thinking and Design Transition Team

Re: Influencing Public Policies Steering Committee (IPP) and IPP Working Groups

From: David Carlson, chair, Influencing Public Policies and Prue Adler, staff liaison


This memo responds to your September 21, 2014 request for input from the Steering Committees concerning how to best transition to the new strategic framework. The Influencing Public Policies Steering Committee (IPP) discussed the questions posed by the Transition Team on October 14th. In addition, the chairs of the Working Group on Fair Use and Related Exemptions, the Regional Federal Depository Libraries Working Group and Influencing Public Policies conducted a call on November 7th to further engage on the work of the two Working Groups. Finally, IPP and Transforming Research Libraries jointly sponsor the Accessibility and Universal Design Working Group. Based on these conversations and members’ understanding of the role of the Essential Capacities, the following observations and recommendations are suggested.

IPP and its working groups identified seven key areas of focus in 2014. These areas of focus are reflected in the IPP Priorities for 2014 (attached). Based on the Committee and Working Group discussions, much of this work is seen as integral to the success of many of the components of the system of action and will be integrated into many of them. Based on the fall discussions, it is our understanding that the Accessibility and Universal Design Working Group will be ongoing and its work integrated into all ARL activities. We will address this issue later in the document but one area of concern with this approach is loss of focus and leadership on public policy issues. Throughout the strategic design process, we heard from members repeatedly in many of the working groups that they see public policy advocacy and education as one of the essential activities of ARL and a key reason for their membership and involvement. Given this criticality, we have a concern that if public policies are everywhere they may be nowhere. Based on this concern, it is our recommendation that in order to maintain a focus on the vital issues of public policy that IPP be included as a formal component of the various components of the SOA ensuring cohesive policy, coordinated action, and effective communication.

Questions from the Strategic Thinking and Design Transition Team: The activities your committee is currently engaged in:

1. How do they map to the ARL Strategic Framework for 2015+ and the Essential Capacities and System of Action it includes (pp. 9, 19+ of the above-referenced Report)?
2. For those that do, which can be completed in the next six months? Which will require additional time for completion, and how much time?
3. For those that don’t, how and on what schedule do you recommend sunsetting them?

———

8 Questions from the Strategic Thinking and Design Transition Team: The activities your committee is currently engaged in:
The seven areas of focus identified by the IPP are:

- Copyright and Intellectual Property
- Open and Public Access Policies
- Digital Data Policies
- Best Practices and Policies Relating to Accessibility
- Privacy, Surveillance and Telecommunications
- Access to Government Information
- Funding of Key Agencies/Programs

We have listed some of the components of the System of Action identified in the Strategic Plan below with some discussion of how the priorities of the IPP will function as a critical component for success and progress.

**Collective Collections**

Copyright and intellectual property issues will loom large in the collective collections component and that involves the current work of the Working Group on Fair Use and Related Exemptions. Evidence of this strong link is the lawsuit between the Authors Guild and HathiTrust. In addition, there are copyright issues in an initiative that is now underway to formalize, among some research libraries, the harvesting and long-term preservation of and access to web content. Open and public access policies, digital data policies and accessibility issues will be essential elements of new collaborative platforms and are key policy issues that will be ongoing for many years.

To be successful, an open platform for innovation with few barriers to access including positive financial models will require ongoing telecommunications policy work such as that concerning network neutrality. Working to ensure that there is an open, effective, non-discriminatory and financially affordable Internet will be central to the success of creating platforms to provide sustainable access to knowledge resources.

Much of the work of the academy today depends upon digital and network-based cyberinfrastructure. Research universities have developed and continue to develop these technologies based on extensive federal funding, much of which has come from the National Science Foundation. Support for selected federal agency appropriations will be important to continue such as ARL’s participation in CNSF that supports NSF funding. IPP appropriations work has also supported members’ appropriations such as the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine and the National Agriculture Library. These and other appropriations measures such as language concerning public access policies will assist in the ARL components of the System of Action. Finally, the work of the Regional Federal Depository Libraries Working Group in promoting effective access to digital and digitized government information will be firmly grounded in the Collective Collections component. Digitizing the corpus of federal documents is a priority of ARL and HathiTrust and participation in that initiative will continue.

**Scholarly Dissemination Engine**

Copyright and intellectual property policy issues will be central to the scholarly dissemination engine thus the portfolio of the Working Group on Fair Use and Related Exemptions and IPP. This includes new public policy work with AAU and APLU on digital rights management and also includes issues regarding preservation. In addition, public policies relating to public and
open access to journal literature, digital data and new forms of scholarly communication will be integral to this component.

Libraries that Learn

As research libraries deploy new analytical tools in support of teaching and learning, privacy issues arise with how student data are used. Although privacy is a long-standing issue of the ARL’s public policies portfolio, recently there has been interest in how privacy issues map to the use of analytics by libraries and higher education institutions. It is anticipated that more exploration and understanding needs to be undertaken in this policy area.

ARL Academy

Public policy issues have been and will continue to be important to research library leadership and their staff. Including a policy component in leadership activities provides needed education for research library leadership to interact with their campuses on a host of policy issues and also to respond on the national level regarding national policies that may impact their campus.

Essential Capacities

Advocacy and Policy: The work of IPP and its working groups are well positioned to bring significant strength and focus to the Advocacy and Policy Essential Capacity. Much of the current IPP portfolio aligns with the initiatives within the System of Action and promotes and advances the evolving interests of research libraries.

Partnerships: The public policy work of ARL entails developing extensive partnerships in Washington and beyond in support of ARL’s priorities. For example, this ranges from library-related partnerships such as the Library Copyright Alliance, to work with higher education associations such as AAU and APLU, to work with the National Federation of the Blind and finally, with the Open Access Working Group. Partnerships span both the public and private sectors and may be focused on multiple issues or reflect a focus on a priority issue. These partnerships are an essential element of ARL’s ability to convey message and to change and/or create new law and policy.

Issue Incubator: New ideas and seeds of change will have policy components, be it best practices and/or understanding the current legal context in which a new idea may flourish or whither. A new initiative may also lead to new legislative work to try and change or update the current legal structure to be more hospitable to an innovative change. Finally, a new effort may require collaborating with federal agencies.

A recent example of how ARL tackles an issue that first emerges from the policy sphere is demonstrated through ARL’s public policy work on accessibility issues. The combination of a WIPO treaty on the visually impaired, a string of settlements between higher education institutions and the US Government over inaccessible technology in the classroom and congressional consideration of current copyright law relating to the print disabled, led to the formation of an ARL Task Force and now a Working Group to better address such issues. Similarly, SHARE was originally conceived as a response to the OSTP memo on enhancing public access to federally funded research resources.

The Accessibility and Universal Design Working Group works under the auspices of IPP and TRL. Most recently, this Working Group defined its future work with a focus on “at-scale” agenda items. On October 1, 2014, ARL appointed Katya Pereyaslavsk as a visiting program
officer (VPO) for accessibility and universal design. Her at-scale efforts are best summarized in the announcement of Katya’s appointment (http://www.arl.org/news/arl-news/3408-katya-perevaslavska-named-arl-visiting-program-officer-for-accessibility-and-universal-design). The ARL Accessibility and Universal Design Working Group, led by Ed Van Gemert, has been a very strong and active working group that includes ARL deans and directors, front-line library staff, an LIS educator, and a computer science researcher. The Working Group, like the Task Force that preceded it, is anchored in Public Policy and Transforming Research Libraries because it is public policy (copyright exemptions, the Americans with Disabilities Act, section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, the Marrakesh Treaty, HathiTru court decisions, etc.) that defines what’s required and what’s possible in the provision of services to people with disabilities; and how those services are organized within and among libraries falls within the TRL realm of workforce transformation, teaching and learning. This is extremely important work for ARL to be involved with and it would appear to fit under the “Essential Capacities” of “Advocacy and Policy” but the STADTT should consider how to make Accessibility and Universal Design more visible within the new ARL framework writ large.

Context

As stated in the report of the Strategic Thinking and Design Initiative, Essential Capacities—which include advocacy and policy—“reflect work that must be done in order for ARL to successfully implement current and new activities ... and will be integrated into future initiatives.” The work of the IPP and its Working Groups entails tracking, promoting or opposing legislation and Administration policies and programs. Although some Administration and legislative activities may be short-lived, this is not typical. While some activities may include short-term strategies, the activities themselves occur over long periods of time, and some may be ongoing. Most policy activities take many years to be introduced, passed by Congress and signed by the President—or to be defeated—and even when defeated they may be resurrected again in another session with a corresponding change in leadership. Even activities that are short lived require extensive groundwork and analysis to ensure that the law and/or new proposed regulations will result in good policy without negative unintended consequences. Also, for most proposals, it is necessary to undertake activities for coalition building to ensure that support is available when needed. Building coalitions requires time and patience.

With regards to policy activities in the judicial realm, cases can drag on for years such as Google Books and Georgia State University. These cases require ongoing investments in legal briefs and meetings with congressional and administration staff among others.

In the international realm, treaties can take a decade if not more to conclude, followed by years of work in support of treaty ratification by the US Congress. All of these national and international policy efforts entail extensive coalition building and outreach within higher education and beyond, which also takes time.

Unlike other ARL Committees and Steering Groups, the work of IPP and its working groups do not have many time-limited projects. And for those that were time limited, such as the development of the Code of Best Practices in Fair Use in Academic and Research Libraries and the ARL GIS Literacy Project, these projects were embedded in investments made over many years in copyright and access to government information. Another example is the Section 1201 Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) rulemaking process. LCA must file every three years for already approved exemptions otherwise the exemptions lapse. Furthermore, these activities are embedded in larger issues that require continuous attention. For example, while the development of the Code of Best Practices has been completed, encouraging adoption and use of the Code and responding to attempts to restrict fair use are all part of continuing efforts to
promote and advance fair use and will never have an end date. As a result, most of ARL’s policy portfolio involves long-term investment in an identified and evolving set of priorities.

4-6. Committee structure and working groups

Members of IPP and its working groups discussed the questions posed concerning committee structure and alignment. There was strong consensus that a formally board-designated Advocacy and Policy committee or forum was needed in the new framework. This essential capacity forum/committee would provide guidance to the ARL policy staff in aligning work with the new ARL initiatives and provide campus, consortial, national and international context for pertinent policy issues as well as actively engage in policy work including providing testimony as needed. Importantly, the IPP Committee and its working groups provide a venue for updates and exchanges concerning both US and Canadian policy issues. The IPP is open to new arrangements and alternative means for discussion and informing the membership but the committee believes strongly that some sort of central group with a clear link to public policy program officers at ARL is essential. In addition to Committee members, there is always a large number of directors who attend the IPP meetings and they have signaled strong interest in public policy issues. The new central group would continue to be open and participation for non-central members would be encouraged and welcomed.

The tasks of the two IPP working groups could be merged into the Advocacy and Policy Essential Capacity committee/forum. There was a strong recommendation that the chair of the Advocacy and Policy committee/forum continue to be an ex-officio member of the ARL Board of Directors. Finally, there was a recommendation that the chair, members of the committee/forum and ARL staff provide updates at ARL meetings on current policy issues under active discussion as these briefings are extremely helpful to local campus discussions and ensure that directors are well versed on key policy issues.

12/17/2014

---

9 B. Questions from the Strategic Thinking and Design Team: Your committee itself:
4. Does it make sense in the context of the new framework?
5. If so, as is? Or, does it need realigning?
6. If not, should it be replaced? Merged/Reassembled? Sunsetted?
Appendix 9: Transition Report
Statistics and Assessment

December 23, 2014

To: Strategic Thinking and Design Transition Team (STADTT)

From: Robert Fox, Dean of Libraries, University of Louisville
Martha Kyrillidou, Senior Director, ARL

Re: Statistics and Assessment

Per your memo of September 21, 2014, please accept this report from the Statistics and Assessment committee. The questions posed in the September memo were discussed at the committee meeting on October 14th. Based on the outcomes of those discussions and follow up feedback received, we respectfully submit the following recommendations. This document is framed to follow the questions posed by the transition team and the activities and priorities of the program.

As the Strategic Thinking and Design Transition Team (STADTT) begins its work, ARL engaged the members in discussions regarding the future of the activities of the Statistics and Assessment Committee and how best they can be organized effectively and efficiently to transition into the ARL Strategic Framework for 2015+, as described in the Report of the ARL Strategic Thinking and Design Initiative, August 28, 2014. The committee discussed the following questions as to how current activities map to the Essential Capacities and the System of Action:

*How do current activities map to the ARL Strategic Framework for 2015+ and the Essential Capacities and System of Action it includes (pp. 9, 19+ of the above-referenced Report)?*

Committee members affirmed that the statistics and assessment program has been in transition for a while now and has been navigating change effectively. The committee and staff have been articulating and guiding the transition from the strictly descriptive means of measuring research libraries based on size of collections and budgets to capturing the value that libraries bring to students, faculty, and the university community through new multi-faceted approaches.

The program provides leadership and influences other organizations collecting library statistics, such as IMLS, NCES/IPEDS, ACRL, ASERL, CARL, and SCONUL. The program is looked upon as a leading capability well beyond ARL member libraries; the value of the program transcends ARL institutions as it successfully articulates a broader vision for capturing library value. For example, events like the Library Assessment Conference have expanded beyond ARL member libraries. Similarly, with programs like LibQUAL+®, the reach of ARL goes beyond North America. Martha Kyrillidou serves on the editorial boards of the Northumbria Conference on Performance Measurement and Metrics and the Quantitative and Qualitative Methods for Libraries Conference.

Part of the attempt to modernize the annual data collection was achieved by the ARL Board appointed “Task Force on Reviewing ARL Statistics®, ARL Supplementary Survey and ARL Annual Salary Survey” that completed its work in 2012 after collecting in depth feedback by interviewing all member leaders. The recommendations of the Task Force were implemented in the 2012–2013 ARL Statistics and we are currently in the second year of implementation of
these changes. The changes were received positively and are gradually being adopted by member libraries. As part of the research agenda the committee pursued in developing new qualitative ways of capturing evidence ARL also engaged in analysis of narrative descriptions capturing important context in the development and transformation of research libraries.¹

Assessment is an Essential Capacity in the new framework, and, furthermore, assessment components are important in every element of the System of Action. Statistics and assessment activities will continue with an evolving emphasis. Some committee members would like to see assessment being placed in the center of the new ecosystem. It could not only be part of the System of Action but could also be one of the innovative grant experiments! The committee recommends that the advisory structure around assessment-related activities be a combination of a standing committee and ad hoc working/steering groups.

By next October this new structure should be in place, and committee members emphasized that it will be checked frequently and adjusted as needed. During the discussion, some committee members expressed concern that the current framework does not articulate goals, and yet they are being called to reorganize based on broad System of Action concepts. Committee members asked for developing evolving goals during the initial transition period. Currently the key goal of the program is “to describe and measure the performance of research libraries and their contribution to research, teaching, learning and community service.” This goal can be augmented by emphasizing the need to capture the value of ‘transformation,’ ‘innovation,’ and ‘collaboration.’ The committee linked assessment of the evolving reorganization to notions of articulating goals and objectives and defining activities and strategic and operational milestones and metrics. The pragmatic voices of the committee emphasized that the question is not whether assessment is important or whether the committee is needed. Instead, it is essential for the committee and the program to continue the momentum built over recent years in capturing evidence and ensuring that libraries utilize it and integrate it into the larger university planning process. Committee members emphasized the value of the descriptive statistics as they are used in educating other campus constituencies, in strategic planning, annual reports and briefing pieces. Furthermore they emphasized the importance of augmenting the descriptive data with new ways of capturing evidence.

Assessment has changed in research libraries over the last 15 years. Libraries now have assessment officers, who need support in defining success in their new roles. ARL needs to continue to help them understand the evolving role of assessment and how to more effectively integrate the evidence libraries collect into the university’s goals, mission, and vision. The program and the committee members have engaged in doing outreach and education for assessment officers, and this is still badly needed.

The notion that assessment is key to all five elements of the System of Action surfaced strongly. Committee members talked about sets of principles, noting that different infrastructures will be useful for different sets of principles. For example, the notion of the stand-alone research library that needs to be described in its relation to a distinct research university is one model captured through the ARL Statistics. The use of a standardized user survey tool, implemented across multiple libraries and offering insights on cross-library and industry trends, could lead to major collective actions in system improvements and delivery of scalable services. Furthermore, the notion of collective collections might require a completely new way of capturing the contribution of each library to the collective. (For example, examining the number of unique versus duplicate titles held by each institution in HathiTrust can capture a unique profile of its collaboration.) Altmetrics indicators may yet offer insights into a different type of infrastructure and its associated principles.
The committee identified links between current activities and the System of Action initiatives. Many elements of LibQUAL+ link to the Collective Collections concept, as well as to Libraries that Learn. The MINES for Libraries® protocol links well to Libraries that Learn. ClimateQUAL® and the ARL Annual Salary Survey link well to the ARL Academy. The LibValue toolkit links well to the Innovation Lab, even as specific methods also map to other parts of the System of Action—for example the ‘LibValue of Digitized Special Collections’ can map to Collective Collections and the ‘LibValue of Information Commons’ can map to Libraries that Learn. Similarly the new Measuring Up grant, which emphasizes usage statistics of institutional repositories and digitized collections, can map to Collective Collections, Scholarly Dissemination Engine and Libraries that Learn.

Discussing what is part of the core ‘Assessment’ Essential Capacity and what is part of the System of Action will prove to be an enlightening exercise that can inform the formation of future advisory structures.

For those activities that do need to be completed, which can be completed in the next six months? Which will require additional time for completion, and how much time?

All program activities map well to the Strategic Framework and the current annual cycle of some will be completed in the next six months (ARL Statistics, ARL Annual Salary Survey, and other annual surveys). The new cycle of annual surveys will start in the summer of 2015.

The other projects offered through StatsQUAL® (LibQUAL+, ClimateQUAL and MINES for Libraries) are based on market demand, and they can continue to be offered on that basis. If these are considered useful, a certain level of R&D is needed, so they can continue to serve well and be marketed more effectively. For example, in-depth qualitative grounding for the items capturing the value of library services, access to collections and library spaces is needed so the wording of the LibQUAL+ items remains fresh reflecting the most current environment.

The LibValue toolkit will be complete in the next couple of months; there is interest in engaging a Visiting Program Officer (VPO) in this area, especially as it relates to the value of facilities and the value of digital collections. Such VPO assignments could have a two- to three-year duration. There is also interest in doing a retrospective analysis of the Salary Survey data with a VPO from Brigham Young University. This activity, which can be initiated and completed within this coming year, maps to the ARL Academy part of the System of Action.

We expect to complete the following activities over the next six months:

- 2012–2014 Facilities Inventory
- 2013–2014 Source of Funds
- 2013–2014 ARL Statistics
- 2014–2015 ARL Annual Salary Survey
- 2014–2015 Budget Survey,
- 2015 Special Collections Profiling

The facilities survey and the special collections profiling are on a three-year cycle; the other surveys are annual. New projects are emerging in relation to the salary survey: a retrospective 20-year analysis with a Visiting Program Officer and the augmented/additional data collection on demographic data through the 2015–2016 ARL Annual Salary Survey.
Similarly, ongoing projects like LibQUAL+, ClimateQUAL, and MINES for Libraries® have operational components that will be completed with various libraries implementing them over the next six months, yet a number many libraries are continuing their engagement beyond that period. Continuing R&D will be needed for the StatsQUAL® suite of tools, so that they maintain their currency and relevance, and explicitly link to the System of Action. For ClimateQUAL, staff will be conducting major analyses and writing book chapters over the next nine months.

The reduction of the number of libraries participating in LibQUAL+ has allowed for some efficiency in that we reduced the FTE staffing needs. At the same time, if the trend continues we will need to devise a new way of charging indirect costs on LibQUAL+ possibly tied to the variable salary costs or the number of participating libraries. Raym Crow’s report to the ARL Board a couple of years ago offered some initial analysis and modeling, but a deeper look on the efficacy of charging indirect costs at increased levels may be necessary tied with a systematic marketing effort.

Martha Kyrillidou is also a participant in a new IMLS-funded project focusing on usage metrics for digital collections and institutional repositories, which begins in December and continues for a three year period. A needs assessment is built into the grant, and training on Google Analytics is also included for the next year.

The launching of the LibValue toolkit needs to be completed with an eye on expanding the implementation of the different methods among different groups of libraries (possibly through a VPO assignment).

Lastly, developing a cohort for the Value Scorecard training consultation in collaboration with our management consulting partners is a continuing priority. This activity can also be linked directly to the System of Action by offering a ‘table of contents’ view of the framework with associated key success metrics.

Planning is underway for the 2016 Library Assessment Conference, and we continue to provide focused training for new assessment professionals. More in-depth technical training was called for as well as more in-depth training in institutional research data as the Academic Library Survey is integrated back into the IPEDS data collection system.

*For those activities that don’t finish in the next six months, how and on what schedule do you recommend sunsetting them?*

The committee does not expect to sunset any of its activities. As the annual ARL Statistics 2013–2014 is in its second cycle of implementing the new definitions and the Academic Library Survey is integrated back into IPEDS, it may be useful to look at the annual ARL Statistics with an eye to future. The survey could possibly be trimmed down in some areas, for example the electronic use data, and augmented in others, for example by moving the ‘gate count’ from the facilities inventory to the annual survey. In reviewing the annual ARL Statistics, we can look into the possibilities of streamlining with the Academic Library Survey if possible. At the same time ARL needs to be ready to offer advice on any changes and enhancements we want to see three years from now when the current Higher Education Reauthorization Act completes its current cycle.

*Does the ‘committee itself’ make sense in the context of the new framework?*

The committee sees a continuing role in the context of the new framework.

*If so, as is? Or, does it need realigning?*
The scope of the committee may need to be refined with task forces and/or advisory structures that focus on the strategic elements of the different methods/tools as well as at-scale issues.

For example, an advisory structure for ensuring that a tool for measuring service quality is relevant needs to have leaders who are willing to both advise and do some key strategic hands-on work on the related R&D.

A possible structure could be a standing committee with oversight responsibilities, subgroups that focus on specific R&D (for example, “What is digital library service quality and assessment?” “What is the return on investment—ROI?”), and short-term advisory groups for projects like the revision of the annual ARL Statistics and/or the ARL Annual Salary Survey.

If not, should it be replaced? Merged/Reassembled? Sunsetted?

The committee should continue; the committee can transition into the new framework building momentum systematically over time year after year.

How can we position ARL to offer strong leadership in this area in the years to come?

The committee and ARL may want to engage outside experts among the faculty ranks (economists, statisticians, anthropologists, psychologists, etc.) to identify new areas of focus that would be on the leading edge of bringing assessment into the System of Action initiatives, or even to engage in bold cutting-edge initiatives solely focused on assessment.

Our key goals will be to create and nurture expertise in assessment as it ties to ARL institutions through empirical efforts, to enable ARL to assess our programs, and to educate the broader community through forums like the Library Assessment Conference.

We also need to complete the ARL data warehouse so we can readily and flexibly draw on the data that we already have to publish reports and create headlines, in the vein of the marketing studies done by OCLC. ARL may indeed need to bring the various research entities (such as Ithaka S&R, OCLC, Data and Society, NISO, COUNTER, DLF, etc.) together to explore whether we can learn more from each other and find ways to cooperate more effectively. We need to have our infrastructure be responsive and easily used in delivering analytics and engage in the delivery of predictive analytics.

Some library directors would like the statistics and assessment program to offer more advanced training so that ARL is seen as being expert not only on library issues but on institutional research. Libraries can be a strong research arm for our universities, both through preserving and making available locally deposited data and through becoming repositories of data across the different higher education association entities.

We ultimately need to know what we want to know about ourselves and how we will go about getting it. Our current activities help us do the following now:

- **ARL Statistics**: describe distinct research libraries usually as an entity organized around a distinct university.
  - Committee members voiced a strong sentiment: “Don’t lose sight of the value of the core dataset, for if every university program had a dataset like the one libraries have, the universities would be positioned better!”
  - Future: Examine how we can more effectively capture the value of collaborative entities (CRL, HathiTrust, etc.)
- Advisory structure: ARL Assessment Standing Committee for maintenance; survey revisions would require the formation of Board-appointed task forces chaired by the ARL Assessment Committee Chair, so that the composition of the group would remain the same during the revision process.

- **ARL Special Collections Survey Profiles**: describe our special collections in terms of the extent of their budgets, staffing, and instructional sessions.
  - Now and in the next six months, collect short impact stories that tell us about innovative approaches as a way of learning lessons from each other.
  - Future: Examine how our unique collections deliver value to students and faculty in our institutions and how they transcend our institutional boundaries by reaching beyond our immediate user base.
  - Advisory structure: a combination of ARL Assessment Standing Committee and Special Collection Group/Committee.

- **ARL Annual Salary Survey**: describe the salaries of our professional staff and demographic data regularly.
  - Future: Examine how we can more effectively capture shifting job responsibilities, their effects on salaries, and their relationship to other demographics.
  - Advisory Structure: ARL Assessment Standing Committee for maintenance; special projects like analysis of demographics or longitudinal data analysis can be guided by a subgroup/task force.

- **LibQUAL+**: measure library services as Affect of Service, Information Control and Library as Place.
  - Description: LibQUAL+ is a suite of services that libraries use to solicit, track, understand, and act upon users’ opinions of service quality. These services are offered to the library community by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL).
  - Future: Explore how we can emphasize service quality for a different library model that may not have a physical space associated with it. Consider what type of regrounding work needs to take place.
  - Advisory structure: Steering Committee (Colleen Cook, Fred Heath, Martha Kyrillidou, Bruce Thompson, Stephen Town, and Elliott Shore). This advisory body may be composed of leaders and researchers who are engaging in service quality improvement and systematic measurement using LibQUAL+ and are working on improving the value of this protocol. Colleen Cook, Fred Heath, Martha Kyrillidou, and Duane Webster were Co-PIs on the US Department of Education FIPSE grant that funded the original development of the protocol. It is one of ARL’s ‘new measures’ initiatives.

- **ClimateQUAL**: capture the perceptions of library staff regarding organizational climate and diversity.
  - Description: ClimateQUAL: Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment is an assessment of library staff perceptions concerning (a) their library’s commitment to the principles of diversity, (b) organizational policies and procedures, and (c) staff attitudes. It is an online survey with questions designed to understand the impact perceptions have on service quality in a library setting.
  - Future: Examine how we can link staff perceptions to customer expectations and perceptions. A book contract has been signed for completion in 2015.
  - Advisory Structure: Research Team (Sue Baughman, Paul Hanges, Martha Kyrillidou, Charles Lowry, Shaneka Morris, Mark Puente, and Gary Roebuck). This research team has been assembled based on leadership, programmatic, and research interests, backgrounds, and skills. Sue Baughman, Paul Hanges, and Charles Lowry originally developed this effort at the University of Maryland; it
became part of ARL’s StatsQUAL suite of services and was branded as ClimateQUAL. It is one of ARL's 'new measures’ initiatives.

- **MINES for Libraries:** capture the impact of networked electronic services.
  - Description: Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services (MINES for Libraries) is an online transaction-based survey that collects data on the purpose of use of electronic resources and the demographics of users. As libraries implement access to electronic resources through portals, collaborations, and consortium arrangements, the MINES for Libraries protocol offers a convenient way to collect information from users.
  - Future: Examine how we can scale and standardize the data on use and value of electronic resources (altmetrics).
  - Advisory structure: Consultants Brinley Franklin and Terry Plum work with Martha Kyrillidou and Gary Roebuck to implement the protocol in libraries. This protocol is derived from the method universities use to determine indirect cost rates. It is one of the ARL ‘new measures’ initiatives.

- **LibValue:** a toolkit of different methods on capturing value.
  - Description: This research focuses on three main areas: teaching/learning, research, and the social, professional, and public engagement functions of the library. Expected outcomes of the project include models for calculating value and ROI in academic libraries and web-based tools for assessing ROI and value which can be used by academic librarians.
  - Future: It is hard to capture value and ROI effectively, but we need to keep trying, and a visiting program officer assignment could help move this area forward.
  - Advisory Structure: This IMLS grant included both a research team (Co-PI Carol Tenopir, Co-PI Paula Kaufman, Martha Kyrillidou, Bruce Kingma, Donald King, Tina Chrzastowski, Gayle Baker, Teresa Walker, Ken Wise, Regina Mays, Megan Oakleaf, and Rachel Fleming-May) and an advisory structure that included Carol Mandel and Colleen Cook among the ARL directors, among other researchers including economists and other faculty.

- **Measuring Up:** capture usage of institutional repositories and digitized collections effectively and efficiently (analytics and altmetrics) (new grant December 1, 2014–November 2017).
  - Future: ARL will lead a needs assessment, best practices research, and educational efforts.
  - Advisory Structure: This grant includes a research team (PI Kenning Arlitsch, Martha Kyrillidou [ARL], Jeff Mixter [OCLC], Cameron Steward, Dale Hendrickson, Zoe Chao, Brian Freels-Stendel [University of New Mexico], Patrick O’Brien, Scott Young, and Leila Sterman [Montana State University]) and an advisory structure that includes Bob Fox (Chair of the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee), among other researchers and faculty.

**Conclusion**

The program needs to continue to serve the need to “describe and measure the performance of research libraries,” emphasize the evidence it collects on “the contribution of research libraries to research, teaching and learning,” and augment the framework through evaluation of innovative and transformative services. Identifying how libraries contribute to the learning and research activities of our students and faculty is the key focus for delivering value in the future, and ARL has a major role to play in this area.

Thank you for starting the conversation!
Information on the Task Force Charge is available on the Members-only part of the ARL website at: [https://sites.google.com/a/arl.org/members-only/home/board-cmte-tr-wgrp/board-committee-and-task-force-charges-and-reports#SA](https://sites.google.com/a/arl.org/members-only/home/board-cmte-tr-wgrp/board-committee-and-task-force-charges-and-reports#SA); a briefing to the ARL Membership is also captured in the following document: [https://5bbf58ad-a-8451c3e5-sites.googlegroups.com/a/arl.org/members-only/home/board-cmte-tr-wgrp/PotterBriefing_ARL%20Statistics%20Meeting%20Fall%202011.pdf?attredirects=0](https://5bbf58ad-a-8451c3e5-sites.googlegroups.com/a/arl.org/members-only/home/board-cmte-tr-wgrp/PotterBriefing_ARL%20Statistics%20Meeting%20Fall%202011.pdf?attredirects=0); Related materials communicating the changes and forms are available at: [http://www.arlstatistics.org/About/Mailings/stats_2012-13](http://www.arlstatistics.org/About/Mailings/stats_2012-13) and [http://www.arlstatistics.org/About/Mailings/stats_2013-14](http://www.arlstatistics.org/About/Mailings/stats_2013-14).

See: ARL Profiles: Research Libraries 2010: [http://www.arlstatistics.org/about/profiles](http://www.arlstatistics.org/about/profiles)