

# ARL Statistics Revision Task Force Final Report

June 2024

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



<https://doi.org/10.29242/report.statisticstaskforce2024>

ASSOCIATION  
OF RESEARCH  
LIBRARIES

ARL Statistics Revision Task Force Final Report

June 2024

Association of Research Libraries (ARL)

**ARL Statistics Revision Task Force Members**

Athena Jackson, Chair, University of Houston

Don Gilstrap, University of Alabama

Kat King, Princeton University

Steve Mandeville-Gamble, University of California, Riverside

Beth Namachchivaya, University of Waterloo

Carisa Polischuk, University of Saskatchewan

Maurini Strub, University of Rochester

Cherie Turner, University of Houston

Kevin Borden, Association of Research Libraries

Suggested citation: *ARL Statistics Revision Task Force Final Report*.  
Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, June 2024. <https://doi.org/10.29242/report.statisticstaskforce2024>.

# Table of Contents

- Executive Summary.....1**
- Findings .....4**
  - The areas of inquiry used to frame the structure of the ARL Statistics survey complement previous work and are grounded in current research library values.....4
  - Some areas of inquiry may be better suited for inclusion in the ARL Statistics survey than others..... 5
  - Some elements of the existing ARL Statistics survey may still be valuable today .....7
- Lessons Learned ..... 10**
  - Task force model may not be right approach for this work..... 10
  - Considering input from multiple perspectives will strengthen recommendations, and also raises challenges.....11
- Conclusion..... 13**
- Appendix A: ARL Statistics Revision Task Force Charge.....14**
  - Purpose .....14
  - Charge .....14
  - Membership .....15
  - Terms .....15
  - Meetings .....15
  - Areas of Responsibility .....15
  - Decision-Making .....16
  - Code of Conduct .....16
- Appendix B: Statistics Refresh Survey Instrument ..... 17**
  - Introduction/Background..... 17
  - Areas of Inquiry .....18
  - Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion .....19
- Appendix C: Statistics Refresh Survey Results ..... 23**
  - Parts 1 and 2: Areas of Inquiry, Questions, and Metrics.....23
  - Part 3: Potential DEI Metrics.....26
  - Part 4: Usefulness of Existing Measures in the ARL Statistics Survey .....26

## Executive Summary

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) charged the ARL Statistics Revision Task Force to review the ARL Statistics survey and recommend ways to improve its structure and content so that the data collected through this instrument is more useful to ARL member institutions. Task force members met on a regular basis beginning in Spring 2022 to review the ARL Statistics survey and similar past work to revise it, engage current and former members of the Research and Analytics (R&A) Committee, and analyze the results of that engagement.

The work of this task force re-established the foundation for revising the ARL Statistics survey by focusing on a potential structure that builds on past efforts to revise this instrument while also centering on areas of inquiry that are of value to today's research libraries. By analyzing past efforts to revise the ARL Statistics survey and considering contemporary needs and values, the task force derived several areas of inquiry that could be used to frame a revised ARL Statistics survey. The task force engaged current and former (back to 2018) Research and Analytics Committee members to:

- Propose three potential research questions for their top areas of inquiry that would be of use for libraries to be able to answer with data in the ARL Statistics survey
- Suggest metrics that would be most useful to answer their proposed questions above
- Suggest metrics that could help assess member efforts to create diverse, equitable, inclusive, and accessible work environments, services, and collections
- Identify the usefulness of existing metrics in the ARL Statistics survey in terms of assessing the areas of inquiry derived from previous ARL research and ARL's priority to diversity, equity, and inclusion

This group was targeted for engagement because of their proximity to and involvement in recent efforts to revise the ARL Statistics survey.

Results of this engagement informs some of the findings listed below. The full results of the engagement can be found in [appendix C](#).

Similar to previous efforts to revise the ARL Statistics survey, this task force also encountered challenges. Working through a task force means accomplishing the goals through part-time volunteer effort. This makes it difficult to maintain the continuity and rhythm necessary to carry out the charge. In addition, a task force composed of professionals from ARL member institutions means those that work closely with the ARL Statistics survey also sought to revise it. This makes maintaining an objective third party lens difficult, if not impossible. The task force recognized that this work, should it continue, might benefit from an outside consultant that can dedicate all the time necessary to the work and who does not have the same relationship with the survey.

Valid challenges notwithstanding, the task force did find value in the experience and uncovered interesting and worthwhile information that moved this work forward. Centering their work on ARL values, the task force generated several findings and lessons learned, which are discussed below:

- The areas of inquiry used to frame the structure of the ARL Statistics survey complement previous work and are grounded in current research library values
- Some areas of inquiry may be better suited for inclusion in the ARL Statistics survey than others
- Some elements of the existing ARL Statistics survey may still be valuable today
- Task force model may not be right approach for this work
- Considering input from multiple perspectives will strengthen recommendations, and also raises challenges

Given these findings and lessons learned, the task force is not recommending any changes to the ARL Statistics survey at this time. The work of this task force indicates that there is more conversation to be had with the membership about data issues that are high priorities at ARL member institutions.

Rather than creating another group to address the complex task of updating the ARL Statistics survey, the R&A Committee can work through this in a more indirect way. Systematically engaging the membership to discuss various and wide ranging topical issues in library assessment and data and analytics may present opportunities to learn more about the types of metrics that would be impactful for ARL to collect. Once identified, the R&A Committee and ARL staff can socialize potential modifications to the ARL Statistics survey on an ongoing, but piecemeal basis. Should the committee reach a point where it makes sense to be more deliberate and direct about wholesale changes to the ARL Statistics survey, the best course of action would be to bring in a third party partner to lead that work with the membership, as supported by the findings and lessons learned in this report.

## Findings

### The areas of inquiry used to frame the structure of the ARL Statistics survey complement previous work and are grounded in current research library values

The task force derived several areas of inquiry from a review of how the ARL Statistics survey has evolved, as well as previous efforts to improve upon it. Prior analysis performed by the Research and Analytics Committee suggested that the data included in the ARL Statistics survey do not adequately support some ARL efforts such as the membership criteria framework. While the task force was aware of this, other efforts are underway to revise the membership criteria. The task force suggests that future work in this area be integrated with membership criteria considerations and vice versa. After synthesizing key themes from previous efforts to revise the survey, the task force also considered the values of today's research libraries and sought to bring these complementary sources of information together that included the following areas of inquiry:

- **Collections Stewardship:** Information related to how we curate, maintain, and share our physical and digital information resource collections.
- **Organizational Development:** Information about organizational structure and climate, and efforts for supporting staff and developing new competencies and expertise.
- **Spaces/Infrastructure:** Information about the infrastructure that supports staff work and service delivery, including the spaces the library owns, manages, or occupies.
- **Research Outcomes and Impact:** Information about how the library increases research productivity and impact, and facilitates innovative research, creative thinking and problem solving.
- **Learner Success:** Information related to how the library supports learning or enhances the success of learners/users at our institution.

In addition to these areas of inquiry, the task force sought to call attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion in a revised ARL Statistics survey. Specifically, the task force was looking to explore how a revised ARL Statistics survey could integrate diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) metrics across four areas outlined in [ARL's DEI priorities](#):

- Advance access to economic and social prosperity and encourage full participation in society
- Counter the historical lack of access to material resources about underrepresented human groups in collections that we cultivate and steward
- Focus on recruiting into our organizations and developing individuals who identify as people of color, or are from historically underrepresented racial and ethnic groups
- Ensure that our community continues to improve the representation of historically underrepresented, underserved, or marginalized groups in information resources

### **Some areas of inquiry may be better suited for inclusion in the ARL Statistics survey than others**

As part of its engagement, the task force surveyed current and former members of the Research and Analytics Committee going back to 2018. The goal was to elicit feedback from those closest to past work on revising the ARL Statistics survey. The task force received 17 responses from a total of 32 individuals surveyed. The task force, however, cautions members from generalizing these findings too broadly, since they represent information from a targeted subset of the membership. The first part of the survey asked respondents to provide the following feedback:

1. From the five areas of inquiry provided, select up to three that would have the biggest impact on identifying organizational needs and trends

2. For each selected area of inquiry, suggest questions they would like answered by data contained in a revised ARL Statistics survey
3. Propose metrics that would be most useful to answer their questions from the previous step
4. Based on ARL’s DEI priorities, identify metrics that could be used to help assess member efforts to create diverse, equitable, inclusive, and accessible work environments, services, and collections across ARL institutions

The survey results indicated that three of the five areas of inquiry may offer more potential impact for ARL institutions than the remaining two. As shown in the table below, Research Outcomes and Impact, Learner Success, and Collections Stewardship received more responses than Spaces/Infrastructure and Organizational Development.

<b>Area of Inquiry</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Percent of responses</b>
Research Outcomes and Impact	17	100.0%
Learner Success	13	76.5%
Collections Stewardship	11	64.7%
Spaces/Infrastructure	5	29.4%
Organizational Development	4	23.5%

The survey instrument used to collect feedback can be found in [appendix B](#). In addition, a summary of potential questions and metrics for each area of inquiry and metrics that could help assess member institution efforts to create diverse, equitable, inclusive, and accessible work environments, services, and collections can be found in [appendix C, part 3](#). Generally, the task force’s framework of narrowing survey responses from areas of inquiry, to questions, to potential metrics served as a useful way to obtain targeted information. Survey respondents were able to offer specific questions and metrics that applied to each proposed area of inquiry rather than thinking about the

ARL Statistics survey as a whole. This structured feedback provides a foundation for further exploration of these topics, questions, and metrics to see if they resonate with the broader membership.

One notable result from the responses was that many of the metrics identified by survey respondents are count data (i.e. # of items, people, products, etc.). This is not surprising because respondents were instructed to emphasize only information that could be included in a quantitative survey like the ARL Statistics survey. However, when it comes to such quantitative data, count data are predominant. In thinking about revising the ARL Statistics survey, it may be prudent to challenge narratives that count data are inherently bad or not useful. Instead, the crucial distinction is to focus on what is counted, why it is counted, and how those counts can be used in more meaningful analytic ways than simply reporting aggregate totals.

### **Some elements of the existing ARL Statistics survey may still be valuable today**

The second part of the survey issued to current and former Research and Analytics Committee members asked respondents to identify the usefulness of existing metrics in the ARL Statistics survey in terms of assessing the areas of inquiry derived from previous ARL research and ARL's priority to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion. According to the responses, several items collected through the existing ARL Statistics survey instrument remain useful today.

While full results are available in [appendix C](#), at least 80% of survey respondents indicated the following metrics in the ARL Statistics survey are useful:

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Metric (% useful)</b>
Expenditures	Total salaries and wages (90.9%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional staff salaries and wages (90%)</li> <li>• Support staff salaries and wages (90%)</li> <li>• Student assistants salaries and wages (90%)</li> </ul> Total library materials (90.9%) Total library expenditures (83%)
Personnel	Total Staff FTE (90.9%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional staff, FTE (91.6%)</li> <li>• Support staff, FTE (91.6%)</li> <li>• Student assistants, FTE (91.6%)</li> </ul>
Instruction	Number of library presentations to groups (83%) Number of total participants in group presentations (83%)
Interlibrary Loans	Total number of filled requests provided to other libraries (91.6%) Total number of filled requests received from other libraries or providers (91.6%)
Doctor's Degrees and Faculty	Number of full-time instructional faculty (84.6%)
Enrollment	Full-time students, undergraduate and graduate (91.6%) Part-time students, undergraduate and graduate (90.9%) Full-time graduate students (90%) Part-time graduate students (90%)

The results of this survey also show that very few metrics in the current ARL Statistics survey were flagged as overwhelmingly not useful. In only a few instances a metric received more responses in the “not useful” category. These include:

- Collections: Volumes Held
- Use of Electronic Resources: Number of Regular Searches (databases)
- Use of Electronic Resources: Number of Federated Searches (databases)

Survey respondents were also able to qualify their selections on the usefulness of existing metrics with unstructured text responses to provide additional context and information. Some themes in these comments included the value in revising the definitions for some of the existing metrics in the ARL Statistics survey. This would increase consistency and accuracy of data reporting across institutions. Additionally, several comments suggested that reporting data metrics in isolation was less valuable than combining information with ancillary metrics, such as the ability to normalize by a population or indicator of library size.

One of the reasons for pursuing a revision to the ARL Statistics survey is that there is a general assumption the current survey is insufficient to meet member needs. These results indicate that it may be best to consider any changes/updates to the ARL Statistics survey alongside or in addition to existing metrics that still provide value. If these results can be verified with broader member engagement, it may suggest that improving the ARL Statistics survey necessitates more than deciding on new variables to collect through the instrument. Larger goals for the application of the data must be clearly articulated and agreed upon by the membership to get the most value out of any data collection effort.

## Lessons Learned

### **Task force model may not be right approach for this work**

This task force, like similar groups before it, encountered challenges related to the breadth of this work and its far reaching implications for the Association. Ultimately, the complexity of the problem exceeded the parameters of the charge and the capacity of the task force. Accomplishing the goals of this work requires sustained effort and focus. An ARL task force composed of volunteer member representatives and assessment staff at member institutions lacks the logistical flexibility and overall bandwidth to maintain this level of effort. It is notable that the original charge for this task force was scoped down from its original breadth. The fact that the task force still faced these challenges illustrates the degree to which the enormity of this task does not lend itself to the task force work model.

Accomplishing this work through a task force also raises challenges related to third-party objectivity. A task force composed of member representatives and assessment professionals from member institutions are put in a difficult and somewhat paradoxical position—they are both too far removed and too close to the survey to bring the necessary third-party objective lens to the work. From a macro perspective, many member representatives and staff in member libraries do not have the insight of how the survey works beyond data collection. This limits their ability to know if a particular strategy, direction, or recommendation is the right way to go, or to even formulate one in the first place. For more specific and tactical elements of the survey—such as individual metrics—they may be too close to the information to offer substantive changes that would work beyond their institution or circumstances. Even when considering wide-scale feedback from the ARL membership, these issues would likely be applicable. An outside researcher or consultant might be in a better position to dive into the details of how the survey works from data collection through publication and probe the membership with questions to generate recommendations where they have no stake in the outcome.

## **Considering input from multiple perspectives will strengthen recommendations, and also raises challenges**

This task force was structured in a way that mimics ARL Association Committees, with a mix of ARL member directors and member institution staff. The idea behind this decision was that member representatives speak for ARL member institutions and can provide direct input on how the ARL Statistics survey should align with strategic priorities of member institutions. To complement this perspective, assessment professionals have direct knowledge and expertise to ascertain how to translate key concepts into quantitative metrics that can be collected at scale.

This structure benefited the task force with a diversity of positions and perspectives. However, it also raised challenges about how to reach a similar cross section within ARL member institutions in a rigorous manner that minimized the potential for systemic bias in the information collected. Reaching member representatives is straightforward as there can be only one per ARL member institution at any given time. However, the population of assessment professionals in ARL member institutions is less well known and more loosely defined. This raised methodological concerns about balancing perspectives from member representatives and assessment professionals who work in ARL member institutions. In order to put some bounds on this issue, the task force decided to engage current and former members of the Research and Analytics Committee dating back to 2018. This audience included both member representative and assessment staff input, and feedback was provided by those closest to the most recent efforts to review and revise the ARL Statistics survey. Any extension of this work will likely have to devise an approach that can capture input from multiple perspectives across the Association while minimizing bias.

Other issues of concern related to finding a way to mitigate the potential for any one institution or group of institutions having an outsized influence over the direction of the ARL Statistics survey. In future efforts for this work, the task force recommends that

key differences in ARL member institution types (e.g. academic, governmental, public, Canadian) be accounted for and ensure any final recommendations reflect an equitable information gathering process.

Finally, this task force encountered challenges with parallel work at ARL that coincided with their objectives. While in the midst of their work, ARL also charged a task force to modify the membership criteria, which may have implications for data collected through the ARL Statistics survey. The ARL Statistics Revision Task Force recognized that any data collection recommendations from the membership criteria effort would be a critical component to its own work. The ARL Statistics Revision Task Force recommends that ARL work to harmonize these parallel initiatives temporally so that the Association can get the most value from concurrent efforts.

## Conclusion

The work of this task force provides a step forward in the effort to restructure the ARL Statistics survey so that it better meets the needs of the Association. The framework offered for structuring a revised survey builds on previous work and incorporates topics of relevance and need in today's research libraries. Over the course of many efforts to revise the ARL Statistics survey various approaches and concepts have circulated among a pool of ideas. Notions that have been discussed include incorporating data external to the ARL membership but within the research context and establishing greater emphasis on maximizing the analytical use of these data. While these specific items were outside the scope of this task force's charge, they still informed the framework that was presented here. This task force acted with intention to build upon previous efforts and have those ideas come through in this work so as to not discard or discount the effort of previous groups. Ultimately, the membership must coalesce around an overarching structure for the survey that addresses the type of information that will be collected through the survey, and the applications for using the information in analysis and decision-making. To this end, the task force identified the need for expanded engagement of these ideas more broadly across the Association. This is especially relevant for ensuring that all ARL member institutions have an equitable voice in the direction of the ARL Statistics survey.

The task force also recognizes the need to move forward with this work in a way that fosters third party objectivity. The task force model may not be the best option for accomplishing the desired outcome for updating the ARL Statistics survey. Finally, aligning efforts across ARL initiatives will be crucial to the success of any future iteration of the ARL Statistics survey. In particular, the ongoing work focused on the membership criteria may overlap with potential recommendations that could come out of a revision to the ARL Statistics survey. Ensuring alignment across these initiatives will keep these efforts complementary and avoid contradictory recommendations.

# Appendix A: ARL Statistics Revision Task Force Charge

## Purpose

The purpose of the ARL Statistics survey Revision Task Force is to recommend in what ways to revise the quantitative information included in annual data collection through the ARL Statistics survey. By reviewing and proposing revisions for the quantitative survey, this task force will enable ARL institutions to track, report, and analyze measures that align with current organizational needs. The quantitative data gathered through the ARL Statistics survey is critical to articulate the investments that libraries make across our membership and to enable members to detect trends. While assessing notions of value (local, regional, national) is important, this survey is not intended to directly measure these types of concepts using quantitative means.

## Charge

The ARL Statistics survey Revision Task Force is responsible for recommending changes to the ARL Statistics survey that would better reflect metrics that the ARL membership would like to collect and track. The task force should focus on defining and recommending changes that are suitable for a quantitative survey instrument. Other qualitative information captured from member engagement or other research activity for this project that is not directly applicable to the ARL Statistics survey should be reserved for contextual or future work purposes. Specifically the task force should:

1. Engage membership to explore how members would like to use ARL Statistics survey data in the context of (a) data currently collected and (b) the need for potential changes to data collection through the survey.

2. Analyze membership input and align the existing ARL Statistics survey with a revised survey structure that reflects the ways members foresee using ARL Statistics survey data.
3. Create a road map that defines a desired end state for the ARL Statistics survey, recommends changes to meet that end state, and outlines the sequence and timing of introducing these changes to the ARL Statistics survey. The task force should also include recommendations for how frequently to reassess and revise the survey instrument to ensure it continues to meet member needs.

## **Membership**

- The task force will be chaired by an ARL member representative appointed by the Research and Analytics Committee.
- The task force is composed of six to eight members with experience and responsibility in library assessment, with an anticipation of an equal balance of member representatives and member library employees.
- The task force reports to the Research and Analytics Committee.

## **Terms**

- Members of the task force will serve for the duration of the project, up to implementation.
- Exact dates will depend on the pace of the work, but ARL anticipates the task force's work may be complete by mid-2023.

## **Meetings**

The task force will meet as needed to conduct the work of its charge.

## **Areas of Responsibility**

- Explore, identify, and execute activities for addressing the components of the charge.
- Engage the membership in a systematic and structured way through Association Committees and across the Association as a

whole, to gather feedback about what quantitative information would be useful, and potential intended applications for ARL Statistics survey data.

- Synthesize feedback from the membership to develop proposed revisions to the ARL Statistics survey instrument, including specific data points that should be collected through the ARL Statistics survey.
- Produce deliverables with recommendations to the Research and Analytics Committee in a report format with a clearly articulated set of recommended actions and a rationale for each item.
- Provide updates to the Research and Analytics Committee as progress warrants, or as requested by the committee.

## **Decision-Making**

The task force makes recommendations to the Research and Analytics Committee, and, as appropriate, to the ARL executive director.

## **Code of Conduct**

The task force adheres to the [ARL Code of Conduct](#) in all of its deliberations and activities.

Approved by the ARL executive director February 4, 2022

# Appendix B: Statistics Refresh Survey Instrument

## Introduction/Background

The ARL Statistics survey has been collecting statistics on university libraries for several decades. The last major change to the survey occurred in 2012.

In 2017, the ARL Assessment Program Visioning Task Force was charged to develop a forward-looking assessment program that advances the organizational outcomes of the 21st-century research library. Their [recommendations](#) included refreshing the ARL annual statistics.

In 2022, the ARL Research and Analytics Committee charged the [ARL Statistics survey Revision Task Force](#) to build off the Visioning Task Force's work by recommending specific changes to the **quantitative data** in the survey to better reflect metrics the ARL membership would like to collect, and enable ARL institutions to track, report and analyze measures that align with current organizational needs. The ARL Statistics data should also align with other ARL programs, enabling capacities, and core activities such as policy and advocacy, diversity and inclusion, open access, and other key initiatives.

After reviewing the results of research conducted in 2017, including a survey sent to ARL members, the Statistics Survey Revision Task Force developed this survey to follow-up on those results, to further clarify what quantitative measures would best serve ARL members, and to inform our next steps for research and member engagement.

**Participation in this survey is very important; feedback will be synthesized to inform follow-up conversations and engagement. The task force will use this information to develop proposed revisions to the survey instrument, including specific data points to be collected through the ARL Statistics survey.**

*To view the full survey, please see the PDF at the following link: [Refresh ARL Annual Statistics Survey](#)*

## Areas of Inquiry

**The ARL Statistics survey is critical for articulating the investments that libraries make across our membership. Therefore, it is important to determine which areas align best with the current organizational needs of ARL institutions and which areas are most important in terms of enabling ARL members to detect trends.**

Listed below are five areas of inquiry derived from previous ARL research. If the ARL Statistics survey were to add or improve in these areas, which would have the biggest impact upon identifying organizational needs and trends? **Please select up to three areas below.**

- Collections Stewardship:** Information related to how we curate, maintain, and share our physical and digital information resource collections.
- Organizational Development:** Information about organizational structure and climate, and efforts for supporting staff and developing new competencies and expertise.
- Spaces/Infrastructure:** Information about the infrastructure that supports staff work and service delivery, including the spaces the library owns, manages, or occupies.
- Research Outcomes and Impact:** Information about how the library increases research productivity and impact, and facilitates innovative research, creative thinking and problem solving.
- Learner Success:** Information related to how the library supports learning or enhances the success of learners/users at our institution.

Are there any areas missing **that you would have listed in your top 3 above?** Please specify. [Open Response]

Before responding to the questions on this page, please consider questions and metrics that you feel reflect the collective good of the ARL membership as a whole, allowing for meaningful comparisons to be made across ARL institutions. [Open Response]

For your top areas of inquiry, what three questions would you like answered by this data? [Open Response]

What metrics would be most useful to answer your questions above? These can include new metrics, metrics already planned/in use at your institution or other institutions, etc. [Open Response]

## **Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion**

To support [ARL's priorities](#), we want to pay close attention to how a revised statistics survey could integrate diversity, equity, and inclusion into metrics across all four of the following areas.

1. Advance access to economic and social prosperity and encourage full participation in society
2. Counter the historical lack of access to material resources about underrepresented human groups in collections that we cultivate and steward
3. Focus on recruiting into our organizations and developing individuals who identify as people of color, or are from historically underrepresented racial and ethnic groups
4. Ensure that our community continues to improve the representation of historically underrepresented, underserved, or marginalized groups in information resources

With these four areas in mind, what metrics could help assess member efforts to create diverse, equitable, inclusive, and accessible work environments, services, and collections across ARL institutions? [Open Response]

An important part of refreshing the ARL Statistics is to review the current metrics and determine whether they reflect the collective good of ARL members. In doing so, it is important to remember the five areas of inquiry derived from previous ARL research and ARL's priority to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion ([Areas of Inquiry and DEI Priorities](#)).

The following pages list metrics included in the current ARL Statistics survey.

Keeping in mind the five areas of inquiry derived from previous ARL research and ARL's priority to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion ([Areas of Inquiry and DEI Priorities](#)), how useful are the following metrics in assessing these areas **OR** priorities?

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

### **Collections**

- Titles held
- Volumes held
- Electronic books (included in "Volumes held")

Please comment on or qualify any of your selections above. [Open Response]

### **Expenditures**

- Total library expenditures (exclude fringe benefits)
- Total library materials
  - One-time resource purchases
  - Ongoing resource purchases (e.g., subscriptions, annual license fees)
  - Collection support
- Total salaries and wages
  - Professional staff
  - Support staff
  - Student assistants
- Other operating expenditures
- Fringe benefits
- Fringe benefits (official designated percent)
- Consortia/Networks/Bibliographic Utilities Expenditures from External Sources

Please comment on or qualify any of your selections above. [Open Response]

## **Personnel**

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

- Total staff, FTE
  - Professional staff, FTE
  - Support staff, FTE
  - Student assistants, FTE

## **Instruction**

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

- Number of library presentations to groups
- Number of total participants in group presentations

## **Reference**

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

- Number of reference transactions

## **Circulation**

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

- Number of initial circulations (excluding reserves)

Please comment on or qualify any of your selections above. [Open Response]

## **Use of Electronic Resources**

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

- Number of successful full-text article requests (journals)
- Number of regular searches (databases)
- Number of federated searches (databases)

## **Interlibrary Loans**

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

- Total number of filled requests provided to other libraries
- Total number of filled requests received from other libraries or providers

## **Annual Gate Count**

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

- Annual gate count

Please comment on or qualify any of your selections above. [Open Response]

## **Doctor's Degrees and Faculty**

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

- Number of Doctor's Degrees awarded
- Number of fields in which Doctor's Degrees can be awarded
- Number of full-time instructional faculty

## **Enrollment**

(Useful, Not Useful, or Unsure/No Opinion for each)

- Full-time students, undergraduate and graduate
- Part-time students, undergraduate and graduate
- Full-time graduate students
- Part-time graduate students

Please comment on or qualify any of your selections above. [Open Response]

What is your current role in the library?

- Director / Administrative Leadership
- Assessment Librarian / Professional
- Other (please specify)

Please select the ARL institution you represent from the following dropdown list.

## **Appendix C: Statistics Refresh Survey Results**

The ARL Statistics Task Force survey collected data from current and former R&A Committee members to:

1. Propose three potential questions for their top areas of inquiry that would be of use for libraries to be able to answer with data in the ARL Statistics survey
2. Suggest metrics that would be most useful to answer their proposed questions above
3. Suggest metrics that could help assess member efforts to create diverse, equitable, inclusive, and accessible work environments, services, and collections
4. Identify the usefulness of existing metrics in the ARL Statistics survey in terms of assessing the areas of inquiry derived from previous ARL research and ARL's priority to diversity, equity, and inclusion

The following summary extracts the most potentially actionable pieces of feedback from the first three parts of this survey.

### **Parts 1 and 2: Areas of Inquiry, Questions, and Metrics**

Open-ended responses: Potential areas of inquiry not listed that would be in top 3

- New/innovative library services and supports (e.g. data services, datasets, RDM support and tools, knowledge synthesis supports)

### **Questions & Metrics Connected to Areas of Inquiry:**

## COLLECTIONS STEWARDSHIP

Focus areas: measuring collections usage, volume/proportion relative to other metrics, collections investment/expenditures

Question	Metric
Collections moves	Total volumes/linear feet moved
Digital repository activity	# items in digital repository
What is the usage of collections relative to population size?	[n/a]
General collections in open stacks vs. remote storage/closed stacks	% collections located in various kinds of stacks/storage
How do expenditures and usage in these emerging areas (alt pub agreements) compare to traditional means of access?	% of materials budget dedicated to non-traditional collection development approaches
What investments are libraries making in collections (including open access) and what measures of use do we have in common?	Dollars invested in collections (purchased and licensed)  Dollars invested in open access (article processing charges (APCs), infrastructure...)

## ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Focus areas: staffing levels, training, professional development

Question	Metric
Staff training and professional development number/hours of courses completed	# of continuing education (CE) units # of professional meetings attended # of staff attending professional meetings
How are we adapting to post pandemic staffing levels?  Are there new partnerships/combined responsibilities?  Are jobs being reconfigured to fill gaps?	Emerging functional areas or areas of growth (e.g. top 5 list of many functions)  Sliding scale of “more emphasis/less emphasis” across various functions within the library

## SPACES/INFRASTRUCTURE

Focus areas: measuring different ways people use space

Question	Metric
How are people using spaces besides studying?	[n/a]
How are spaces used?	<p>Metrics on partnerships that use spaces in the library (writing centers, IT support, etc.)</p> <p>Data on how space is used within (seats, reserved spaces)</p>

## RESEARCH OUTCOMES/IMPACT

Focus areas: Measuring library's role in research output

Question	Metric
Data on research outputs of parent organization staff/faculty/student	<p>Count of research outputs</p> <p>Altmetrics around research outputs</p>
Questions focusing on institutional repositories, OER	Numbers and participation
What new forms of research does the library facilitate?	<p># librarians as co-PIs</p> <p>Library publishing of digital scholarship projects</p>
Resources dedicated to directly supporting research	<p>Associated salaries/benefits costs</p> <p>Associated FTE</p>
[n/a]	Number of grants obtained or publication supported by library resources (research services, collections, training, infrastructure, etc.)

## LEARNER SUCCESS

Focus areas: Measuring materials and activities dedicated to learning

Question	Metric
Questions focusing on textbooks, course reserves, loanable technology	Circulation amount and types of textbook, course, reserve, and loanable technology
How does the library facilitate active learning?	# of student curated exhibits
How does the library facilitate post-graduation success?	Student internships, fellowships, scholarships, etc. at the library
Resources dedicated to directly supporting learning	Associated salaries/benefits costs Associated FTE

## Part 3: Potential DEI Metrics

Focus areas: training, DEI investment/resources

- Training and development funding
- Engagement in professional development related to DEIA
- Resources dedicated to building EDI/supporting decolonization/increasing representation
- Expenditures on recruiting efforts that target underrepresented groups

## Part 4: Usefulness of Existing Measures in the ARL Statistics Survey

ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: COLLECTIONS	Useful (%)	(n)	Not Useful (%)	(n)	Unsure/No Opinion (%)	(n)	Total
Titles held	50.00	6	25.00	3	25.00	3	12
Volumes held	33.33	4	41.67	5	25.00	3	12
Electronic books (included in "Volumes held")	41.67	5	41.67	5	16.67	2	12

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total library expenditures (exclude fringe benefits)	83.33	10	16.67	2	0.00	0	12
Total library materials	90.91	10	9.09	1	0.00	0	11
– One-time resource purchases	54.55	6	27.27	3	18.18	2	11
– Ongoing resource purchases (e.g. subscriptions, annual license fees)	63.64	7	27.27	3	9.09	1	11
– Collection support	50.00	5	20.00	2	30.00	3	10
Total salaries and wages	90.91	10	9.09	1	0.00	0	11
– Professional staff	90.00	9	10.00	1	0.00	0	10
– Support staff	90.00	9	10.00	1	0.00	0	10
– Student assistants	90.00	9	10.00	1	0.00	0	10
Other operating expenditures	72.73	8	27.27	3	0.00	0	11
Fringe benefits	45.45	5	45.45	5	9.09	1	11
Fringe benefits (official designated percent)	45.45	5	45.45	5	9.09	1	11
Consortia/Networks/Bibliographic utilities expenditures from external sources	41.67	5	41.67	5	16.67	2	12

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: PERSONNEL</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total staff, FTE	90.91	10	90.09	1	0.00	0	11
– Professional staff, FTE	91.67	11	8.33	1	0.00	0	12
– Support staff, FTE	91.67	11	8.33	1	0.00	0	12
– Student assistants, FTE	91.67	11	8.33	1	0.00	0	12

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: INSTRUCTION</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Number of library presentations to groups	83.33	10	8.33	1	0.00	0	11
Number of total participants in group presentations	83.33	10	8.33	1	0.00	0	11

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: REFERENCE</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Number of reference transactions	50.00	6	33.33	4	16.67	2	12

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: CIRCULATION</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Number of initial circulations (excluding reserves)	50.00	6	16.67	2	33.33	4	12

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: USE OF ELECTRONIC RESOURCES</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Number of successful full-text article requests (journals)	58.33	7	16.67	2	25.00	3	12
Number of regular searches (databases)	33.33	4	50.00	6	16.67	2	12
Number of federated searches (databases)	33.33	4	50.00	6	16.67	2	12

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: INTERLIBRARY LOANS</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total number of filled requests provided to other libraries	91.67	11	0.00	0	8.33	1	12
Total number of filled requests received from other libraries or providers	91.67	11	0.00	0	8.33	1	12

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: ANNUAL GATE COUNT</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Annual gate count	66.67	8	8.33	1	25.00	3	12

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: DOCTOR'S DEGREES AND FACULTY</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Number of Doctor's degrees awarded	58.33	7	8.33	1	33.33	4	12
Number of fields in which Doctor's degrees can be awarded	72.73	8	9.09	1	18.18	2	11
Number of full-time instructional faculty	84.67	11	7.69	1	7.69	1	13

<b>ARL Statistics Survey Data Points: ENROLLMENT</b>	<b>Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Not Useful (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Unsure/No Opinion (%)</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Full-time students, undergraduate and graduate	91.67	11	0.00	0	8.33	1	12
Part-time students, undergraduate and graduate	90.91	10	0.00	0	9.09	1	11
Full-time graduate students	90.00	9	0.00	0	10.00	1	10
Part-time graduate students	90.00	9	0.00	0	10.00	1	10