

**College Libraries Section,
Standards Committee Minutes,
ALA Annual Meeting, 2000**

ACRL College Libraries Section

Standards Committee

Joint Meeting with the **Continuing Education Committee**

MINUTES

Friday, July 7, 2000

Chicago

Present:

Will Bridegam, Amherst MA (2000), Chair

Rebecca Bostian, Governors State Univ. IL (2000)

Rick Hart, Penn State Erie (2000)

Sharon McCaslin, Longwood College VA (2000)

Jim Mullins, Villanova Univ. PA (2000)

Bill Nelson, incoming Chair

Absent: Bob Fernekes, Georgia Southern University (2000)

Dave Pilakowski, Williams College MA (2000)

Guests: Lisabeth Chabot, Chair, Continuing Education

John Jaffe

Will opened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. with a brief outline of the agenda for this meeting, which is primarily to prepare for the program on applying the new standards, scheduled for Sunday morning in the conference center. The College Library Section business meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m., followed by the committee presentation at 10.

Lis indicated that her committee members would be distributing handouts, one of which includes the URL for the website, where the bibliography and slide presentation can also be obtained. She will act as moderator, introducing the committee and the program and soliciting comments and questions afterwards.

Will provided the PowerPoint slide show on his laptop, while each of the presenting committee members briefly explained the content of his or her portion of the program. Will and Dave are doing the process and history of the revision, which is already familiar to the committee members. Sharon went over the development of a mission statement. Rick approached the subject of selecting a peer group by discussing the results of a survey he had done of libraries in the Northeast. Of the 35 respondents, most had been doing some sort of consultation and sharing with peers for years. Rick noted the usefulness of having both literal and aspirational peers. Jim brought out the open-ended flexible nature of the quantitative analysis in the standards, including a few slides about regression analysis applied to quantitative data. Becky briefly outlined her presentation of actual experience applying the standards. She noted that her institution had an accreditation team site visit shortly after she had finished the evaluative report and that the team members had been very complimentary, not only of the product, but also of the process. Bill and Bob have collected quotations from the manuals and instructions

for regional accreditation agencies, correlating them to the sections in the standards. Jim noted that Middle States is using information literacy as the objective, broadly defined, and that they have come close to actually endorsing or at least noting the new ACRL CLS standards.

Lis will announce the ACRL program in Denver at the end of this ALA program, thus providing additional opportunity for exposure to the Standards. She will solicit comments and questions from the audience after this program and will suggest that further comments and questions may be raised as these standards are used more extensively, so that the program in Denver will provide additional feedback.

Will then suggested some possible questions from the audience, so that the committee could anticipate their answers.

1. If there are no baselines or thresholds, won't the comparisons degenerate into satisfaction surveys? A. Numbers don't mean as much as they used to. Peers may be aspirational rather than just literal. At this point some in the committee noted that the new standards do not forbid use of the old 1995 numbers, but it was the adamant consensus of the committee that such a regression should not be encouraged. Negotiating with the administration and setting one's own interpretation on the data are essential and beneficial tasks.
2. Why not select a few successful institutions and use their averages to make updated benchmarks for everyone? A. There is no one uniform definition of success. Under the new standards each library can do this using its own definition of success.
3. Why don't you use the ratio of online catalog hits per FTE? A. The standards are not proscriptive. New ratios can and should be developed and used as the profession evolves, and as each institution's needs change.
4. How can we learn more about regression analysis? A. Take a statistics course or talk to a faculty member about your data.
5. What about virtual ownership? A. The subject of access is addressed in the standards. As points of comparison are developed, new ratios can be created.
6. Why not just use IPEDS statistics only? A. IPEDS is turning volunteer and cannot be depended on to remain static or even to remain at all. In the past the statistics have failed to cover what is needed and they are too slow to develop changes.
7. What if peers won't share data? A. Becky noted that of her set of peers only one refused to cooperate, so she just left them off. Rick noted that older statistics are often available in published form.
8. Shouldn't the ratios be weighted? A. As needed, and with justification, they may be. Again, depending on the mission of the library, on the variance from the missions of the peer groups, and other factors, the narrative report can suggest mitigating factors.
9. Why isn't there a recommended percentage of E & G? A. Comparisons need to be relative. The definition of E & G is changing, depending on how financial aid is counted, for example. The absence or presence of computing services in the library budget, archives and preservation departments, and various other anomalies make such a comparison difficult.

10. If libraries and instructional technology are merging, why do the standards reflect only libraries? A. Libraries have not yet subsumed instructional technology! The question of appropriate media and technology access is addressed in the standards.

Jim noted that the standards are intended as an indicator only rather than the final or only answer. Becky added that the document is important depending on how and why it is used. Lis suggested that the new standards require librarians to take more intellectual responsibility for evaluation.

Will asked Bill Nelson, as the incoming Chair, to coordinate the effort to publish an article based on the publication.

There will be a joint meeting of the new Standards Committee and the Continuing Education Committee at 11:30 a.m. Saturday. The agenda will be to finalize the program for the ACRL program in Denver.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

ACRL College Libraries Section
Continuing Education Committee
Standards Committee

Joint Meeting

MINUTES

Saturday, July 8, 2000

ALA Annual Meeting, Chicago

11:30am-12:30pm

Present:

Continuing Education Committee:

Rita Gulstad, Central Methodist College--Mo (2002), Incoming Chair

Laura Rein, Webster University--MO (200?)

Standards Committee:

Bill Nelson, Augusta State University--GA (2002), Incoming Chair

Rebecca Bostian, Governors State Univ.--IL (2002)

Lisabeth Chabot, Mary Baldwin College--VA (200?)

Bob Fernekes, GA Southern University--GA (2002)

Rhonna Goodman, Manhattanville College--NY (2002)

Kitty McNeill, Emory Univ.--Oxford College--GA (2002)

David Pilachowski, Williams College--MA (2000)

Bill Nelson, incoming Chair of the CLS Standards Committee, called the meeting to order. The agenda was posted to committee members in advance.

After Laura Rein was appointed recorder for the meeting, introductions were made and committee rosters were passed for corrections.

Rita Gulstad and Bill Nelson reviewed the Continuing Education Committee and Standards Committee charges and noted that ACRL has charged the committees to jointly get the word out to our constituents on the new ACRL standards.

Lisabeth Chabot reviewed the ALA program scheduled for Sunday entitled "Applying the New Standards for College Libraries." She noted that it would cover the rationale behind the development of the standards as well as the major changes concerning peer review, outcomes, and assessment.

Rita discussed the joint proposal for the ACRL Denver meeting tentatively entitled "New Standards for College Libraries: Strategies for Evaluating Collections and Services." It will be a panel presentation in the Leadership and Management Track. Speakers include James Mullins, Bill Nelson, and Bob Fernekes. While the final acceptance of proposals will not be decided until August, we can be fairly certain that we will be approved since ACRL made the original charge to the committees. After some discussion, the committees decided that the focus of the presentation should be on best practices. Rita will post a query on COLLIB-L soliciting information about libraries that have applied the new standards.

In order to facilitate regional and local access to continuing education, we plan to have the panel videotaped. Other ideas that we may explore include asking ACRL to publish a workbook (Bill Nelson and Bob Fernekes have already developed one), holding an online forum (e.g., via COLLIB-L), and creating a distance education course.

The committees agreed that the overall focus of all of our continuing education efforts should be on "closing the loop" and using the results of assessment for continuous improvement.

Last Update: April 22nd, 2002