

COPPUL ROI Task Group Documents

ASSESSMENT MAILING LIST

Institution	First name	Last name	Position	email
Athabasca University	Elaine	Fabbro	Acting Director, Library Services	elainef@athabascau.ca
Brandon University	Angela	Revet	Library Assistant, Acquisitions	Revet@brandonu.ca
Brandon University	Betty	Braaksma	University Librarian	Braaksmab@brandonu.ca
Canadian Mennonite University	Vic	Froese	Library Director	vfroese@cmu.ca
Concordia University College of Alberta	Lynette	Toews-Neufeldt	Assistant Director, Info Services	lynette.toews-neufeldt@concordia.ab.ca
Dalhousie University	Heather	MacFadyen	Collections and Scholarly Communications Librarian	Heather.MacFadyen@dal.ca
Grant MacEwan University	Jane	Duffy	Dean of Libraries	duffy@macewan.ca
Mount Royal University	Brian	Jackson	Liaison Librarian	bjackson@mtroyal.ca
Northern Alberta Institute of Technology	Karen	Schlegl	Coordinator, Collections and Information Support	kschlegl@nait.ca
Quest University Canada	Venessa	Wallsten	University Librarian	Venessa.Wallsten@questu.ca
Red Deer College	Kristine	Plastow	Chair, Library Information Common	Kristine.Plastow@rdc.ab.ca
Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology	Nina	Thurlow	Librarian, Library and Testing Services - Kelsey Campus	nina.thurlow@siast.sk.ca
Simon Fraser University	Natalie	Gick	Associate University Librarian, Administrative Services	ngick@sfu.ca
Southern Alberta Institute of Technology	Genevieve	Luthy	Library Manager	genevieve.luthy@sait.ca
Trinity Western University	Ted	Goshulak	University Librarian	tgosh@twu.ca
University College of the Fraser Valley	Colleen	Bell	Information Literacy and Web Services Librarian	colleen.bell@ufv.ca
University College of the North	Stan	Gardner	Dean	sgardner@ucn.ca
University College of the North	Kathy	Ellerton	Learning Resources Instructor	kellerton@ucn.ca
University of Alberta	Allison	Sivak	Public Services Librarian	Allison.Sivak@ualberta.ca
University of British Columbia	Jeremy	Buhler	Assessment Librarian	jeremy.buhler@ubc.ca
University of Manitoba	Kristen	Kruse	Asst Librarian, Tech Services	Kristen.Kruse@umanitoba.ca
University of New Brunswick	James	Mackenzie	Reference Librarian	jmackenz@unb.ca
University of Northern British Columbia	Allan	Wilson	Director	Allan.Wilson@unbc.ca
University of Northern British Columbia	Heather	Empey	Acquisitions Librarian	Heather.Empey@unbc.ca
University of Victoria	Chelsea	Garside	Assessment and Statistics Analyst	cgarside@uvic.ca
Vancouver Island University	Kathleen	Reed	Assessment and Data Librarian	kathleen.reed@viu.ca



**COPPUL Workshop for “Directors plus one”
Focus on Library value and ROI – Collections**

September 26, 2013

**Location: University Centre room 543/44
University of Manitoba**

Complimentary COPPUL shuttle vans will transport guests from the Inn at the Forks to the meeting. Please convene in the hotel lobby at 8am.

Agenda

8:30 - 9:00	MORNING REFRESHMENTS (Continental breakfast)
9:00 - 9:15	Welcome - Gwen Bird (COPPUL), Bob Foley (VIU), Jeremy Buhler (UBC)
9:15 - 10:00	Keynote “Library Return on Investment” Bruce Kingma, <i>Associate Provost for Entrepreneurship and Innovation and Professor, iSchool and Whitman, Syracuse University</i>
10:00 - 10:15	BREAK
10:15 - 10:45	Library Impact Starter Kit - Allison Sivak (UA) and Kathleen Reed (VIU)
10:45 - 11:45	Report on Collections Assessment projects: Jeremy Buhler (UBC) and Kathleen Reed (VIU)
11:45 - 12:15	LUNCH
12:15 - 1:00	ROI Case Study at Syracuse: Bruce Kingma
1:00 - 2:00	Library Impact Starter Kit: Allison Sivak (UA) and Kathleen Reed (VIU) <i>Birds of a feather: Small group discussion, reporting out, and recommendations</i>
2:00 - 2:15	BREAK
2:15 - 3:00	LibQUAL+ Information Control presentation: Chelsea Garside (UVic) and Allison Sivak (UA)
3:00 - 3:15	Closing reflections and next steps - Jeremy Buhler (UBC)

Return on Investment (ROI) Task Group

Terms of Reference - Approved by Directors March 2013

The Return on Investment (ROI) Task Group will actively support the COPPUL strategic framework goal of *demonstrating the value of the library to the university* by

- identifying a common set of library and university metrics as a foundation for ROI projects
- developing knowledge of current and emerging practices in library assessment with an emphasis on communicating value and calculating ROI
- identifying areas of potentially *high* and *low* return on investment and developing ROI methodologies to help libraries communicate value to key stakeholders and make evidence-based decisions about priorities and funding
- aligning ROI projects with the values of parent institutions and communicating outcomes in ways that are meaningful to key stakeholders

The Return on Investment (ROI) Task Group was formed in March 2011 to identify ROI initiatives that would benefit COPPUL libraries. Initial membership consisted exclusively of library directors. At the Spring 2012 meeting the Directors agreed to renew Task Group membership by inviting library professionals directly involved in assessment. The revised Task Group first met in January 2013 and will report to Directors at least once a year via written report to a Board meeting, and more frequently as needed or requested.

Working definition of ROI

To help focus its work the Task Group uses the following working definition of ROI:

"The basis of ROI studies is to quantify and demonstrate the library's economic value to the institution. For every dollar spent on the library, the university receives dollars back in the form of additional grants income or donations, or long term value to the community from an educated work force, more productive faculty and more successful students and graduates. ROI must be articulated within the mission and objectives of the specific institution." (Tenopir, 2009; Measuring the Value and Return on Investment of Academic Libraries, p11.)

While the definition above emphasizes economic value to the institution, ROI also includes "values of all types that come to stakeholders and the institution from the library's collections, services, and contribution to its communities." (Fleming-May, Fritzier, Radom, 2012; presentation from the LibValue Project).

Past activities

- Survey on ROI and Internal Assessment Practices at Member Libraries, distributed to COPPUL members in December 2011.
- Presentation about ROI with emphasis on the efficient use of metrics to support ROI projects, 2012 Spring Meeting in Calgary (March 22-23). Presented by Allison Sivak and Jeremy Buhler.

Membership

Jeremy Buhler (Assessment Librarian, University of BC) **co-chair**
Allison Sivak (Assessment Librarian, University of Alberta) **co-chair**
Jane Duffy (Dean of Libraries, Grant MacEwan University)
Chelsea Garside (Assessment and Statistics Analyst, University of Victoria)
Kristen Kruse (Electronic Resources Librarian, University of Manitoba)
Kathleen Reed (Assessment and Data Librarian, Vancouver Island University)

COPPUL ROI Task Group: 2013/14 Activity Report

The Return on Investment (ROI) Task Group actively supports the COPPUL strategic framework goal of *demonstrating the value of the library to the university*. The group meets monthly and reports to the COPPUL executive director, responding to priorities identified by COPPUL directors.

2013/14 activities

The ROI Task Group chose the value of library collections as its theme for 2012/13. Members developed several projects (e.g. the value of Index & Abstract products, the ROI of Demand Driven Acquisitions programs) and presented them during a 1-day workshop preceding the September directors' meeting. The workshop also included ROI presentations by Dr. Bruce Kingma (Whitman School of Management, Syracuse University) and exercises to help focus assessment projects about library value.

The September workshop was also an opportunity for the Task Group to solicit feedback from directors about future directions.

2014/15 plans: new group member, expanded network, new projects

In consultation with Gwen Bird and Bob Foley the Task Group added a new member in 2014 (Betty Braaksma, Brandon University) and identified 3 projects for the coming year:

Developing a COPPUL ROI/assessment network

Professional development in assessment and ROI remains a priority for many directors. In response the Task Group will establish an informal network by inviting representatives from each COPPUL library. This network will help the Task Group stay connected to member libraries' needs, provide a forum for discussion of assessment and ROI topics, and offer informal professional development and support. The Task Group intends to host quarterly online meetings on topics identified by network members.

COPPUL statistics

CARL collects and compiles COPPUL library statistics but the reporting process can be onerous for non-CARL libraries and turnaround time is sometimes slow. In an effort to clarify and/or simplify the reporting process the Task Group will review requirements and definitions for the COPPUL stats, documenting overlap with other provincial and national library statistics surveys.

The ROI of COPPUL membership

Task Group members will work with Gwen Bird to identify ways to measure the ROI of COPPUL membership. The goal is to produce a report for each member library covering services available to all members (e.g. consortial licensing, reciprocal borrowing), as well as optional initiatives like SPAN, the Private LOCKSS Network, and Archivemata.

Members

Jeremy Buhler (Assessment Librarian, University of BC) **co-chair**
Allison Sivak (Public Services Librarian, University of Alberta) **co-chair**
Betty Braaksma (University Librarian, Brandon University)
Jane Duffy (Dean of Libraries, Grant MacEwan University)
Chelsea Garside (Assessment and Statistics Analyst, University of Victoria)
Kristen Kruse (Electronic Resources Librarian, University of Manitoba)
Kathleen Reed (Assessment and Data Librarian, Vancouver Island University)

COPPUL ROI Task Group: September 2014 Activity Update

The Return on Investment (ROI) Task Group actively supports the COPPUL strategic framework goal of *demonstrating the value of the library to the university*. The group meets monthly and reports to the COPPUL executive director, responding to priorities identified by COPPUL directors.

Update on current projects

Establishing the COPPUL ROI/assessment network

In May 2014 the ROI TG invited representatives from COPPUL libraries to join a network of colleagues interested in library assessment and ROI. This network will help the Task Group stay connected to member libraries' needs, provide a forum for discussion of assessment and ROI topics, and offer informal professional development and support. The first online meeting of this group will take place September 23. The meeting will be moderated by ROI TG members and will be an opportunity for network members to introduce themselves and to engage with our first discussion topic: *achieving change through assessment*. The ROI TG intends to hold quarterly online meetings on topics selected by the group.

COPPUL statistics

A subgroup of COPPUL ROI task group members is examining three sets of statistics from the Canadian Association of Research Libraries, the Alberta Association of Academic Libraries, and the Council of Post Secondary Library Directors (B.C.). We have mapped each of the surveys, looking at what questions are unique, and what questions overlap between the three sets of questions. The primary purpose of this project is to recommend a set of statistics for COPPUL members that is meaningful to the membership, and provides a set of benchmarks, which some members have stated is useful when they are discussing resources with their postsecondary administrators.

Before submitting the final report to the COPPUL Directors, we would like to ensure that the COPPUL ROI task group as a whole has carefully reviewed our proposed statistics, so that we can speak to the measures' strengths and limitations. Individual measures always have some limitations and it is important to be clear on what we can say with confidence, and what knowledge we still do not have.

Task Group membership

There is currently one vacancy on the ROI Task Group. The open position is for a COPPUL Director to act as a bridge between the Task Group and other COPPUL Directors.

Current members

Jeremy Buhler (Assessment Librarian, University of BC) co-chair
Allison Sivak (Public Services Librarian, University of Alberta) co-chair
Jane Duffy (Librarian, Grant MacEwan University)
Kristen Kruse (Electronic Resources Librarian, University of Manitoba)
Kathleen Reed (Assessment and Data Librarian, Vancouver Island University)

Vacant (Director from a COPPUL Library)

COPPUL ROI Task Group: 2014/15 Activity Report

The Return on Investment (ROI) Task Group supports the COPPUL strategic framework goal of *demonstrating the value of the library to the university*. The group reports to the COPPUL executive director, responding to priorities identified by COPPUL directors.

Overview

The pace of ROI TG activity slowed during 2014/15. In the preceding year four of six task group members performed library assessment roles in their organizations. Since then membership and responsibilities have changed and only two members hold jobs directly related to assessment and ROI.

We recognize that the performance of the ROI TG should not depend on overlap between task group projects and members' day-to-day working responsibilities. In December 2014 co-chairs Allison Sivak and Jeremy Buhler spoke with Andrew Waller about the future of the task group. Members are discussing how best to proceed and we expect to propose changes to the group and/or terms of reference later in 2015.

2014/15 activities

The Task Group's 2013/14 activity report identified three projects for 2014/15:

COPPUL ROI/assessment network

The Task Group established an informal assessment/ROI network by inviting a representative from each COPPUL library. Among our goals is to provide a forum for assessment/ROI topics and to offer informal professional development and support. We created a mailing list for discussion and in September 2014 participants were invited to an inaugural online meeting on the topic of *achieving change through assessment*. Unfortunately technical difficulties made group discussion nearly impossible at that first meeting. We have not yet held a second online discussion.

Review of COPPUL statistics

CARL collects and compiles COPPUL library statistics but the reporting process can be onerous for smaller libraries and turnaround time is often slow. In 2014 Allison Sivak and Kristin Kruse reviewed the reporting requirements, identifying areas where stats collection and definitions could be simplified and considering potential improvements. This work is nearly complete and we expect to share a more detailed report with the COPPUL executive director in Spring 2015.

The ROI of COPPUL membership

In 2014 Jeremy Buhler and Kathleen Reed explored ways to measure the ROI of COPPUL membership. Existing quantitative metrics for consortial licensing activities lend themselves well to ROI statements, but we found few applicable metrics for other COPPUL initiatives. Developing an ROI report that goes beyond qualitative statements may require COPPUL members to report additional metrics in a systematic way (e.g. number of reciprocal borrowers served) and coordination with other committees. Work on this project is ongoing.

Members (Mar 2015)

Gwen Bird (University Librarian, Simon Fraser University) new member in 2015
Jeremy Buhler (Assessment Librarian, University of BC) co-chair
Allison Sivak (Public Services Librarian, University of Alberta) co-chair
Kristen Kruse (Electronic Resources Librarian, University of Manitoba)
Kathleen Reed (Assessment and Data Librarian, Vancouver Island University)

COPPUL Statistics Review

September 2015

CARL collects and compiles COPPUL library statistics. For COPPUL members who are also part of CARL, submissions to CARL's annual survey are repurposed for the COPPUL publication and no further reporting is required. For non-CARL libraries, however, the COPPUL stats represents an additional reporting stream, the reporting process can be onerous, and turnaround time is sometimes slow.

In an effort to clarify and/or simplify the reporting process for non-CARL members the Task Group reviewed requirements and definitions for the COPPUL stats, documenting overlap with other provincial and national library statistics surveys.

One member of the Task Group completed the mapping between three sets of statistics: CARL, the Association of Alberta Academic Libraries (AAAL), and the British Columbia Council of Post-Secondary Library Directors (CPLSD). A second member reviewed and corroborated the completed mapping.

The accompanying Excel document includes four worksheets. The first three (*CARLBase*, *CPSLDBase* and *AAALBase*) show one association's suite of statistical measures, with notes on what measures from the other two associations map to the base suite's. The final tab, *COPPULsuggested*, lists our final suggestions for statistics that might be most useful for the COPPUL directors' stated purposes (comparison over time and/or between institutions, particularly from the perspective of smaller institutions who are making business cases for their collections budgets).

As shown in the *Appendix A - Mapping Notes*, we believe that comparisons across small and large institutions are best made through ratios.

If COPPUL directors wish to reduce the reporting burden on non-CARL libraries, we recommend reducing the reporting requirements to a subset of the current CARL survey. As a guideline for the subset, consider what you would need to create the ratios presented in Appendix A.

If COPPUL directors instead, wish to to create a new subset of statistics, we recommend looking at our *COPPULsuggested* statistics and choose which measures are easier to gather. The Directors should pay particular attention to defining what resources are to be counted in the collections titles measure. *Appendix B* includes the ARL and ANSI/NISO Z39.7-2004 definitions for titles.

All measures have limitations and involve decision-making for clarity, particularly when measuring the work of complex organizations like libraries. We have suggested the statistics with the most overlap between the three statistics questionnaires, and in some cases made a judgment call (e.g., counting titles rather than volumes, as avoiding counting duplicate holdings). All measures are also somewhat imprecise; some duplicates will slip through, for example. We are quite willing to make change to this suggested suite of measures if Directors express their preference for volumes over titles, for example.

If Directors choose to review this package, here are several questions that could help the COPPUL suite if answered concretely:

- What is it that COPPUL directors need to know most, for comparison purposes? (titles per FTE, ILL items retrieved vs items borrowed, collection expenditure vs overall expenditures, collection expenditure per student/faculty FTE, etc.)
- Does format matter? E.g., print vs electronic? Is it more important to understand serials vs. monographs? Databases?
- Count titles or volumes? Different current stats ask for different numbers (titles makes most sense as “unique” holdings)
- Would directors prefer to know how and where the money is being spent, or what the holdings are? What is more useful for their purposes?

Respectfully submitted,

Allison Sivak for COPPUL ROI Task Group

allison.sivak@ualberta.ca

Work completed by: Kristen Kruse (UManitoba) and Allison Sivak (UAlberta) with input from Jeremy Buhler (UBC)

Appendix A – Mapping Notes

- Certain stats are very straightforward, and here's where we see the most overlap
 - Library staff FTE
 - Library staff salaries / benefits
 - Student FTE
 - Traditional services: ILL, instruction, ref questions, opening hours, total materials (differs whether counting volumes or titles), library seats, expenditures on collections
- COPPUL stats should
 - Reduce work by relying on already-collected stats as much as possible
 - Avoid including stats on services that don't apply across different COPPUL institutions (e.g., special collections)
 - Include only information that changes over time (e.g., square footage generally static)
 - Be comparable across diverse institutions; for example, ratios could be more useful than straight title counts
- Suggested subset of CARL statistics to gather (these are also listed on the spreadsheet):
 - Collection
 - Total monograph titles (print and e)
 - Total serial titles (print and e)
 - Expenditures
 - Total spent on one-time acquisitions
 - Total spent on ongoing acquisitions
 - Other collection expenditures
 - Total library budget
 - Total salaries and benefits, all staff
 - Staffing
 - FTE librarians
 - FTE non-librarian staff
 - FTE casual staff
 - Institution
 - FTE students
 - FTE faculty
 - Activity
 - Number of questions (reference, directional, consults)
 - Number of instructional sessions taught
 - Number of students taught in instructional sessions
 - ILL items loaned
 - ILL items borrowed
 - Number of full text articles retrieved

- Number of initial circulation
- Ratios
 - Collection \$ to FTE students and faculty
 - Library budget to FTE students and faculty
 - ILL borrowed per total FTE students / faculty
 - Monograph titles per FTE student and faculty
 - Serial titles per FTE student and faculty
 - FTE librarians to FTE faculty
 - FTE library staff to FTE students
 - Circulation to FTE students and faculty
 - Students reached via instruction session to FTE students
 - Number of instruction sessions to FTE faculty
 - Number of instruction sessions to librarians
 - Number of questions per FTE (students and faculty)

Appendix B – ARL and ANSI/NISO Z39.7-2004 Definitions

ARL

Question 1. Titles Held. Report all the instances of titles managed and maintained by the library including cataloged, locally digitized, and licensed resources. Counting the 245 field when the library provides stewardship for those resources may be sufficient.

ANSI/NISO Z39.7-2004

The designation of a separate bibliographic whole, whether issued in one or several volumes Titles are defined according to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. A book or serial title may be distinguished from other such titles by its unique International Standard Book Number (ISBN) or International Standard Serial Number (ISSN). This definition applies equally to print, audiovisual, and other library materials. For unpublished works, the term is used to designate a manuscript collection or an archival record series. Two subscriptions to Science magazine, for example, are counted as one title. When vertical file materials are counted, a file folder is considered a title.

Report the total number of titles catalogued and made ready for use. Consider a title to be the title of a distinct bibliographic manifestation, usually represented by its own bibliographic description or record in the catalog. Count multiple copies of the same manifestation as one title. If the library owns or has access to identical content in different formats, count each format as a different title. For example, a serial title available in print, microform and online would be counted as three titles. Count different editions and versions of the same work as separate titles since they denote depth in the collection.

Do not report here titles for which your library is not providing sustained stewardship and maintenance.

Include special collections materials, government documents, serials and monographs; microforms, computer files, manuscripts and archives, audiovisual materials (cartographic, graphic, audio, film and video, etc.). Special collection materials in particular constitute resources of national/international distinction and the breadth and depth of these resources is a key indicator tied to the mission of research libraries.

Include all materials where financial contribution has been made even if partial.

Include gifts.

If your library digitizes content from its own collection and the content is accessible under current copyright law you can report it. Do not count HathiTrust, CRL, Internet Archive, etc. unless your library owns the digitized item and it is accessible under current copyright law.

For demand driven acquisition report titles only after they are purchased. If a library does not provide access to a title, do not report it.

COPPUL ROI Task Group: Sep 2015 update

The Return on Investment (ROI) Task Group supports the COPPUL strategic framework goal of *demonstrating the value of the library to the university*. The group reports to the COPPUL executive director, responding to priorities identified by COPPUL directors.

In early 2015 ROI Task Group co-chairs Allison Sivak and Jeremy Buhler discussed the future role of the Task Group with COPPUL executive director Andrew Waller. At their March 2015 meeting COPPUL directors agreed to a hiatus in the Task Group's activities pending development of COPPUL's new strategic plan. Once the plan is complete directors may revisit that decision, potentially reviving the group with a new mandate in alignment with COPPUL's strategic priorities.

Task Group members agreed to provide brief reports on two partially completed projects: a review of COPPUL statistics and an exploratory report on the ROI of COPPUL membership (attached).

On behalf of the entire Task Group we thank the directors and the COPPUL executive for the opportunity to contribute to the Council, to make valuable professional connections, and to further assessment work at our own institutions.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Buhler, University of British Columbia
Allison Sivak, University of Alberta

co-chairs, COPPUL ROI Task Group

Task Group Membership (2015)

Gwen Bird (University Librarian, Simon Fraser University)
Jeremy Buhler (Assessment Librarian, University of BC) **co-chair**
Allison Sivak (Public Services Librarian, University of Alberta) **co-chair**
Kristen Kruse (Electronic Resources Librarian, University of Manitoba)
Kathleen Reed (Assessment and Data Librarian, Vancouver Island University)

Framework report on the ROI of COPPUL membership

The ROI TG was asked by former executive director Gwen Bird to help identify and collect quantitative metrics that could be used to communicate the return on investment of membership in COPPUL. The goal was to create a framework for an annual report that could be customized for each member institution, employing ROI calculations to show the impact and value of several COPPUL initiatives.

The role of the Task Group was to assemble relevant data and help create a template for the initial report.

Scope

The project focused on identifying ROI metrics for the following COPPUL services:

- Reciprocal borrowing program
- Shared Print Archive Network (SPAN)
- Private LOCKSS Network (PLN)
- Centralized ILL invoicing
- Archivemata

COPPUL's consortial licensing activities were identified as one of the most important components of a potential ROI report, but e-resource cost and use figures were not part of this project because the metrics are already available to the COPPUL executive.

Findings

Creating the desired ROI report template requires metrics that are a) applicable to most COPPUL members, b) reported consistently across member libraries, and c) available on an annual basis. This proved a smaller set of metrics than we originally supposed.

As mentioned above, some of the most useful metrics for this purpose are COPPUL's consortial licensing figures, in large part because they are available centrally and do not require individual COPPUL members to track and report data independently.

For a COPPUL membership benefit such as reciprocal borrowing, however, there is no central data source. We found that member libraries have various ways of recording circulation transactions to visitors from other institutions, and that in many cases it would be time consuming or impossible to identify where the visitor was from. A metrics-based ROI report on the value of reciprocal borrowing would require COPPUL members to establish new data collection and reporting practices. We feel this should only be undertaken if the value of comparative data on reciprocal borrowing outweighs the cost of data collection.

Other COPPUL initiatives – e.g. the Private LOCKSS Network (PLN), Archivemata – lend themselves more readily to comparative data collection because there are centralized systems. For this project we spoke with committee members from PLN and reviewed SPAN metrics. While no ROI metrics were systematically collected at that time, the PLN group was reviewing its strategic objectives and was interested in identifying metrics that reflect their own work. If captured in a way that identifies each participating institution this dataset could be another important source for a future COPPUL ROI report.

Conclusion

At the beginning of the project we hoped that existing COPPUL metrics could be used in ROI calculations that applied to COPPUL as well as to each member institution. In practice we found that apart from consortial licensing, eresource use, and data storage figures, few such data points are readily available. For other COPPUL initiatives it is unlikely that the creation of an ROI report justifies the cost of

