

2017

The Data Framework: A Collaborative Tool for Assessment at the UNLV Libraries

Starr Hoffman

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, starr.hoffman@unlv.edu

Ashley Hernandez-Hall

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, ashley.hernandez-hall@unlv.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/lib_articles

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Hoffman, S., Hernandez-Hall, A. (2017). The Data Framework: A Collaborative Tool for Assessment at the UNLV Libraries. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 29(2), 1-21.

https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/lib_articles/528

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Article in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in Library Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

Hoffman, S. and Hall, A. “The Data Framework: A Collaborative Tool for Assessment at the UNLV Libraries.” Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship, 29(2), in press.

Abstract: Keeping track of the data that academic libraries capture is a massive task. The University of Nevada - Las Vegas (UNLV) University Libraries developed a data framework as a tracking tool for data points. This framework is both a data dictionary and a manual that records data-gathering procedures. This ensures that the data is continually gathered and reported in the same way, and also ensures that institutional memory of those procedures is preserved, regardless of staff turnover. Additionally, the revised Data Framework, and the revision process, transformed staff attitudes about data reporting and strengthened the libraries' culture of assessment.

Keywords: assessment, culture of assessment, academic libraries, data, database, data dictionary

Author's Notes: *Starr Hoffman (PhD, MLA, MA) (corresponding author) is the Head of Planning and Assessment at the University Libraries, University of Nevada - Las Vegas (UNLV). starr.hoffman@unlv.edu*

Ashley Hernandez-Hall (MSW) is the Library Data Analyst at the University Libraries, University of Nevada - Las Vegas (UNLV). ashley.hernandez-hall@unlv.edu

Received: October 20, 2016

Accepted: December 30, 2016

Academic libraries capture and report vast quantities of data; keeping track of what needs to be gathered, how, at what times, and by whom is not a simple endeavor. Some of the most common quantitative data that libraries gather include counts of physical and electronic collections, usage statistics for those collections, counts of visitors to library buildings, and number of library instruction presentations to students. These numbers are used for many purposes, including planning for future facility expansion, arguing for a larger budget and/or staff positions, and determining if collections are being discovered and used by patrons. They are also used to benchmark library collections, staffing, and performance against other libraries.

Keeping track of all that data is a massive task, particularly in a library system with branch locations and a large staff. Thus, the University of Nevada - Las Vegas (UNLV) University Libraries first developed a data framework over a decade ago as a tracking tool for data points (the actual piece of data that is collected) to be collected and reported (whether internally or externally). The Data Framework acts as both a data dictionary (listing data points and their definitions, as well as who requests and uses that data) and a manual that records data-gathering procedures (including the provider's name, the frequency of reporting to the Assessment Unit, and the procedure for obtaining the data). Recording the procedures ensures not only that the data is gathered and reported in the same way each year, but also ensures that institutional memory of those procedures is preserved regardless of staff turnover.

Literature Review

A crucial step to forming a culture of assessment within an academic library setting is understanding what this means. Farkas (2013) suggests that organizations that have a strong culture of assessment “assess because they *want* to know how they can improve” (p. 15) as opposed to assessing simply because it is an arbitrary requirement. However, while Ennis (2010) says that culture is “code for not just doing assessment, but *liking* it” (p. 16) he goes

on to point out that the emphasis would be better placed on ensuring that libraries develop organizational assessment procedures, given that administrators at most institutions request these processes. Other researchers echo this concept of a plan or procedures as required for a strong assessment program and a culture of assessment. Farkas, Hinchliffe and Houk (2015) explain, “Without a clearly articulated plan and expectations, an assessment culture may not be achieved. Everyone in the organization needs to understand what is expected of them regarding assessment; simply stating its importance is rarely sufficient” (p. 166). This plan must also be supported and emphasized by library leadership as those leaders help to guide organizational assessment activities and emphases. Without a strong leadership that values assessment, a culture of assessment is less likely to be present (Farkas et al., 2015; Lakos & Phipps, 2004; Ndoye & Parker, 2010).

Beyond leadership and a strong assessment plan, researchers have pointed out that stakeholder needs (which in this case include the data provider) must be addressed in order to create a strong culture of assessment. According to Ndoye and Parker (2010), “policy design can empower stakeholders by allowing them enough flexibility to address their own issues and needs so that they can easily integrate assessment into daily practice and promote the development of internally-driven processes and procedures” (p. 37). This suggests that an assessment plan should not only emphasize larger organizational needs, but also the needs of all data providers, including branch libraries, departments, and even committees or individuals. By including the needs of all stakeholders in an assessment plan, greater buy-in is developed and a culture of assessment can flourish.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas is a public doctoral university, Carnegie ranked as higher research activity, with a student body of approximately 23,000 undergraduates and 4,800 graduate students. The UNLV University Libraries has four branches (Lied Library, the Architecture Studies Library, the Music Library, and the Teacher Development and

Resources Library) and employs 67 librarians and professional staff and 35 classified staff. The institution is quite young, having been established in 1957, and is ethnically and racially diverse, ranked as the second most diverse U.S. campus by *U.S. News and World Report* and was designated by the U.S. Department of Education as a Minority Serving Institution.

History of the Data Framework

In 2007, the Dean of Libraries and the Head of Assessment decided to create a document outlining the data that the UNLV University Libraries collected for various purposes. This document, originally called the Data Matrix and later changed to the Data Framework, was designed to house information pertaining to each piece of data collected. This matrix was a simple Excel spreadsheet organized into tabs for broad data categories such as “patron-related” or “institutional data” (see figure 1). Thus, administrators were able to monitor the kinds of data that the University Libraries collected. This was the tool’s primary use; non-administrative library staff did not frequently use the Data Framework. Instead, data providers (that is, library staff who report data) were usually instructed on what to provide (and how) by the Head of Assessment.

[place figure 1. “Original Data Framework” here]

Over time, it became apparent that frequent updates were needed to keep the Data Framework up to date and in synch with changing reporting requirements at the national, statewide, and institutional levels. However, updates proved challenging, as the framework was “owned” by administrators (namely the Head of Assessment and Dean of the Libraries) with many other responsibilities. Updates necessitated meeting individually with each data provider and department. Furthermore, changes to data points outside of the organization’s control (such as changes to a national survey) needed to be updated in the framework as well as communicated to the library staff responsible for those data points. Since data providers did not use the original Data Framework, reporting data on time took precedence over

updating the framework. This led to a continuous cycle of the Data Framework falling out-of-date and out of usefulness.

The Data Framework Update Project

In 2014, a new Data Analyst was hired with two objectives: fostering the library's culture of assessment and updating the existing Data Framework. While the Data Framework update project began with the goal of simply eliminating redundant data points and adding missing ones, it became apparent that the original Data Framework, as conceptualized and implemented, was useful only to a handful of key administrators in the organization. Instead of spending significant time updating this limited-use tool, an advisory committee (the Data Matrix Advisory Group) decided that the entire framework should be revised for organization-wide use in training new staff in data-collection processes, ensuring the consistency of data collection, and clarifying data points. Additionally, the tool would be useful for helping all staff to understand the complexity of the libraries through the lens of the data described in the framework. Thus this new tool, and the revision process itself, would help foster a culture of assessment within the UNLV University Libraries.

Revising the Data Framework took five steps, most of which were accomplished during a series of meetings with individual library departments. The revision process consisted of developing the data points, categorizing them, defining data points, documenting collection procedures, and updating the tool.

Developing Data Points

First, the library's Data Matrix Advisory Group listed all data points that were reported to external agencies (such as Association of College and Research Libraries and the National Center for Educational Statistics), as well as data points that the Dean of Libraries requests on a regular basis. This ensured that important data points not otherwise "owned" or used by a specific library department would remain in the revised Data Framework.

Next, the Data Matrix Advisory Group worked with each department to develop a list of data points. In initial meetings, the Data Analyst asked departments what data points they currently collected; what they were used for; what questions or issues the department would like to resolve; and about any new projects they would like to assess, potentially with new metrics. This produced a list of current data points, new data points to add, and “wishlist” data points that could not be implemented immediately. Data points were also identified for potential deletion and were removed from the Data Framework after verifying with the dean, division directors, and others that they were not used elsewhere in the organization.

Categorizing Data Points

Next, the Assessment Unit decided which elements were necessary for the Data Framework to be an effective manual for the library’s data-management needs. The final elements are:

- Category and subcategories. These indicate the kind of data in broad and then increasingly specific terms; some data points have multiple subcategories. For instance: Collections (category) > Digital and Electronic Collections (subcategory 1) > E-books (subcategory 2).
- Data point. This describes the data that is collected. For instance, in the example above that deals with e-books, a specific data point might be the count of e-books by title. A second data point falling under the same categories and subcategories could be the count of e-books by volume.
- Definition (multiple levels). Definitions are provided not only for each data point but also for each category and subcategory.
- Procedure. Describes the reports, or queries, or other collection methods used to obtain the data.
- Frequency. How often the data is collected.

- Division and department. Two levels in the library's organizational hierarchy. Division is the highest level, followed by department.
- Data provider. The person responsible for reporting specific data points.
- Responsible party. The position ultimately responsible for ensuring that data points in their area are recorded (usually the supervisor of the data provider).
- Data requester. The person or entity requesting the data. This may be an external agency or an internal stakeholder.

Defining Data Points and Categories

Next, the Assessment Unit defined the data points, as well as their categories and subcategories. This was crucial, because the time that the Assessment Unit spent each year gathering data for the ACRL and IPEDS surveys was primarily spent discussing which data points were appropriate for each question and how that data could be collected. Both definitions and procedures were important to this process. The goal was to make the data-collection process understandable by anyone in the library, not only by the departments that collected the data.

The Assessment Unit provided some initial definitions for categories and subcategories by using standards and definitions from the National Information Standards Organization (NISO), the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), NCES, and ACRL, among others. The resulting definitions were later reviewed and revised during department meetings. Then departments were tasked with drafting definitions for any remaining undefined data points in their area. Assessment then reviewed these drafts and asked questions as needed.

Developing Procedures

Next, each department was asked to record the procedures used to obtain their data. This included noting any software or other applications used, and any specifics about how to

run queries or reports. In some cases, departments had already documented their data collection procedures, which were simply added to (or linked from) the Data Framework.

Updating the Tool

Finally, the Assessment Unit planned an update cycle to coincide with reporting data to the ACRL and IPEDS surveys. Since many data points are reviewed at that time due to survey question changes, Assessment determined this was an optimal time to begin an annual data-point review and update. This annual update ensures that the tool remains current and useful as a training tool and reference manual.

Using the Data Framework

The end result is a tracking tool that acts as a data-management map, allowing the UNLV Libraries to keep a stream of accurate and consistent data flowing into the Planning and Assessment Unit. Data is provided regularly according to the frequency noted in the framework, and the Assessment Unit can easily discover who is responsible for a specific data point in order to ask questions or to send a reminder about submitting data.

The Data Framework is useful as a data manual for everyone in the library who provides data. For instance, for a data provider reporting data on a monthly basis, once a month she would filter the Data Framework by her name to show all the data points for which she is responsible. She can then click on any data point to read its definition and its collection procedures. The data provider then runs her report (or otherwise obtains the necessary data) and uploads it to a shared folder on the library's network drive. The Assessment Unit has connected much of this data to the library's instance of Tableau Server (as Data Sources), with auto-refresh cycles. Thus, the data will be available almost immediately for the library staff to view, analyze, explore, and to create additional visualizations.

Fostering a Culture of Assessment

The extensive process of collecting and creating data definitions and procedures necessitated buy-in from every department that provided this information. The Assessment Unit alone could not have completed this project; each data point required the expertise of those departments collecting the data. Simply involving each department in the revision of the Data Framework has helped to foster a sense of ownership in the project and in library data, thereby fostering the culture of assessment within the organization. Previously the data-collection process had been limited to the Assessment Unit's requests for data for varied – and sometimes unclear – purposes. The revision process enabled every data provider to become a part of the data collection and reporting process, from creating a new data point to reporting it and finally using the data to make decisions. This new sense of community commitment to data-collection and reporting enabled staff to feel like an invested member of the process, rather than simply reporting data with limited knowledge of why it is collected and little say in how it is used.

Framework Format

The format of the Data Framework interface was key to its ultimate usability. The tool's original Excel format, while initially useful, became difficult to navigate as the number of data points increased. Filtering features in Excel are also limited and not intuitive. Although the Framework was divided into tabs that separated data points into logical groups (such as “use” and “services”), this structure was inconvenient for data providers who were responsible for, and thus needed to locate, data points in multiple tabs. This challenging navigation contributed to non-administrative staff's reluctance to use the framework in its original format.

Designing the Framework

Designing the new interface entailed exploring several potential formats. The following questions pertaining to the use and availability of the tool had to be answered before an appropriate format could be selected.

(1) Who will be using the Data Framework?

Because the intended user group was expanded to include data providers and their supervisors, and was intended for frequent (rather than annual) use, the format had to be simple and intuitive.

(2) What features would be useful for Data Framework users?

New applications of the framework, including for training and as a reference, necessitated the ability to filter on multiple elements. Such filters would enable easier navigation of the greater number of data points. Additionally, the newly added elements (definitions and procedures) needed to be accessible while not cluttering the framework interface. Thus, the ability to link and jump between multiple information displays was identified as a necessary feature.

(3) What platforms are available for the Data Framework?

Multiple platforms were considered for the new Data Framework, including the cloud-based Google Sites platform and an improved Excel spreadsheet. Google Sites was vetted and found useful, as hyperlinks could be utilized for definitions and procedures (linking users to corresponding documents uploaded to Google Drive). However, easily navigating the lengthy list of data points was still challenging, because Google Sites did not provide filtering features. While separate pages could have been created for each element desired as a filter (such as a page organized by data provider and a page organized by data requester), this would have required content replication as well as a significant time commitment for updates. In the end, Tableau was the only platform that combined filtering capabilities, simple hyperlink functions, and an intuitive user interface.

Tableau

Tableau is business intelligence software with the capability to visualize data in worksheets, dashboards, and storyboards with an array of filter and navigation options. Visualizing the framework was a challenge. Tableau is typically used to visualize (primarily numeric) data, but the Data Framework does not actually display data; it only describes the data points to be gathered. Considerable planning was necessary to settle on a final design.

The Design. The Data Framework design was shaped by the principles of simplicity and efficiency. After considerable experimentation, the Assessment Unit settled on a two-dashboard design. The first dashboard presents the primary elements of the Data Framework, and includes filter options (see figures 2 to 4). Users are presented with the primary data category, subcategory, and the data point itself, rather than all information pertaining to the data points. The remaining elements are presented as filters and include library branch, division, department, data provider, responsible party, data category, and requestor. Including these elements as filters both adds functionality (enabling the list of data points to be limited based on specific criteria) and ensures that excessive columns do not dominate the interface.

[Place figures 2 and 3 here.]

The second dashboard in the Framework is the Definitions and Procedures dashboard, which includes definitions for the main category and the data point itself, as well as the data collection procedures. Users can navigate to this dashboard by clicking on any data point in the Framework Dashboard and navigate back to that dashboard by clicking a back arrow (see figure 4).

[Place figure 4 here.]

Another of the many benefits of utilizing Tableau for the Data Framework interface is that the underlying information is safe from accidental tampering. All of the elements of the

framework (the data points, definitions, procedures, and so on) are stored in a separate Excel spreadsheet that feeds this information into the Tableau dashboards. This is a benefit of Tableau's function as a data visualization tool rather than a data storage program. Because the elements are housed outside of Tableau (in the Excel spreadsheet), users can utilize filters and the Assessment Unit can edit the interface without making any changes to the underlying information. The Excel spreadsheet, with 14 separate columns and over 700 rows of data, is a challenge to navigate, visually overwhelming, and aesthetically displeasing (see figure 5). By using Tableau's many visualization options, the Assessment Unit was able to design an effective tool that was simple to navigate for everyone, even those who had not previously worked in a Tableau environment.

[Place figure 5 here.]

Framework Sharing

Once the Data Framework was completed, the Assessment Unit needed a way to share it across the organization. This presented several challenges. Tableau workbooks require Tableau software in order to be viewed. Since there were only three Tableau Desktop users in the library at this time, this requirement was problematic. Tableau does have the ability to create a "packaged workbook," which is a point-in-time snapshot of the data and visuals that is readable using the free Tableau Reader application. However, this application provided some difficulties. First, users must download Tableau Reader to view the document. This application is as simple to use as Adobe Reader but requires frequent updates (more than the average application). Second, the packaged workbook's dependence on snapshots of the data makes version control difficult. Since the packaged workbook is a version from a specific time, users will not be using the most updated version of the framework if they don't consistently re-download it.

Each of these barriers, individually, could be resolved fairly simply. However, together, these barriers were considered too cumbersome for users. After exploring options,

library administrators decided that Tableau Server was a suitable solution. With it, users can log in using individual accounts to view all Tableau visuals in an online environment. This eliminates the need for users to download additional software, because the Tableau Server environment is locally hosted and is accessible through a web browser. Since the workbooks' connection to the source files is live, any data displayed in visuals is updated in real time.

The Tableau Server solution to sharing the framework opened the door to a vast array of data-sharing options. Beyond the Data Framework tool, library staff can utilize Server to share other data visuals across the library. Currently, the UNLV University Libraries' instance of Tableau Server already houses visual reports of multiple library and campus surveys, facility visit data, and additional smaller projects. By visualizing the data outlined in the Data Framework and making those visuals easily accessible to staff, excitement around data collection has grown. Instead of simply handing over data to the Assessment Unit to be used in reports or surveys that were of limited use and interest, Tableau has empowered users to create their own quick and accurate pictures of library data. By utilizing filters, users can drill down into complex library-wide data, making it easier to incorporate data into various reports. In addition, data visualizations can be incorporated into websites and newsletters, an attractive way for library faculty and staff to tell their story through data.

Next Steps

Transforming the Data Framework from a purely administrative tool to a visualized manual housed on Tableau Server was an enormous project. While the framework shell has been built and much of the underlying information has been added, there are additional tasks before the transition is complete.

Although library staff has begun beta-testing the Data Framework, considerable training is still needed. Training on how and when to use the Data Framework will allow the

Assessment Unit to push data ownership to the departments, encouraging self-assessment and greater organizational use of data in decision-making. Further training in the Tableau environment is also necessary.

Culture of Assessment and Self-Assessment

As users become familiar with and start using Tableau Server and the Data Framework on a regular basis, they will be able to explore their data in new and exciting ways. Instead of reporting data just when it is required and only accessing static reports, users will be able to explore their data visually and on-the-spot, using Tableau Server's built-in analysis tools. (Server provides a simplified version of Tableau Desktop's analysis features, allowing anyone with a server account to customize dashboards and easily drag-and-drop variables as needed.)

Instead of reporting data only when it is required and only seeing the results in static reports, Tableau offers expanded data access as well as advanced analysis tools. Users will be able to explore their data visually and in real time using Tableau Server's built-in analysis tools, which are simplified versions of the Tableau Desktop features. Users will also be able to view and customize existing dashboards with drag-and-drop features, subscribe to visuals to get regular updates, and explore library-wide data (not only what is reported by their department). All of this will pave the way for an organization-centered analysis, instead of a department-centered one. This organization-centered analysis will further encourage a culture of self-assessment.

Conclusions

The Data Framework has already proven to be a useful and viable tool that enables accurate data collection and reporting. But beyond its use as a data manual, the revised Data Framework, and the journey to create it, has transformed staff attitudes about data reporting.

Instead of feeling burdened by mandated data collection and reporting, library staff is excited about exploring, visualizing, and sharing data in innovative ways.

References

- Farkas, M. G., Hinchliffe, L. J., & Houk, A. H. (2015). Bridges and barriers: Factors influencing a culture of assessment in academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, 76(2), 150-169.
- Farkas, M. G. (2013). Building and sustaining a culture of assessment: Best practices for change leadership. *Reference Services Review*, 41(1), 13-31.
- Ennis, D. J. (2010). Contra assessment culture. *Assessment Update*, 22(2), 1-15.
- Ndoye, Abdou & Parker, Michele A. (2010). Creating and sustaining a culture of assessment. *Planning for Higher Education*, 38(2), 28-39.
- Lakos, A. & Phipps, S. (2004), Creating a culture of assessment: A catalyst for organizational change. *Libraries and the Academy*, 4(3), 345-361.

Figure 1. Original data framework (then titled the Data Matrix).

Data Matrix					
Data Needed	Frequency of Data Collection	Source of Data / Who Collects (note Assessment Unit harvests and reports to outside agencies)	Where is data reported and/ or stored	Who is asking for the data	Frequency, Time Cumulated/ Reported
1. GENERAL INFORMATION:					
Do your total library expenditures exceed \$10,000? [Eligibility Question] Y or N	annual	Tessie C./ Admin.	Collection Uniform Stats Form; NCES Academic Libraries Survey	NCES	biennial
Does your library support virtual reference services? Y or N	biennial	Libraries Website	NCES Academic Libraries Survey (added 2010) (line 900)	NCES	biennial
Does your library support reference service via Email reference Y or N	biennial	Libraries Website-Desk Tracker; All service desks	Libraries Database; Uniform Use Stats; NCES Academic Libraries Survey [line 901]	NCES	biennial
Does your library support reference service via Chat reference, Commercial Service? Y or N	biennial	Libraries Website-Desk Tracker; All service desks	Libraries Database; Uniform Use Stats; NCES Academic Libraries Survey [line 902]	NCES	biennial
Does your library support reference service via Chat reference, Instant Messaging Application? Y or N	biennial	Libraries Website-Desk Tracker; All service desks	Libraries Database; Uniform Use Stats; NCES Academic Libraries Survey [line 903]	NCES	biennial
Does your library support reference service via Short Message Service (SMS) or text messaging? Y or N	biennial	Libraries Website-Desk Tracker; All service desks	Libraries Database; Uniform Use Stats; NCES Academic Libraries Survey [line 904]	NCES	biennial
Number of branch and independent libraries, not including Lied	biennial	UNLV Libraries web page	NCES Academic Libraries Survey [line 100]	NCES	biennial
Documents digitized by the library staff? Y or N	biennial	WDS	NCES Academic Libraries Survey [line 700]	NCES	biennial

Figure 2. Updated Data Framework, showing an overview of the main dashboard (using the Tableau interface).

UNLV Libraries Data Framework						
Click on Data Points to Navigate to Definitions						
Division	Branch	Department	Provider	Responsible Party	Data Category	Requester
(All) ▼	(All) ▼	(All) ▼	(All) ▼	(All) ▼	(All) ▼	(All) ▼
Data Category	Data Subcategory		ID #	Data Point		
Events	Campus Outreach and Engagement		254	Event by name		
			255	Event Attendee event name		
	Community Outreach and Engagement		256	Event by name		
			257	Event Attendee event name		
	Donor Development and Outreach		145	Event by name		
			146	Event Attendee event name		
Expenditures	Consortia Licenses		65	Total expenditures		
	Fringe Benefits		147			
	ILL		66	EFTS/Docline Credits		
			67	EFTS/Docline Paid		
			68	IFM - Charged		
			69	IFM - Paid		
			70	IFM transaction fee total		
			71	ILL subscription fee monthly		
			72	Invoice items paid		
			73	Memberships - LINK+		
			74	Memberships - ILLiad		
			75	Reprints - Articles		
			76	Reprints - Copyright		
			77	Shipping by Company		
			78	Shipping Materials		
	Materials/Services Costs		156	One-time purchases of books, serial back-files, a..		
			157	E-Book expenditures		
			158	Ongoing commitments to subscriptions		
			159	All other materials/service costs		
	Operating Expenditures		148	Preservation Services		
			149	All other operations and maintenance expenses		
			160	Renovations		

Figure 3. Detailed view of the Data Framework's main dashboard, showing data points, categories, and subcategories.

UNLV Libraries Data Framework					
Click on Data Points to Navigate to Definitions					
Division (All) ▼	Branch Lied ▼	Department (All) ▼	Provider (All) ▼	Responsible Party (All) ▼	Data Category (All) ▼
Requester (All) ▼					
Data Category	Data Subcategory	ID #	Data Point		
Professional Development	Co-Sponsored Professional Development Opportunity	180	Events		
		181	Persons		
	Organizational Training	176	Training Count		
		177	Training Attendee Count		
	Webinars	178	Webinar Count		
		179	Webinar Attendee Count		
Scholarly Activity	Articles	182	Count		
	Book Chapters	187	Count		
	Books	188	Count		
	Faculty Procured Grants	186	Count		
		189	Amount Total		
	Other Scholarly Activity	190	Count		
	Poster Sessions	183	Invited Sessions - Count		
		184	General Sessions - Count		
	Presentations	185	Count		

Figure 4. Definitions and procedures dashboard in the Data Framework.

Definitions & Procedures <i>Click the arrow to return to Matrix</i>	
Data Category Definition - Salaries and Wages	
Salaries and Wages	<p>Salaries and wages. Exclude fringe benefits. If professional, support staff and student salaries cannot be separated, check the Manual Override box and enter the total.</p> <div> Click for Options Go to ACRL Instructions Go to IPEDS Instructions </div>
Data Point Definition - Student Assistants	
Student Assistants	Student assistant salaries coming from all funding sources
Procedure - Student Assistants	
Student Assistants	Total cost of student assistant wages paid during specified time period regardless of budgetary source (work-study included)

Figure 5. Excel spreadsheet that contains the information used in the Data Framework interface (showing five out of 16 total columns).

	A	B	C	D	E
1	ID #	Main Category	SubCat1	SubCat1Def	SubCat2
163	173	Interlibrary Loan	Documents Provided to o	<i>Filled requests for materials received from other libraries exclu</i>	Non-returnable
164	174	Interlibrary Loan	Documents Received from	<i>Total interlibrayr loans and documents received from other lib</i>	Returnable
165	175	Interlibrary Loan	Documents Received from	<i>Total interlibrayr loans and documents received from other lib</i>	Non-returnable
166	261	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Community Session Count
167	262	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Campus Attendee Count
168	263	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Community Attendee Count
169	264	Instruction	Course-Based Instruction	<i>Structured learning activities, workshops, and learning opport</i>	Session count
170	265	Instruction	Course-Based Instruction	<i>Structured learning activities, workshops, and learning opport</i>	Attendee Count
171	266	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Campus Session Count
172	267	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Community Session Count
173	268	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Campus Attendee Count
174	269	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Community Attendee Count
175	270	Instruction	Course-Based Instruction	<i>Structured learning activities, workshops, and learning opport</i>	Session count
176	271	Instruction	Course-Based Instruction	<i>Structured learning activities, workshops, and learning opport</i>	Attendee Count
177	272	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Campus Session Count
178	273	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Community Session Count
179	274	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Campus Attendee Count
180	275	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Community Attendee Count
181	276	Instruction	Course-Based Instruction	<i>Structured learning activities, workshops, and learning opport</i>	Session count
182	277	Instruction	Course-Based Instruction	<i>Structured learning activities, workshops, and learning opport</i>	Attendee Count
183	278	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Campus Session Count
184	279	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Community Session Count
185	280	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Campus Attendee Count
186	196	Staff	All other paid staff	<i>Non-custodial Support Staff</i>	FTE Count
187	197	Staff	Librarians	<i>Academic faculty doing work that requires professional educa</i>	FTE Count
188	281	Instruction	Non Course-Based Instruc	<i>Workshops and activities centered on more structured learnin</i>	Community Attendee Count
189	549	Instruction	Course-Based Instruction	<i>Structured learning activities, workshops, and learning opport</i>	Session count