

## Ranking Among Aspirant & Peer Institutions for 2009

---

### Rationale

By comparing snapshots of library services and materials as well as institutional characteristics, the Rutgers University Libraries continually assess our alignment with our mission statement and the goals of the university. While the criteria used in our composite scoring represent only a few of many possible internal and external measures, those selected are uniquely helpful in progressing towards our goals and monitoring current standards.

The score is based on the sum of rankings of expenditures, staffing, collections, and selected grants for library systems in 34 “aspirant and peer” institutions, i.e., public institutions who, like Rutgers, are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU). Since the AAU confers membership on institutions meeting certain criteria, i.e., *universities distinguished by the breadth and quality of their programs of graduate education and research*, the list of AAU public institutions provides a natural peer group for comparison purposes. For more about AAU Members and membership criteria, see <http://www.aau.edu/>.

### Methodology

- Using the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) 2007 survey data, RUL identified five (5) relevant areas for assessment—“Total Expenditures,” “Total Staff,” “Total Current Serials,” “Volumes in the Library,” and “Volumes Added.” Each AAU public institution’s data was extracted from the tables available from ARL.
- Next, rank was calculated by sorting the 34 institutions highest to lowest for each of the five (5) factors, and, then, a rank number was assigned for each factor—with the highest raw number assigned “1” and the lowest assigned “34.” (No duplication was observed in the raw numbers for the 2007 data set.)
- Each institution’s rank number for each factor was tallied to create a single composite value. The composite values, in turn, were ranked. In this case, two pairs of institutions share ranks.
- To create a measure of grant success, the grant-recipient lists of three well-known resources for library grants were reviewed carefully: the Mellon Libraries and Scholarly Communication Grants (2004-07), the Institute of Museum and Library Services National Leadership Grants for Libraries (2004-08), and the National Science Foundation’s Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology Education Awards (2003-08). Links to these sources are included at the bottom of the “Grants Received” spreadsheet. Dollar values for grant awards were tallied for each of the 34 institutions, and the institutions were ranked, with the largest total award assigned “1.” Eight (8) of the library systems received no grants from the three sources and were assigned the highest number, “27,” in the Rank in total \$\$ from Grants from Three Sources” column.
- By combining the composite score rankings from the ARL factors and the overall rank list from the “Grants Received” spreadsheet, an “Aspirant and Peer Institutions” chart was devised. The designations within the top 10, 15, and 20 tiers help to chart our progress compared to aspirants and peers in both operations and grant income achievement.