Agenda Item VII.L.

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
May 28 – 30, 2015
Chicago, Illinois

Report: SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Metrics[1]

Date Submitted: 6 May 2015

Officers

- Martha O'Hara Conway, Co-Chair, ACRL/RBMS, University of Michigan
- Emily R. Novak Gustainis, Co-Chair, SAA, Harvard University

Membership

- Alvan Bregman (ACRL/RBMS), Queen's University, Canada
- Adriana Cuervo (SAA), Rutgers University
- Rachel D'Agostino (ACRL/RBMS), Library Company of Philadelphia
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (ACRL/RBMS), University of Minnesota
- Angela Fritz (SAA), University of Arkansas Libraries
- Lisa Miller (SAA rep), Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University
- Katy Rawdon (ACRL/RBMS), Temple University
- Cyndi Shein (SAA), University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries

Summary of Meeting Activities

The Joint Task Force met either in person or via conference call nine times between 13 August 2014 and 16 April 2015. Please see the attached PDF (2014August_2015April.pdf) for compiled meeting minutes.

Ongoing Activities

The Joint Task Force is actively engaged in scoping its work to best satisfy its charge. Principal tasks have been identified as:

[1] http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics

- Determining the categories/types of collection material for which we will develop guidelines regarding metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying holdings
- Defining and scoping the categories/types of collection material to be counted
- Proposing metrics, best practices, and/or guidelines for getting at the following three counts/measures:
  (1) bibliographic units (e.g. titles)
  (2) physical units (e.g. volumes, sheets, audiocassettes, film reels)
  (3) space occupied (e.g. linear feet, cubic feet, gigabytes)
- Accounting for and addressing the need to distinguish:
  (1) Material managed and described at the collection level from material managed and described at the item level
  (2) Material that has been described and is available for use from material that has not been described/is not available for use

These tasks have been envisioned with the understanding that the task force must account for:

- Different reasons why repositories count collections
- Different vocabularies and expressions of extent specific to the variety of content standards in play across repositories
- The impact of common collections management systems on counting and reporting

The task force is currently engaged in defining the categories and types of collection materials, which will be submitted with the Task Force's Annual Report.

Completed Activities

- Developed microsite infrastructure and appointed Joint Task Force webmaster (Friedman-Shedlov) to post meeting agendas and minutes
- Created a shared documentation hub using Google Drive, with objective of appraising and transferring relevant documentation to the SAA microsite
- Conducted a group conversation/Q&A with Jackie Dooley re: the OCLC *Taking Our Pulse* survey and report (10 December 2014)
- Posted calls for survey instruments, worksheets, methodologies, etc. (February 11-12 and March 9, 2015) that have been used to provide a number for collections [of archival and/or manuscript material], titles [bibliographic units], and/or physical units held, including those used to figure out how much physical space collections occupy, count any non-textual formats held, such as audio-visual materials, and determine extent for born-digital material. Calls for instruments were posted to the following listservs: AMIA; Archives & Archivists; ArchivesSpace List; ARL-ASSESS; ARSC; CIC Special Collections; CLIR Recipient List; MAC; New England Archivists; OCLC Primary Resources; RBMS Info; SAA Leadership; TCART; and WestArch. Surveys will be used

to assess the scope of the reporting categories/definitions on which the group is currently working

New/Upcoming Activities

- Complete reporting categories/definitions
- Analyze survey instruments received from professional community
- Consider implications of reporting categories and determine “minimum/baseline” counts and their relationship to tiered reporting
- Determine supporting documentation needed to create and distribute user-friendly best practices (such as: guide to matching collections materials to particular categories; reporting examples; maximum capacity guidelines for digital extent; “master” physical extent chart via leveraging available extent calculators, etc.)

Questions/Concerns for Council Attention: None.

Minutes for Break-Out Meeting, JTF-HCM
13 August 2014

Present: Alvan Bregman; Adriana P. Cuervo; Rachel A. D'Agostino; Angela Fritz; Lisa K. Miller; Katy Rawdon; Cyndi Shein; Martha O'Hara Conway (Co-Chair); Emily R. Novak Gustainis (Co-Chair)

Absent: Lara Friedman-Shedlov

After the Joint Meeting, the JTF-HCM convened to review and discuss the scope of the JTF-HCM charge as posted: http://www2.archivists.org/governance/handbook/section7/groups/SAA-ACRL-RBMS-Joint-Task-Force-on-Holdings-Metrics. While providing guidance on the access status of holdings (processed vs. unprocessed) was deemed relevant to the charge, it was agreed that this was more appropriate to a follow-up discussion once a counting methodology had been determined.

Members discussed their particular interest in the work at hand and what they saw as major challenges. What will the purpose of the counts be? What role does planning for the security of collections factor in to holdings counts? How can we make counts comparable across collections?

- Adriana talked about non-standard formats, particularly counting ephemera
- Rachel talked about the non-university perspective (the Library Company being the only non-university JTF member)
- Alvan talked about physical measurements, particularly with regard to space planning. His institution's archives and special collections are being brought together, so a rationale for holdings and measurement criteria, especially as they relate to inventorying, is of strong interest. He is also interested in security and counts for other types of administrative work, such as collection valuation and security. He has used weight per ALA security guidelines
- Katy talked about special libraries and arts institutions, and the role of non-academic libraries. Temple has massive collections, and she feels the lack of a standard. She is also interested in non-standard formats
- Martha talked about the need to scope what it is we count and how do we count it. ARL does not count anymore – so who will? We need to distinguish between the how and the why of what we do
- Angela talked about advocacy issues, the need for assessment for unprocessed collections, and how available standards could leverage support
- Cyndi was interested in systems available and varying levels of IT support we have
- Adriana talked about the difficulty in counting extent/holdings for non-textual items, such as museum objects
- Lisa was interested in at what point would we use a standard and how many people would actually adopt. How might we enable buy in?

- Emily talked about her experiences with the Processing Metrics Initiative and her work on a Harvard Working Group and Sub-Group on tasked with repeating a survey of special collections holdings at Harvard. Also interested in how we express digital extent

The group discussed evidence and value. What is a collection worth? How does risk management factor in to counts? (More valuable = more granular counting?) What things are managed at the collection level vs. the item level? How are items grouped (including books)? How are stacks spaces organized (such as stacks organized by size of materials)?

Emily talked about what she and Martha considered four "core" areas of investigation:

- Our vocabularies and the number of "things" (formats) to count
- Our collection management systems (and others) and how those systems may "force choices" in how we count
- Our content standards and how they prescribe expressions of counts
- Our physical containers and the variety of holdings conversion tables (can we create a "master" list to facilitate counting?)

The following areas of interest among members emerged as a product of the conversation:

- Lisa: Collection planning
- Adriana: Museums/3-D objects
- Cyndi: Systems/applications
- Angela and Rachel: Special formats
- Katy: Cross-repository interactions/data sharing
- Alvan: Administration

These areas of interest could be used to guide or focus our investigations.

The meeting concluded with Emily stating that she would circulate the group's first assignment, which is to share information about how counts are handled as each member's institutions and think about the similarities and differences in preparation for the first call in September. Also up for discussion will be a user survey on counts to SAA/RBMS membership interested and engaged and the microsite, which Lara has volunteered to help maintain.

SAA/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures
Meeting Minutes
2014-09-17

Present: Alvan Bregman; Adriana P. Cuervo; Rachel A. D'Agostino; Angela Fritz; Lara Friedman-Shedlov; Lisa K. Miller; Katy Rawdon; Cyndi Shein; Martha O'Hara Conway (Co-Chair); Emily R. Novak Gustainis (Co-Chair)

Absent: n/a

First Task

- Meeting opened with a discussion of JTF members' accounts of how collections are measured at their institutions

- Some members were both appalled and relieved to learn that they were not alone in the lack of holdings reports at their institutions

Survey/Inventory

- Some members are currently engaged in collection-wide inventory/survey [Cuervo, Rawdon]
- Inventory/survey at sites discussed are primarily focused on measuring containers (box, etc.), not the intellectual content
- Discussion of what is meant by the term "collection" (discrete body with same provenance?)
- Request for members to share their homegrown survey plans/templates

Consensus was that the JFT needs to provide some type of survey guidelines as part of our output. We need to communicate what should be counted/measured and how to count/measure it when conducting a survey.

Group recognized that institutions may have to report counts in different ways to the various bodies to which we are accountable. Was suggested that if the dimensions of containers are precisely measured and recorded, then one can apply a formula to the container count to transform it to any unit of measure (feet, meters, cubic, linear, etc.) to meet reporting requirements for specific agencies. Parallel statements of extent may be appropriate.

Group discussed how complex/difficult counting and measuring becomes for material that cannot be measured by box--such as folders, flat files, and AV material. For example, Katy recognized that measurements for AV containers do not reflect the total running time (TRT) of the content. Knowing the TRT provides some indication of the time and money it will take to convert and/or process the actual content.

Why do we measure collections? What is the purpose? [JTF needs to address]

- Angela: Different managers adopt different methods for different reasons. As our professions have adopted standards/schemas (DACS/ EAD) and collection management systems, we've adapted our counts to work with these standards, schemas, and systems.

- Katy: As a cataloger, she needs to know how to express extent in MARC. Group recognizes value of multiple parallel statements of counts and need to know how to express extent.

Group agreed that best practice is to measure the physical space the collection occupies as well as the intellectual content [need to scope intellectual content].

Lisa: First focus of group should be to identify the purpose/reason we count things. Might be helpful to also address the problems we've encountered while trying to count things, so our guidelines can take these challenges into account. (Group agrees.)

Issues:

- Multiple systems used for collection management and recording information. Information can be distributed in different systems based on material type (i.e., Cyndi reported that Special Collections rare books/volumes are counted in an ILS by one department, while collections/archives are counted in a database by another department at UNLV)
- How do we know we're comparing apples to apples even in a single system at a single institution? For example, sometimes the item record represents a single item, but sometimes it represents multiple items (volumes in a single title)
- Need to address challenge of measuring multiple material type

The group agreed that individual reports (by JFT members) based on material type needed as a starting point.

- Martha suggested OCLC report, "Taking Our Pulse," formats and that we remain mindful of the difference between item-level and collection-level counts.

- Alvan suggested using material type list and standards that govern specific material types from DACS as a starting point for material types.

- Angela expressed concern about trying to create a "list" of material types given the wide variance of formats and how differently we measure them. She suggested subgroups for each type of format.

The group agreed that individual reports (by JFT members) based on material type would set the stage for how we formulate questions we want to ask the community in our survey.

Emily asked whether or not we should ask a few other institutions to participate in our initial "list" to include some other non-academic library perspectives, such as institutional archives, genealogical societies, historical societies, etc.

One member stated she was reluctant to go beyond the JTF at this point in our research, stating that we have a wealth of information and variety represented in the JFT. (Group agreed)

Group discussed using the term "Levels" when referring to degrees/intensity/details/scope of what gets counted and how; it was agreed that using the terms (from DACS) "minimal," "optimum," and "added value" are more appropriate than Level 1, 2, 3. Group agreed that minimal = measuring the space occupied (whether on a shelf or on a server) by the material. The next step/level would be measuring the intellectual content [collection count].

Methodology: How to create individual reports on each format?

1. Examine the ten responses in the First Task. Use the responses to flesh out the individual reports on each format--details of how to count each format.
2. Include various standards relevant to measuring each format
3. Begin with DACS list of companion standards to see how the specialized communities (such as AMIA for AV) recommend measuring that format
    a. Break down and address sub-types of each material (for AV that would include finer details of audio, video, analog, digital…)
4. Include purpose of standard/method for measuring this format/material type

The group returned to the question as to why we are measuring collections/material. Different needs will require different methods (space vs. workflow/processing time vs. how much content available for researcher). This question is pivotal to the development of our guidelines.

Emily mentioned that one communal purpose/need/reason for measuring collections is to aggregate holdings counts from across various repositories—to have one place where all repositories are measuring the same thing in the same way. Usually this is done by reporting based on our only common denominator…the footprint (amount of physical space) the space the materials occupy. This may, in fact, be the basis of the "minimum" standard we express in our guidelines and if so, we need to be clear about the objective of the minimum standard. The minimum standard must meet the most basic need of the largest number of repositories.

Action items:

1. Martha will follow up with Amy re: JTF announcement
2. Anyone who has local/homegrown survey guidelines should share them via Google drive
3. Martha will post OCLC and ARL survey definitions to Google drive
4. Martha to create Google doc for group to collaboratively build list of reasons/motivators for "why we count"
5. Martha will send out a Doodle poll ASAP to determine next meeting date (members' schedules booked weeks/months in advance)
6. Emily will be responsible for contacting notetaker for next meeting using A-Z list
7. Emily will create test template that will serve as example for the individual reports on formats. Chose complex/richest format that will yield the widest variety of information/categories/challenges. Template to include:
    a. Summary of findings for group work
    b. Standards that govern each format
    c. Controlled vocabulary preferred for each format
    d. Unit of measure (inches, feet, bytes, volumes, rolls…) appropriate for each format

SAA/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures
Meeting Minutes
2014-10-30

Alvan Bregman (recorder); Adriana P. Cuervo; Rachel A. D'Agostino; Angela Fritz; Lara Friedman-Shedlov; Lisa K. Miller; Katy Rawdon; Emily R. Novak Gustainis (Co-Chair).

Regrets: Cyndi Shein; Martha O'Hara Conway (Co-Chair).

Open meeting: Emily reminded the group that ours are advertised as open meetings.

Although there were no outside attendees today, there may be at future meetings.
1. Review of "Reasons for Counting/Measuring" document (Google Drive)
Emily described this document which is designed to provide a high-level view of our subject. After discussion, it was decided to **add security and collection integrity into the list** of 8 Reasons

2. Review of Description Survey circulated by J. Gordon Daines III on behalf of the SAA Description Section.

Emily referred to this survey (https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/M32LVBS) which solicits information on the "arrangement and description practices and cataloging practices of archivists". Metrics referenced in the survey included linear feet and number of collections.

The group was asked if any of our institutions were conducting surveys, if so whether these could be shared. **Adriana and Katie said they could share surveys** to add to the Michigan and Harvard surveys posted on our Google Drive.

The group will engage outside institutions by putting out **a general call for survey instruments via SAA and RBMS news sites and listservs**; we will also interested in learning if institutions are not surveying their collections.

We also want to refer to large instruments such as those used by OCLC and ARL. At the end of the meeting it was agreed that **Jackie Dooley would be invited to speak to the group** about her experiences with the OCLC survey. A doodle poll will be conducted so we can have a special meeting in early December on this subject.

3. Review of posted documents:

Emily reviewed the AVReport templates she had created, and Excel spreadsheet consisting of 9 worksheets: 1. Category Definitions, 2. Content Standards, 3. Controlled Vocabulary, 4. Additional Terminology, 5. Resources and Relevant Professional Organizations, 6. Terms Used in Survey Instruments, 7. Terms Used by Systems, 8. JTF Internal Exercise Review, and 9. Recommendations.

There was discussion about the variety of definitions, controlled vocabularies and varied categories for audio-visual materials. Specialist and technical terms (under "additional terminology") were highly specific, but there was some ambiguity over the scope of many general terms.

Alvan spoke briefly about his table "Content Standards—Extent—Summary" which outlined the general approach of DACS, RDA and DCRM with regard to extent. The documents tend to give a choice of approaches, and differ in whether to use imperial (DACS) or metric (RDA, DCRM) measurements. Measurement by material type is advised.

4. Template assignment discussion
A list of 8 material types were circulated with the agenda, a 9th type was added after discussion. Each person chose one template on which to work, following Emily's lead with the AV template. **Progress will be reported at our next monthly meeting, with the goal of completing them in time for our January meeting**.

a. Mixed materials (manuscripts and archives) – physical descriptions employed in collection-level records—**Lara**

b. Born digital electronic records comprising all or part of manuscript and archival collections (including CAD for architectural drawings)—**Katy**

c. Audio/sound recordings—**Adriana/Emily**

d. Objects and realia—**MARTHA**

e. Visual materials (photographs, paintings, prints)—**CINDY**

f. Architectural drawings—**Angela**

g. Printed materials maintained by special collections/archives (rare, not rare, pamphlets, serials) – separate category for ephemera?—**Rachel**
h. Maps (cartographic materials)—**Lisa**

i. Single-item Manuscripts—**Alvan**

There was some discussion about working in pairs, but it was decided that for most templates, each person would work independently at first, but we would all in the end review and comment on every template.

The born digital template elicited a lot of discussion: the status of digital surrogates was considered problematic. Some count born-digital or unique digital objects but not surrogates—use copies not being considered part of the collection; others recognize that digital copies are created at great effort and need to be counted to represent work done.

Different counts are needed for different purposes. Should we count everything once, assigning each object to one category, or recognize that some objects are identifiable in more than one category and count them accordingly. One ideal may be to count first to account for physical space; next to take various categories and items into account.

5. **Next meeting: a doodle poll will be circulated** to decide on a time for our regular December meeting. (The meeting with Jackie Dooley—see above—will be considered a special meeting.)

Alvan Bregman

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures
December 8, 2014, 11:00-12:00 PST/1:00-2:00 CST/2:00-3:00 EST

Attending: Conway, Martha (recording); D'Agostino, Rachel; Friedman–Shedlov, Lara; Fritz, Angela; Gustainis, Emily; Miller, Lisa; Rawdon, Katy; Shein, Cyndi.

1. Landscape survey updates/issues discussion

- Some of us expressed uncertainty about where to go next/how far to "drill down" -- what is the purpose of some of the detail that is requested, for example sheet 4 (Additional Terminology)?

- Others had questions about some of the categories (especially "visual material" -- a term apparently used only by SAA) and about the appropriate category for ephemera (visual or printed). Ephemera is a good example of a type of material that might need to be accommodated in multiple categories. [Jackie Dooley confirmed this: in some institutions/repositories ephemera is managed as "visual" or "graphic" material; in others as "printed" material].

- We agreed that it is OK to inquire with colleagues outside of the task force with specific questions about standards, terminology, etc.

2. Review and collaboratively update list of record types grouped by formats being surveyed

- We noted some discrepancies between our categorization and OCLC's (of material by type/format) but did not discuss. Here FYI is how that categorization compares.

Our "Landscape Survey" Work	OCLC Survey
Mixed Materials	Archives and manuscripts (managed as collections)
Single-item Manuscripts	Manuscripts (managed as items)
Printed Materials	Printed volumes
Visual Material	Visual materials
Objects & Realia	Artifacts
Cartographic Materials	Cartographic materials
Audio/Sound Recordings	Audio materials
Born Digital/Electronic	Born-digital materials
Architectural Drawings	[categorized as Visual materials]
Audiovisual Materials	Moving image material
[categorized as Printed Materials]	Microforms

3. Review list of questions for conversation with Jackie Dooley on December 9

- List looks OK -- looking forward to the conversation.

4. Call for survey instruments update

- We'll issue a call for survey instruments sometime in late January or early February

5. RBMS Midwinter Meeting

Date: Sunday 1 February 1:00pm - 2:30pm
Hotel: Swissotel Chicago (across the street from the Sheraton Chicago Hotel and Towers)
Room: Vevey 2 (other JTF is meeting across the hall in the Montreaux Room)

Martha, Rachel, Emily, and Katy will be at the meeting; Angela, Lisa, Lara, and Cyndi will not

ACTION ITEMS

Everyone -- keep working on landscape survey spreadsheets.
Everyone -- upload these as Google sheets (not as Excel or .pdf documents)
Martha -- will initiate a Doodle poll to get best day/time for next meeting (week of 19 January)

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures
January 22, 2015, 10:00-11:00 PST/11:00-12:00 CST/12:00-1:00 EST

Attending: Cindy Shein, Emily Gustainis, Lara Friedman-Shedlov, Katy Rawdon, Alvan Bregman, Lisa Miller, Adriana Cuervo, Martha Conway, Rachel D'Agostino

Agenda

1. Landscape survey progress

Discussion on Road Map document and Thoughts document shared with the group in anticipation of the meeting.

Developed a shared understanding of what we're talking about, how are these identified by standards, and how are they encoded.

Landscape exercise causes frustration, work is interesting/important but how deep/granular do we need to get into each of the formats? Different people shared their experience with the templates (MARC encoding examples, some formats have a myriad of standards that address them, some not, etc.) However, the work done up until this point is a good starting point, there is enough compiled already that can be useful for the Task Force work.

Ways of counting are diverse: maps that are on more than one page count as one…

We will all write a summary/overview of their assigned format, it would be helpful to summarize findings and particular issues germane to the format study.

2. RBMS Midwinter Meeting agenda planning

If people have skype accounts please send your name so we can participate in the meeting.

Sunday February 1, 1:00 -2:30 PM Central

3. Review of call for survey instruments draft email

Discussion between the distinction between item and volume. For the purposes of the call the distinction seems clear enough. Instead of using volume/item, call it physical units for the sake of clarity. Leave parenthetical explanations in first two, remove the third one.

We discussed where to distribute the call. Deadline: Friday, February 20.

We will divvy up the listservs. Remember to adjust last paragraph of the email if you sent the survey to those lists so results can come your way.

What would the final product look like? What would be the best and most useful thing that we can present to our groups? Chart? Rubric? Recommendations, movement towards best practices? Guidelines?

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures
January 22, 2015, 10:00-11:00 PST/11:00-12:00 CST/12:00-1:00 EST

Attending: Cindy Shein, Emily Gustainis, Lara Friedman-Shedlov, Katy Rawdon, Alvan Bregman, Lisa Miller, Adriana Cuervo, Martha Conway, Rachel D'Agostino

Agenda

1. Landscape survey progress

Discussion on Road Map document and Thoughts document shared with the group in anticipation of the meeting.

Developed a shared understanding of what we're talking about, how are these identified by standards, and how are they encoded.

Landscape exercise causes frustration, work is interesting/important but how deep/granular do we need to get into each of the formats? Different people shared their experience with the templates (MARC encoding examples, some formats have a myriad of standards that address them, some not, etc.) However, the work done up until this point is a good starting point, there is enough compiled already that can be useful for the Task Force work.

Ways of counting are diverse: maps that are on more than one page count as one…

We will all write a summary/overview of their assigned format, it would be helpful to summarize findings and particular issues germane to the format study.

2. RBMS Midwinter Meeting agenda planning

If people have skype accounts please send your name so we can participate in the meeting.

Sunday February 1, 1:00 -2:30 PM Central

3. Review of call for survey instruments draft email

Discussion between the distinction between item and volume. For the purposes of the call the distinction seems clear enough. Instead of using volume/item, call it physical units for the sake of clarity. Leave parenthetical explanations in first two, remove the third one.

We discussed where to distribute the call. Deadline: Friday, February 20.

We will divvy up the listservs. Remember to adjust last paragraph of the email if you sent the survey to those lists so results can come your way.

What would the final product look like? What would be the best and most useful thing that we can present to our groups? Chart? Rubric? Recommendations, movement towards best practices? Guidelines?

ACRL/RBMS-SAA Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures
Sunday 02/01/2015 - 1:00pm - 2:30pm CST
Swissotel Chicago - Vevey 2

TF Members Attending: Alvan Bregman, Martha Conway, Rachel D'Agostino (recorder), Katy Rawdon,

Visitors Attending: Matthew Beacom

TF Members Participating Remotely: Emily Gustainis, Cyndi Shein

TF Members not participating: Adriana Cuervo, Lara Friedman–Shedlov, Angela Fritz, Lisa Miller

Summary:

The charge of the task force, included in the Outline/Structure document, was reviewed. This was followed by a discussion of the ten categories of materials listed in this document, the three proposed metrics, and the three levels of counts listed in the Level Matrix document. Finally, the discussion returned to material categories and next steps. *[The agenda called for twenty minutes of this meeting to be held jointly with the ACRL/RBMS-SAA Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries; both task forces agreed to forego joining to allow each task force more time to meet individually.]*

Outcomes:

The task force agreed on the three basic metrics to be established; created an assignment to define the categories of materials to be counted; and decided to initially focus on developing guidelines for a Level One (minimal) count for each of these categories.

Discussion of Metrics and Level Matrix:

The task force reviewed the three proposed metrics as listed in "Thoughts and Reminders" - bibliographic units; physical units; and space occupied. The task force agreed that these three are the only metrics we need to establish.

The discussion then turned to the count levels.

It was agreed that creating guidelines for Level One (minimal) satisfies the mandate of the task force. Therefore, our focus will initially be on defining and establishing guidelines for the Level One count. Information will emerge from that exercise that will aid us in crafting the guidelines for Levels Two and Three, building on the base count established in Level One.

Further discussion of the count levels occurred along with discussion of categories and is included below.

Discussion of the Categories of Materials:

Ten categories of materials were proposed. The categories are drawn from the types of material that were defined in/for the OCLC "Taking Our Pulse" survey, the ARL Annual Statistics, the ANSI/NISO Z39.7-2013 data dictionary, and the Archival Metrics Project. The ten categories proposed are Archives and Manuscripts

(managed as collections); Manuscripts (managed as items); Books, Serials, and Other Printed Material; Cartographic Material; Graphic/Visual Materials; Audio Material (music, sound, and spoken word recordings); Moving Image Material (film, video); Born-Digital Material; Microforms; and Artifacts/Objects.

A discussion of some of the categories followed. Questions were raised, particularly, about born-digital materials (does this include electronic records? surrogates? scans?), and about ephemera (repositories have varying ways of grouping ephemera among printed, visual, and object collections).

This led to the question being raised: to what extent and how can we guide repositories to decide how to count materials that could fit into multiple categories? The observation was made that repositories with already established category definitions that differ from those established by this task force may be reluctant to alter their current practices of measuring and counting. We need to provide guidelines that repositories can use with their existing organizational systems. This led to a brief discussion of the intended deliverables of this task force and an agreement that, while a survey instrument may be a by-product of our work, it will not be our primary deliverable.

Discussion returned to the importance of defining the categories of materials. It was suggested that we can define the categories differently based on the count level. Furthermore, it was stated that not all three of the metrics need to be addressed in each count level for each category of materials. The example was given that, regarding born-digital materials, a Level One count could be solely the metric of space occupied (gigabytes) for electronic records; a Level Two count could separate out different kinds of electronic records (born-digital, scans, surrogates), and then establish other metrics, such as title count.

The task force agreed that our next step should be to establish definitions for our categories (Task 2a in the Outline/Structure document). To this end, task force members chose categories to define based on their own strengths, the needs of the task force, and the work that had already been completed on the landscape review spreadsheets. Definitions will explain what sub-categories of materials that category could or should include. For potentially problematic sub-categories, such as ephemera, each person who is defining a category that may include the sub-category should include it in their category definition.

It was agreed that it is important that the task force have an opportunity to discuss the category definitions at length, with each category standing as its own agenda item in future meetings.

A deadline of Friday February 20 was set for the initial definition, allowing a full week for other task force members to add comments on the definitions before the next meeting. *[This deadline was later changed to Friday February 27]*

The next meeting of the task force will be held on Tuesday, March 3, at 11:00am PST/ 1:00pm CST/ 2:00pm EST, via conference call.

ACRL/RBMS-SAA Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures
Tuesday 3 March 2015 1:00pm - 2:00pm CST
Phone Conference

TF Members Attending: Alvan Bregman, Martha Conway, Adriana Cuervo, Rachel D'Agostino, Lara Friedman–Shedlov (recorder), Angela Fritz, Emily Gustainis, Lisa Miller, Katy Rawdon, Cyndi Shein

ALA Midwinter recap

We agreed that our immediate next steps are well described in the "Outline/Structure for Our Work" document that Martha created and shared right before the Midwinter meeting. Emily has since created a Google spreadsheet version of the "Level Matrix for Counts" document, in which are proposed three "levels" of counts -- minimal, optimal, and added value.

Updates

ALA Connect: Meeting minutes and call for surveys have now been posted on ALA Connect (to mirror what we have been posting on the SAA web site) so ALA membership can follow our work.

Open Forum and Meeting at SAA Annual: An open forum on the work of the task force will be scheduled during the SAA Annual Meeting, sometime on the first day of conference. Our working meeting has not yet been scheduled but will probably not be on the same day. A request has been made for all three SAA-ACRL/RBMS joint task forces (including the newly forming one on primary source literacy) to meet at same time so we can come together at the end and give updates. Virtual participation probably won't be feasible. Emily will send dates/times when she hears back from SAA's Nancy Beaumont and Martha will send dates/times for ALA Annual in San Francisco as soon as we have them.

Call for Survey Instruments: A folder has been set up on Google Drive. There is a folder for each organization that responded to the call with the information that was in email and the survey instrument(s) they sent. Predominantly academic institutions have responded so far. We will look more closely at these once we have finished the current task of writing definitions of format categories. We agreed to suggest additional places to post by the end of the week (March 6th) and add them to the "Survey Request Mailing" spreadsheet. Whoever enters a place to post the call on the spreadsheet should be responsible for sending out the email. We agreed to send out emails on Monday (March 9th) and set a two week deadline to respond (20 March).

Group Review of Definitions

The group decided to try what the public services metrics group is doing and schedule "sprints" to continue this work. A "sprint" is basically a short, specified period of time during which everybody works "at full speed" on a particular/a single/the same task. We agreed that we

would develop definitions for the following three categories/types of material by way of a series of sprints over the course of the next three weeks (“category owners” are in brackets):

- Microforms [Martha and Cyndi]
- Manuscripts (Managed as Items) [Alvan and Martha]
- Born Digital Material/Electronic Records [Katy, Cyndi]

Category owners will create and share (if they have not done so already) in the "Reporting Categories/Definitions" folder a single document with two sections: "Proposed Definition" and "Sources/Context."

There is a “master” document where we will compile all the definitions, as well as a series of individual documents for each format category in the “Reporting Categories/Definitions” folder in Google Drive.

Over the course of the next three weeks, we will develop the three definitions together/as a group. Category owners will propose and then edit, modify, etc. the definitions based on comments, suggestions, etc. from other Task Force members.

The goal is to have three definitions that -- because we have all had an opportunity to comment, suggest, etc -- are ready for discussion (and hopefully agreement/approval) when we meet next.

Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections):
We reviewed the draft language from Emily, Lara, and Martha and decided

- Not to elaborate on types of value this material may have.
- To add a specific clarification that the definition includes the holding institution’s records

After additional discussion and wordsmithing, a revised definition was agreed upon.

Manuscripts (managed as items):
We briefly reviewed a draft from Alvan but ran short of time to discuss at this meeting.

Next Meeting

Martha will send out a poll to schedule next meeting the week of March 23rd.

ACRL/RBMS-SAA Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures
Tuesday, 24 March 2015, 1:00pm - 2:00pm CST

Phone Conference
Present: Alvan Bregman, Martha Conway, Adriana Cuervo, Rachel D'Agostino, Lara Friedman–Shedlov, Angela Fritz (recorder), Emily Gustainis, Lisa Miller, Cyndi Shein
Absent: Katy Rawdon

Group Review of Definitions (cont.)
The group continued to review the draft language for our category definitions starting with Archives and Manuscripts (managed as items).

Archives and Manuscripts (managed as items):

The group:

- Agreed that "unpublished" is an important element and added it to the definition;
- Agreed that, for now, we will limit the definition to material in textual format;
- Agreed that we should leave "[handwritten, typed, or printed]" in the definition;
- Agreed that we may change/add to these definitions to include born-digital materials at a later time.

In drafting definitions, the group agreed on the following format--first sentence provides a general definition and the second sentence provides a list of examples.

A proposal was made that in our final documentation it might be helpful to provide a separate "examples section" which would list types of materials included and excluded in the category.

The "examples section" would come after the general definition.

The group revisited earlier discussions on "why we count" (bibliographic units, physical units,

and space occupied).

After additional discussion, the following revised definition was agreed upon. This definition of Archives and Manuscripts (managed as items) was agreed to on 24 March 2015:

> Unpublished textual material [handwritten, typed, or printed] described and managed as items [at the item level] as opposed to as collections [at the collection level]. Manuscripts include letters, diaries, ledgers, wills, minutes, speeches, theses, dissertations, creative works (both drafts and marked or corrected proofs), and legal and financial documents,and may take the form of codices, scrolls, or single or multiple sheets.

Microforms
The group turned to discuss the definition of microforms.

The group:

- Agreed that, for our purposes, microforms should be considered “microreproductions” ;
- Agreed that, in most instances, microform copies should be counted as separate items even when a repository holds the original item.

This definition of Microforms was agreed to on 24 March 2015:

> A general term referring to any medium, transparent or opaque, that holds highly reduced photographic reproductions (microreproductions). Microforms include microfilm, microfiche, ultrafiche, aperture cards, and microcards.

The group decided to table the discussion of electronic records/born-digital records. It was decided that born-digital materials will be one of the last categories we discuss.

Next Meetings

- Categories for next week: Graphic/Visual Materials and Cartographic Material
- Categories for the following meeting: Sound Recordings and Moving Image Material

- Martha will send out a poll to schedule next meeting for the week of April 13th.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Metrics
Conference call: 16 April 2015, 2:00-3:00 EDT

Present
Alvan Bregman; Martha O'Hara Conway; Adriana Cuervo; Rachel D'Agostino; Lara Friedman-Shedlov; Angela Fritz**;** Emily Novak Gustainis (recorder)**;** Lisa Miller**;** Katie Rawdon; Cyndi Shein

Absent
NA

I. Update Report for SAA Council

Group decided that the mid-year progress report for SAA Council would be drafted by Emily and Martha and circulated to the group the first week of May for submission to Timothy Pyatt by May 15, 2015. Report will include a review of our plan of work, strategy, and general summary. We should emphasize that the group's work is evolving. Emily will confirm with Tim re: any report format needed.

II. Definitions Work

<u>Cartographic</u>
Lisa created two options for the"cartographic" category based on counting everything that source definitions included. "Cartographic" was fairly consistent across glossaries. However, it covers so many formats that are represented in other categories. She and other group members were concerned about arbitrarily including some formats rather than others (such as photographs).

Questions/discussion points:

- What formats exist and how those are counted?
- Perhaps at a minimum, don't include and at an optimal include?
- Should we be defining by content or by form? Why would we call out this content as opposed to form?
- Cartographic separated out because of maps, not books of maps. Reporting maps relates to unbound materials (sheets).
- If we are only reporting on maps and books, should the category still be called cartographic, which has a much broader definition in all the resources listed?
- Some repositories keep photos with maps, some don't.
- Do we really mean oversize? We wouldn't want storage to dictate.
- Fascicles are bound, would people confuse with an atlas? Likely not.

Decisions:

- Count atlases as books (bound volumes).
- Limit category to physical sheets of maps, whether bound with other maps to comprise a set or not, and globes.

- Digital/GIS not included.
- Martha and Lisa will take another stab at limiting to maps and globes and leave as cartographic. It is the first sentence of NISO. Martha and Lisa will refine for the group.

Graphic/Visual Material

Questions/discussion points:

- Why have category name include both graphic and visual?
    - So that no matter what category you use, you recognize it. Majority of definitions refer to graphic, but there is VRA (and others).
    - May simply call the category "graphic" since the definition includes the word visual.
- SAA includes holographic in visual -- are we OK with that?
- Framed paintings are considered two dimensional. We count three-dimensional things as objects.
- How do you count a Braille book? Do we want to call attention to Braille in the definition? Print for the blind can be considered a graphic work, but most institutions would count it as a book.
- Count artist's books as books or visual? Should we include "book-like" things without pages (fine art)?
- How do we handle ephemera?
    - Depends on the nature of the ephemera as counted as printed or visual. Up to repository.
- "This includes" vs. "This may include" in definition?
- Martha includes works of art in objects definition. Some architectural items are objects (such as models) and some are not. Posters may also be included.
- Do we need opaque and transparent if we have an appendix of formats?

Decisions:

- Architectural drawings should be in this category.
- Artists books are counted as books (even though they may be non-traditional book shapes)
- Category does not include moving images.
- Separate categories for moving images and objects.
- Need to come back to microform and digital.

Next category: Objects/Artifacts
Next Meeting: May 5, 2:00 EDT
Next Recorder: Lisa Miller