Agenda Item II.C.

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
August 1, 2019
Austin, Texas

Standards Committee: Recommendation to Approve the Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by Co-Chairs John Bence and Rebecca Wiederhold)

BACKGROUND

In August 2014, SAA and ACRL/RBMS created a joint task force charged with the creation of a standardized statistical measures for holding counts and measures in archival repositories and special collections libraries, consisting of five members appointed by SAA and five appointed by ACRL/RBMS. The work of the Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (the "Task Force") was given an initial two-year charge and was granted an extension in 2016 to finalize the standard, and an additional extension in 2018 to ensure continuity through the long and complex approvals process. This task force operated in parallel with a similar task force focused on public service metrics charged at the same time.

DISCUSSION

The *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* (the "*Guidelines*", see page 3 of supporting documentation) were developed in accordance with procedures for SAA-developed standards and benefitted from the joint nature of the task force for greater inclusion of professional perspectives. By January 2017, the Task Force developed, disseminated, and promoted a draft of the "Level 1" *Guidelines* for comment and feedback (pages 77-97). The open comment period lasted through March of that year. The Task Force also made presentations at meetings and conferences to solicit additional feedback.

Based on the comments gathered (pages 200-224), the Task Force substantially revised the draft *Guidelines* throughout the rest of 2017. The 2017 draft contained "levels of reporting" to provide a tiered system of counting holdings. This concept was collapsed into "Recommended" and "Optional" counts and the three main categories of measures (intellectual, physical, digital) were updated to match this change. The Task Force also authored additional sections of the *Guidelines* to provide context, definitions, scope statements, appendices, etc. to their updated draft.

The revised draft was subsequently posted for comment and feedback in May of 2018 in the same channels as in 2017. However, no substantive comments were received. As a result, the 2018 draft stood as the final draft and was reviewed by Standards as part of the Task Force's submission packet.

As has been done with other joint task forces, RBMS and ACRL approval was sought prior to SAA Standards and Council approval. RBMS and ACRL procedures allow for substantive edits to be made by those governing bodies as a standard progresses through the approval process. Thus, SAA Standards recommended waiting until after ACRL approval to mitigate the risk of a mid-stream change to the standard.

The RBMS Executive Committee approved the *Guidelines* in January 2019 and the ACRL Board of Directors approved it in April (pages 230-238). SAA Co-Chair Emily Novak Gustainis provided the submission packet to SAA Standards in June and it was approved that month. SAA Council approval is the last step in the development of this joint standard.

It should be noted that the *Guidelines* come with no specific maintenance plan. As noted in the submission packet (Cover memo, page 6), use of the *Guidelines* by archival community should inform future revisions. Furthermore, no formal process has been made with RBMS/ACRL for ongoing maintenance, which is also true of the two other standards developed by joint task forces in recent years. Standards will document the *Guidelines* as having a 3-year revision cycle, in order to prompt those discussions in the future if they do not happen sooner.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the SAA Council approve the *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries*. (See Appendix.)

Support Statement: The *Guidelines* were developed with great attention to detail. SAA Co-Chair Emily Novak Gustainis was in regular contact with her Standards liaison and co-chairs at each step of the process. The Task Force developed the *Guidelines* with the Standards development process in mind, taking special care to document their activities along the way. The Task Force was responsive to feedback, overhauling their initial conception of tiered counts and measures to be more universally applicable. Apart from providing an important tool for individual repositories to accurately quantify their holdings and to effectively advocate for the resources to steward these materials, the resulting guidelines will have profession-wide benefits and could allow for interinstitutional aggregation and comparison of data for use in advocacy efforts at a local, regional, or national scale.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: Approval of this standard would have direct, positive impact on the SAA Strategic Goals #3 (*Advancing the Field*), given that this standard was developed in a collaboration with allied professionals and will have national reach. The standard will contribute to the SAA Strategic Goal #1 (*Advocating for Archives and Archivists*), by strengthening the ability of those who manage and use archival material to articulate the value of archives.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Society of American Archivists
Standards Committee

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Submission Packet Cover Memorandum for Standards Committee Review of
Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

June 2019

(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA co-chair of the JTF-HCM)

INTRODUCTION

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "Task Force") was charged with the development of metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries (hereafter "Guidelines"). In doing so, the Task Force was asked to consider accommodating a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions wishing to engage in collections assessment.

To fulfill its purpose as described above, the Task Force was specifically charged to:

- Develop a set of guidelines -- metrics, definitions, and best practices -- for quantifying holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries, paying particular attention to both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described.

- Ensure that the language and scope of the Guidelines are appropriate to archival repositories and special collections libraries in the United States, with due consideration given to aligning the Guidelines with terminology, definitions, and measures employed in other relevant national and international standards.

- Publicize and conduct public hearings, public comment periods, or both to ensure that members of the archives and library professions have adequate opportunities to become aware of and contribute to the development of the Guidelines.

- Follow procedures outlined in SAA's Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard and ACRL's Procedures for Preparation of New Standards and Guidelines to ensure that SAA Standards, ACRL Standards, and RBMS Exec can approve and adopt the Guidelines in a timely manner.

Details specific to the adoption of the Task Force's purpose; the appointment of members and duration of service; reporting procedures; duties and responsibilities; and meeting requirements are available on the SAA website: https://www2.archivists.org/book/export/html/38.

The creation of the Task Force was approved by SAA Council in January 2014 with extension requests granted June 2016 and January 2018.

IMPETUS

Archivists and special collections librarians are increasingly mindful of the need to gather, analyze, and share evidence concerning the value of the collections we hold, the effectiveness of the operations we manage, and the impact of the services we provide. The absence of commonly accepted definitions, metrics, guidelines, and best practices, however, has impeded our ability to undertake meaningful assessment activities and to engage in productive, cross-repository conversations about our collections, operations, and services.

Recognition of these challenges has manifested itself in a number of ways over the past decade, including the 2010 publication of *Taking Our Pulse: The OCLC Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives*; an assessment-themed issue of *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* (13:2, Fall 2012), published by the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL); assessment-related sessions at the meetings of allied professional associations, including the Society of American Archivists (SAA), American Library Association (ALA), and ACRL's Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS); presentations centered on special collections at the biennial Library Assessment Conference sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL); and grant-supported initiatives led by ACRL, ARL, and other organizations aimed at building and fostering cultures of assessment and demonstrating the value that libraries and archives bring to their communities and to society at large.

Within this context, SAA and ACRL/RBMS constituted a joint task force in 2014 and charged it with developing guidelines that would provide definitions and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries consisted initially of ten members, five appointed by SAA and five by ACRL/RBMS, including co-chairs representing each organization. Members were appointed for two-year terms, which were renewed in 2016 for an additional year. Six members agreed to serve for a fourth year.

Representing SAA:

- Emily R. Novak Gustainis (Harvard University) (co-chair) (2014 - 2018)
- Adriana Cuervo (Rutgers University) (2014 - 2017)
- Angela Fritz (University of Notre Dame) (2014 - 2017)
- Lisa Miller (Stanford University) (2014 - 2018)
- Cyndi Shein (University of Nevada Las Vegas) (2014 - 2017)

Representing ACRL/RBMS:

- Martha O'Hara Conway (University of Michigan) (co-chair) (2014 - 2018)
- Alvan Bregman (Queen's University) (2014 - 2016)
- Rachel D'Agostino (Library Company of Philadelphia) (2014 - 2018)
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (University of Minnesota) (2014 - 2018)
- Elizabeth Haven Hawley (University of Florida) (2016 - 2018)
- Katy Rawdon (Temple University) (2014 - 2017)

The Task Force conducted its work as charged between August 2014 and July 2018. The accompanying submission packet provides required documentation to the SAA Standards Committee for its review of the activities and consultation processes undertaken by the Task Force that culminated in the final draft version of the *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* issued May 2018. If the Standards Committee review is successful, and if deemed appropriate, the "Ongoing Maintenance" section of this document provides additional information and suggestions that may assist the Standards Committee and Council in determining 1) an approach to recruiting a variety of institutions to utilize and report out on their implementation of the guidelines and 2) scope the requirements of a longer-term maintenance plan.

ENGAGEMENT

Throughout its period of operation, the Task Force sought the input of the special collections and archives community. While the full scope of activities are illustrated in the accompanying documentation, the Task Force would like to call attention to the following examples of engagement in support of the proposed *Guidelines*.

In February 2015, in an effort to learn more about how archives and special collections repositories are currently quantifying information about holdings, the Task Force issued a call for survey instruments, worksheets, methodologies, etc. via the following:

- ArchivesSpace Users Group
- Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC)
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS)
- Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA)
- Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Assessment Interest Group
- Big Ten Heads of Special Collections

- Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) Cataloging Hidden Collections Grant Recipients
- Midwest Archives Conference (MAC)
- New England Archivists (NEA)
- OCLC Research Libraries Partnership (RLP) Primary Sources Interest Group
- Society of American Archivists (SAA)
- Twin Cities Archives Round Table (TCART)
- Western Archivists (Society of California Archivists, Conference of Inter-Mountain Archivists, Northwest Archivists, Society of Rocky Mountain Archivists, Society of Southwest Archivists)

In January 2017 we issued an invitation to comment on the first draft of our proposed guidelines for quantifying and sharing information about the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries, and in May 2018 the same for a second, significantly revised draft, to the following:

- ArchivesSpace Users Group
- Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS) Preservation and Reformatting Section (PARS)
- Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC)
- Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA)
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS)
- Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA)
- Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Assessment Interest Group
- Big Ten Heads of Special Collections
- Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) Cataloging Hidden Collections Grant Recipients
- In the Loop (SAA e-newsletter)
- Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference (MARAC)
- Midwest Archives Conference (MAC)
- New England Archivists (NEA)
- OCLC Research Libraries Partnership (RLP) Primary Sources Interest Group
- Philadelphia Area Consortium of Special Collections Libraries (PACSCL)
- Society of American Archivists (SAA)
- Society of American Archivists (SAA) Archives Management Roundtable
- Society of American Archivists (SAA) Collection Management Tools Roundtable
- Society of American Archivists (SAA) Description Section
- Society of American Archivists (SAA) Manuscript Repositories Section
- Society of Florida Archivists
- Society of Georgia Archivists
- Society of Southwest Archivists

- Twin Cities Archives Round Table (TCART)
- Western Archivists (Society of California Archivists, Conference of Inter-Mountain Archivists, Northwest Archivists, Society of Rocky Mountain Archivists, Society of Southwest Archivists)

Both releases were published on the Task Force's microsite with an invitation to comment (see: https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics).

The Task Force offered a substantial number of opportunities to engage with membership, including formally scheduled, announced-in-advance, open-to-all meetings at the following:

- ALA Midwinter 2015 (Chicago, IL)
- ALA Annual 2015 (San Francisco, CA)
- SAA Annual 2015 (Cleveland, OH); open forum with the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries and the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy
- ALA Midwinter 2016 (Boston, MA)
- ALA Annual 2016 (Orlando, FL)
- SAA Annual 2016 (Atlanta, GA); Open forum with the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (4 August 2016, at the SAA Annual Meeting)
- ALA Midwinter 2017 (Atlanta, GA)
- ALA Annual 2017 (Chicago, IL)
- SAA Annual 2017 (Portland, OR)
- ALA Midwinter 2018 (Denver, CO)
- ALA Annual 2018 (New Orleans, LA)
- SAA Annual 2018 (Washington DC)

Task Force members presented on the Guidelines at the following conferences:

- Midwest Archives Conference (MAC) Annual Meeting (Lexington KY): "Assessment in Action: Using Results to Improve the Archival Experience" (May 2015)
- Society of American Archivists (SAA) Annual Meeting (Cleveland OH): "Measure Up: Assessment Tools and Techniques from the Field" and "Collecting, Analyzing, and Acting with Assessment Data: A Community Conversation" (August 2015)
- New England Archivists (NEA) Spring Meeting (Portland ME): "Standards and Best Practices for Metrics: Reports from the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Forces" (April 2016)
- Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) Annual Conference (New Orleans LA): "Counting in a Common Language" (June 2018)

ONGOING MAITENANCE OF THE GUIDELINES

As of the submission of this review package to the SAA Standards Committee in June 2019, the *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* have been approved by the RBMS Executive Committee and the ACRL Board of Directors.

If the SAA Standards Committee chooses to recommend to the SAA Council that the *Guidelines* be approved as a SAA standard, a mechanism for periodic review of the *Guidelines* to determine if changes are needed will be required. The Task Force believes, however, that maintenance of the *Guidelines* is dependent on the community first testing the *Guidelines* and reporting out to the community. As with other guidelines and standards that inform our work, it is the Task Force's opinion that it will be necessary to develop a community of practice in support of the *Guidelines*. It is with this in mind that the Task Force suggests that SAA consider how it might bring people together to discuss how they are implementing (and interpreting) the *Guidelines,* such as through a listserv or by convening a diverse cohort of repositories interested in conducting a holding survey utilizing the *Guidelines* as means of testing efficacy. As mentioned in the index to documentation supporting the submission, while the Task Force received feedback on its initial release, it did not receive any feedback on the substantially revised 2018-issued final draft despite using the same channels of communication. While we hope this is because the Task Force spent an exhaustive amount of time addressing the issues raised in 2017, it will be important to query the professional community regarding use of the *Guidelines* since it was posted in May 2018.

.

Submission Packet to Standards
Supporting Documentation

1. Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (Final Draft, 2018)

2. Standards Committee: Proposal for SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (2014)

3. JTF-HCM Annual Reports to Governance
   - Reports to Council (2015-2017)
   - Reports to Standards (2015-2018)
   - "Level 1" Guidelines Release (2017, superceded)

4. JTF-HCM Presentations and Open Sessions
   - Midwest Archives Conference (MAC) Annual Meeting (Lexington KY): "Assessment in Action: Using Results to Improve the Archival Experience" (Transcript, May 2015)
   - Society of American Archivists (SAA) Annual Meeting (Cleveland OH): "Measure Up: Assessment Tools and Techniques from the Field" and "Collecting, Analyzing, and Acting with Assessment Data: A Community Conversation" (Slides, August 2015)
   - New England Archivists (NEA) Spring Meeting (Portland ME): "Standards and Best Practices for Metrics: Reports from the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Forces" (Slides and Session summary, April 2016)
   - Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) Annual Conference (New Orleans LA): "Counting in a Common Language" (poster, June 2018)
   - SAA Forum Handouts (2015, 2016, 2017)

5. Selected Communications
   - Launch announcements
   - Questions, requested information, and minutes from December 2014 conversation with Jackie Dooley re: OCLC's 2010 publication, *Taking Our Pulse: The OCLC Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives*
   - Call for survey instruments
     - Sent to: AMIA listserv; ARCAN-L (ACA-Association of Canadian Archivists); Archives & Archivists; ArchivesSpace List; ARL-ASSESS; ARSC listserv; CIC Special Collections; CLIR recipient list; MAC; MARAC; NEA; OCLC Primary Resources; RBMS Info; SAA Leadership w/request to push to all groups; TCART (Twin Cities Archives Round Table); WestArch listserv
   - Calls for comments
     - 2017 draft/call for feedback

        - Sent to: ACA (Association of Canadian Archivists) (email list); ACA FB page; ACRL Update (bi-weekly e-publication); ALA/ALCTS Preservation Administrators Discussion Group (email list); AMIA (Association of Moving Image Archivists) (email list); In The Loop; Archives & Archivists; ArchivesSpace Users Group; ARL-ASSESS; ARSC (Association for Recorded Sound Collections) (email list); CIC Special Collections; CLIR Hidden Collections (email list); In the Loop (SAA e-newsletter); MAC (email list); MAC (Facebook page); MARAC (email list); NEA (email list); OCLC Primary Resources; Philadelphia Area Consortium of Special Collections Libraries; RBMS Info; SAA Archives Management Roundtable Discussion List; SAA Collection Management Tools Roundtable Discussion List; SAA Description Section Newsletter; SAA Leaders; SAA Manuscript Repositories Section Discussion List; Society of Florida Archivists (SFA News blog); Society of Florida Archivists (The Florida Archivist, newsletter deadline Jan. 15); Society of Georgia Archivists; Society of Georgia Archivists Newsletter; Society of Southwest Archivists; SPARC-L (Harvard's Special Collections and Archives Listserv); Twin Cities Archives Round Table; Western Archivists (email list)

    - 2018 revised final draft/call for feedback
        - Sent to: ACA (Association of Canadian Archivists) (email list); ACA FB page; ACRL Update (bi-weekly e-publication); ALA/ALCTS Preservation Administrators Discussion Group (email list); AMIA (Association of Moving Image Archivists) (email list); Archives & Archivists; ArchivesSpace Users Group; ARL-ASSESS; ARSC (Association for Recorded Sound Collections) (email list); BTAA Heads of Special Collections; CLIR Hidden Collections (email list); MAC (email list); MAC (Facebook page); MARAC (email list); NEA (email list); OCLC Primary Resources; Philadelphia Area Consortium of Special Collections Libraries; RBMS Info; SAA Archives Management Roundtable Discussion List; SAA Collection Management Tools Roundtable Discussion List; SAA Description Section Newsletter; SAA Leaders; SAA Manuscript Repositories Section Discussion List; Society of Florida Archivists (SFA News blog); Society of Florida Archivists (The Florida Archivist, newsletter deadline Jan. 15); Society of Georgia Archivists; Society of Georgia Archivists Newsletter; Society of Southwest Archivists; SPARC-L (Harvard's Special Collections and Archives Listserv); Twin Cities Archives Round Table; Western Archivists (email list)

6. Feedback to 2016 Release (First Draft Release)
    - Comments received
    - Comments grouped by category and how addressed

    NOTE: No comments received on 2018 Final Draft Release

7. References to Guidelines

8. ACRL Submission and Approval

- ACRL Transmittal Sheet for Draft Standards (2018)
- ACRL Board Action Communication (email: May 1, 2019)
- ACRL Approval Announcement (May 3, 2019)

Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

INTRODUCTION

The guidelines embodied in this document were developed to help archival repositories and special collections libraries quantify and communicate information about holdings. The guidelines are presented, and the document is organized, as follows. A **Background** section briefly describes the context within which the guidelines were called for and developed. **Audience and Purpose** serves to remind that the guidelines are intended to be used by repositories of all types and sizes and to account for all varieties of collection material typically held. In the section titled **Overarching Approach,** four fundamentals that are essential to understanding and using the guidelines are explained. **Intellectual Units Held** provides a rationale and guidance for conducting the first of the three counts and measures described in these guidelines; **Physical Space Occupied** and **Digital Space Occupied** provide the same for the second and third. Under the heading **Conducting the Counts and Measures**, basic considerations and general instructions are set out for conducting the recommended and optional counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied. **Appendix A: Categories/Types of Collection Material** provides a definition and a scope statement for each of the ten categories of collection material identified in these guidelines. **Appendix B: Tables for Recording Counts and Measures** consists of three tables, for recording the recommended and optional counts and measures. Finally, **Appendix C: Glossary** identifies and provides a definition for the key terms that are employed in the guidelines.

BACKGROUND

Archivists and special collections librarians are becoming increasingly mindful of the need to gather, analyze, and share evidence concerning the value of the collections we hold, the effectiveness of the operations we manage, and the impact of the services we provide. The absence of commonly accepted definitions, metrics, guidelines, and best practices, however, has impeded our ability to undertake meaningful assessment activities and to engage in productive, cross-repository conversations about our collections, operations, and services.

Recognition of these challenges has manifested itself in a number of ways in recent years, including the 2010 publication of *Taking Our Pulse: The OCLC Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives*; an assessment-themed issue of *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* (13:2, Fall 2012), published by the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL); assessment-related sessions at the meetings of allied professional associations, including the Society of American Archivists (SAA), American Library Association (ALA), and ACRL's Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS); presentations centered on special collections at the biennial Library Assessment Conference sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL); and grant-supported initiatives led by ACRL, ARL, and

other organizations aimed at building and fostering cultures of assessment and demonstrating the value that libraries and archives bring to their communities and to society at large.

Within this context, SAA and ACRL/RBMS constituted a joint task force in 2014 and charged it with developing guidelines that will provide definitions and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries consisted initially of ten members, five appointed by SAA and five by ACRL/RBMS, including co-chairs representing each organization. Members were appointed for two-year terms, which were renewed in 2016 for an additional year. Six members agreed to serve for a fourth year.

Representing SAA:

- Emily R. Novak Gustainis (Harvard University) (co-chair) (2014 - 2018)
- Adriana Cuervo (Rutgers University) (2014 - 2017)
- Angela Fritz (University of Notre Dame) (2014 - 2017)
- Lisa Miller (Stanford University) (2014 - 2018)
- Cyndi Shein (University of Nevada Las Vegas) (2014 - 2017)

Representing ACRL/RBMS:

- Martha O'Hara Conway (University of Michigan) (co-chair) (2014 - 2018)
- Alvan Bregman (Queen's University) (2014 - 2016)
- Rachel D'Agostino (Library Company of Philadelphia) (2014 - 2018)
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (University of Minnesota) (2014 - 2018)
- Elizabeth Haven Hawley (University of Florida) (2016 - 2018)
- Katy Rawdon (Temple University) (2014 - 2017)

AUDIENCE AND PURPOSE

These guidelines were developed to provide archivists and special collections librarians with a set of practical, well-defined counts and measures that can be used to quantify and communicate holdings information. The counts and measures were also formulated to support the aggregation of holdings information from multiple repositories. It was beyond the charge of the task force that developed these guidelines, however, to create either a survey instrument or a data repository.

Careful attention was given to formulating the counts and measures so that any type of repository that manages and provides access to archival and special collections material -- including academic, corporate, and government archives; public and independent research libraries; and historical societies -- can use the counts and measures to quantify holdings in a manner that is consistent with their

application by other repositories. The counts and measures were also designed so that repositories of any size and with any level of financial, human, and/or technological resources can implement them.

Careful attention was also given to developing guidelines that consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of collection material typically held and the different ways collection material is managed and described. The guidelines also recognize the value of an approach to quantifying holdings information that accommodates both recommended and optional counts and measures.

The guidelines do not suggest or recommend any particular methods or even best practices regarding the "hows" of counting or measuring. One of the goals of the guidelines is to encourage the use of a common language for sharing information about holdings, rather than to prescribe a methodology for obtaining that information. Another is to enable their use by a wide variety of repositories, and to account for the many differences that exist among those repositories, especially those having to do with local practices (for accessioning, describing, and managing collection material); available resources (for counting, measuring, generating reports, etc.); and existing systems and sources of information (including integrated library systems, content management systems, databases, and archival collection management systems).

Finally, it is hoped that the existence of these guidelines will encourage the emergence of communities of practice through which groups of archivists and special collections librarians who are using the guidelines to quantify and communicate holdings information document their experience and interact regularly with the goal of developing and sharing best practices.

OVERARCHING APPROACH

Described below are four "fundamental principles" or "overarching themes" that are essential to understanding and using the guidelines.

Types of Counts and Measures

There are four counts and measures that are appropriate for and relevant to the quantification of holdings information.

- Intellectual Units Held
- Physical Units Held
- Physical Space Occupied
- Digital Space Occupied

These guidelines provide a rationale and guidance for recommended and optional counts and measures for three of the four above: Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital

Space Occupied. Physical units (volumes, sheets, audio cassettes, film reels, etc.) held are not counted, nor are the containers (boxes, cases, drawers, etc.) in which collection material is housed. Although a container count may be useful (and used) for purposes of calculating Physical Space Occupied, it is not a meaningful point of comparison among repositories. Similarly, while a count of a particular type of physical unit held, such as a volume count, may have purpose or value for an individual repository in a given situation, the considerable variation among repositories in terms of how collection material is bound, housed, and stored makes meaningful comparisons of physical units held problematic.

Each of the three counts and measures described in these guidelines is distinct from and independent of the other. Conducting a count of Intellectual Units Held, getting a measurement of Physical Space Occupied, and determining Digital Space Occupied are three separate activities. Some repositories, in some cases, might be able to get two or all three of the counts and measures by, for example, generating a report from an archival collection management system. Most repositories, however, will do one thing to get a count of Intellectual Units Held, something else to get a measure of Physical Space Occupied, and an entirely different activity to determine Digital Space Occupied.

Categories of Collection Material

The guidelines encourage repositories to categorize collection material, including all physical and digital manifestations, as one of the following:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

The category definitions and scope statements presented in these guidelines (as Appendix A) are intended to be suggestive as opposed to prescriptive. They have been informed and inspired by a variety of standards governing the description of collection material typically held in archival repositories and special collections libraries, including *Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS)*, *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM)*, *Resource Description and Access (RDA)*, and others. The actual categorization of collection material for the purposes called for in these guidelines will vary, in some ways significantly, from one repository to another. Each repository will have to determine, based upon a variety of factors including the nature and scope of its collections and the granularity of available information, how collection material is to be categorized for purposes of preparing a count of

Intellectual Units Held, a measurement of Physical Space Occupied, and a determination of Digital Space Occupied.

Regardless of how a repository chooses to categorize its collection material, internal consistency in understanding and applying the category definitions, coupled with a well-documented approach to undertaking the work, is critical to making the preparation of the counts and measures called for in these guidelines both meaningful for the repository itself and comparable with other repositories.

Discoverability

For all three of the counts and measures called for in these guidelines, repositories are strongly encouraged to distinguish, whenever possible, collection material that is described online (and is therefore discoverable) from collection material that is not yet described online (and is therefore not discoverable). While explicitly acknowledging the increasingly widely-held perception that "if it isn't online it doesn't exist," the guidelines also propose a definition of "described online and therefore discoverable" that encompasses any description of collection material that can be discovered by way of the web. As such, "described online and therefore discoverable" should be understood to extend well beyond online catalog records and finding aids to include a wide range of web content (blog posts, online exhibits, databases, lists of collections, etc.) as well as web-accessible content (documents, spreadsheets, etc.).

Here it must be stressed that discoverability should not be conflated with availability or deliverability. Collection material that cannot be made available because of physical, access, use, or other restrictions is not the same as collection material that cannot be discovered. Repositories are encouraged to include collection material that is discoverable but cannot be made available.

Recommended and Optional Counts

The guidelines describe "recommended" and "optional" counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied. The recommended counts and measures are intended to serve as a baseline for the preparation and sharing of holdings information. The goal for the recommended counts and measures is to identify counts and measures that archival repositories and special collections libraries of any type and size would find useful and practical to obtain and, ideally, to share. All repositories are encouraged to assemble at least the recommended counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied.

The guidelines also describe a variety of optional counts and measures, which repositories may choose to obtain as needs, interest, and/or resources allow. While many repositories will determine that they can conduct only the recommended counts and measures, others may find value in also conducting a few or many of the optional counts and measures. A repository may find it useful to obtain selected optional counts and measures on a regular basis and to conduct other optional counts and measures

on an as-needed basis or not at all. In this respect, the optional counts and measures outlined in these guidelines should be regarded as starting points rather than an exhaustive list.

INTELLECTUAL UNITS HELD

An accurate, up-to-date count of Intellectual Units Held is as fundamental to a description of the repository as the collections are to the repository itself. A count of intellectual units is essentially a title count, which, for all practical purposes, requires the categorization and counting of existing descriptions of collection material. For most repositories, a systematic, well-documented effort to prepare and share a title count is essential to a variety of purposes including outreach, collection development, and resource allocation.

The following three directives are embedded in, and fundamental to, the Intellectual Units Held count that is called for in these guidelines.

1. Descriptions of collection material should be categorized as one of the following: Archival and Manuscript Material, Published Language Material, Cartographic Material, Computer Programs, Graphic/Visual Material, Moving Image Material, Notated Movement, Notated Music, Objects/Artifacts, Sound Recordings.

2. Collection material that is described online and therefore discoverable should be distinguished from collection material that is not yet described online and is therefore not discoverable.

3. Collection material that is described and managed at the collection level should be distinguished from collection material that is described and managed at the item level.

Keeping in mind that what is being counted are descriptions of collection material, and that some of these will not lend themselves to easy categorization, repositories are encouraged to document, as thoroughly as possible, their decisions about how descriptions of particular types of collection material -- scrapbooks, for example, or collections of advertising ephemera -- are categorized for purposes of preparing a count of Intellectual Units Held.

For all three of the counts and measures called for in these guidelines, collection material that is described online and therefore discoverable is to be distinguished from collection material that is not yet described online and is therefore not discoverable. With the exception of accessioned but not yet processed collections of archival and manuscript material, it will be difficult to obtain a title count for collection material that has not yet been cataloged or otherwise described. For this reason, conducting a count of Intellectual Units Held for collection material that has not yet been described online is considered optional.

The rationale for distinguishing, in the preparation of a count of Intellectual Units Held, collection material that is described and managed at the collection level from collection material that is described and managed at the item level is based on an assertion that a title count that includes distinctions between “collections” and “items” is significantly more meaningful than one that does not. “Described and managed at the collection level” suggests that the collection material is represented by a catalog record, finding aid, or other description that represents the material in the aggregate. The aggregate is either an organic or an artificial collection, and the description of it is the product of archival description, bibliographic description, or some other process that results in a collection-level representation of the material that can be used for purposes including discovery and identification.

Similarly, “described and managed at the item level” suggests that the collection material is represented by a catalog record, finding aid, or other description that represents the material as a single exemplar or instance of a manifestation. The exemplar or instance -- the item described -- is either unique or one of multiple copies produced, and may be comprised of more than one physical unit. The description of it is the product of archival description, bibliographic description, or some other process that results in an item-level representation of the material that can be used for purposes including discovery and identification.

More so than for either of the other counts and measures described in these guidelines, conducting a count of Intellectual Units Held will require that the repository identify and account for idiosyncrasies and variations in its practices for accessioning, describing, and managing collection material. Examples of areas where current and past cataloging practices may need to be considered and accounted for include serials, which may be represented by successive-entry records, latest-entry records, or a combination of both; analytics (when a record is created for something that is a part of something for which a record is also made); and “issued withs” and “bound withs” (when more than one bibliographic work is contained in a single physical item).

Finally, decisions regarding titles held in multiple copies are to be made at the discretion of the repository. If it is preferable (because each copy held is considered unique or important for some reason) and/or practical or convenient (because of how the copies are described), the repository can report each copy held as a separate title.

PHYSICAL SPACE OCCUPIED

An accurate measure of Physical Space Occupied by collection material is key to successfully managing and clearly communicating information about holdings and can critically inform collection management, space and facilities planning, and other efforts. Knowing how much space various categories of collection material occupy can be especially helpful for making projections about collection growth and when advocating for additional resources, especially those related to providing ongoing stewardship of collection material over time.

Physical Space Occupied is reported in measures of linear feet or cubic feet at the discretion of the repository. Also at the discretion of the repository is the decision to report Physical Space Occupied by collection material that is on deposit at, as opposed to formally held by, the repository. A consistent and well-documented approach to these and other decisions, and to the work associated with conducting a measure of Physical Space Occupied, will help to ensure that the measure is meaningful for the repository itself and comparable with other repositories.

The following points provide guidance when measuring Physical Space Occupied.

1. Measure space occupied by physical manifestations of all collection material for which the repository provides sustained stewardship. Include all locations at which collection material is shelved, including those that the repository does not itself manage, such as off-site storage facilities. The decision to report Physical Space Occupied by collection material that is on deposit at another repository is at the discretion of the repository, as is the decision to report Physical Space Occupied by collection material that is on loan to another repository, for display or other purposes.

2. Categorize collection material, whenever possible, as one of the following: Archival and Manuscript Material, Published Language Material, Cartographic Material, Computer Programs, Graphic/Visual Material, Moving Image Material, Notated Movement, Notated Music, Objects/Artifacts, or Sound Recordings. When it is not possible or practical to assign holdings to one of these categories, report the Physical Space Occupied as "Other Collection Material (Not Categorized)." The purpose of "Other Collection Material (Not Categorized)" is to account for and accommodate, for example, multiple types of collection material and/or difficult to categorize collection material in the same physical space (such as a map case containing both maps and posters).

3. For purposes of conducting the recommended measures, there is no need to distinguish collection material that is described online and therefore discoverable from collection material that is not yet described online and is therefore not discoverable. This distinction is explicitly called for in the Optional measures, which are intended to encourage repositories to make this distinction whenever possible. When it is not possible or practical to discern discoverability, report the Physical Space Occupied as “Discoverability Mixed/Unknown.”

4. A count of shelving units and storage cases, by capacity and/or size, can be used for purposes of obtaining a calculated measure of Physical Space Occupied. Similarly a count of containers, again by type or size, can be used for the same.

The following resources may be helpful for calculating a measure of Physical Space Occupied:

- Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library: Linear Footage Calculator
  http://beinecke.library.yale.edu/linear-footage-calculator

- Ohio State University Libraries: Cubic Footage Calculator
  https://library.osu.edu/document-registry/docs/484/stream

- UNLV University Libraries: Rebel Archives Calculator
  https://www.library.unlv.edu/speccol/rebel_archives_calculator/

DIGITAL SPACE OCCUPIED

While some collection material in digital formats may occupy physical space because of the media on which it is stored, the management of such material, including projecting future storage and preservation requirements, requires an understanding of the space it occupies in multiples of bytes.

Because the acquisition, description, management, and delivery of born-digital collection material differs, often significantly, from the same for collection material that has been digitized for purposes of online exhibition, service as a surrogate, or for generating derivatives, the guidelines encourage repositories to distinguish, whenever possible, “Born Digital” from “Digitized” collection material when conducting a measure of Digital Space Occupied. A third characterization -- “Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin” -- is intended to acknowledge and account for the fact that some repositories, in some cases, may find it difficult to accurately and/or confidently distinguish files representing born-digital collection material from files representing digitized or reformatted collection material.

In the context of these guidelines, born digital refers to collection material that was created and is managed in a digital form. As such, all of the following should be categorized as Born Digital collection material:

- Content such as email, spreadsheets, documents, websites, and other files of any format created, maintained, and acquired from within a computing environment, obtained via server-to-server transfer, forensic imaging, or other process.

- Audio, video, and other file formats imaged, extracted, or otherwise copied from floppy disks, zip disks, external drives, digital cassettes, computer hard drives, or other storage media, in association with the migration of files to new external media, a server, or a cloud storage environment.

- Online exhibitions in which born digital or reformatted digital collection material has been contextualized by additional content (curatorial interpretation, narration, annotations, etc.) such that it constitutes a new resource that will be retained and preserved in perpetuity as collection material.

Similarly, in the context of these guidelines, Digitized refers to collection material that has been converted to and is managed in a digital form. As such, all of the following should be categorized as Digitized collection material:

- Analog audio and video that has been converted to a digital format

- Books, manuscripts, maps, photographs, posters, etc. that have been digitized for preservation, publication, online exhibition, or another purpose and retained and preserved in perpetuity as collection material.

When it cannot be determined if the files represent Born Digital or Digitized collection material, they should be categorized as Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin.

A fundamental assumption to the measure of Digital Space Occupied that is called for in these guidelines is that only files that are actively managed as collection material for which the repository provides sustained stewardship are included. Digital files that are produced during the course of service provision, such as scans created in response to patron requests, are not included, nor are digital files created or received by the repository as part of routine operations (correspondence, administrative files, etc.) unless they have been formally accessioned and are being managed as inactive institutional records.

“Actively managed” implies that the files are in a preservation repository or other regularly backed-up storage environment -- that is, any configuration of hard drives, networked servers, and/or cloud-based storage for which measures to extend or ensure the viability of its contents are undertaken. Also implicit in this characterization of “actively managed” is the expectation that files that exist only on external media as acquired or received by the repository, and that have not yet been imaged or extracted to a managed preservation environment, are not to be included in a count of Digital Space Occupied.

The following points provide guidance when measuring Digital Space Occupied.

1. Digital Space Occupied is reported in multiples of bytes -- bytes, megabytes, gigabytes, and/or or terabytes -- at the discretion of the repository.

2. All collection material in digital formats should be categorized as one of the following: Born Digital, Digitized, or Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin.

3. Digital files that are described online and therefore discoverable should be distinguished from digital files that have not yet been described online and are therefore not discoverable. Digital files do not need to be described at the file level to be considered “Discoverable.” When it is

not possible or practical to discern discoverability, report the Digital Space Occupied as "Discoverability Mixed/Unknown."

4. The recommended counts for Digital Space Occupied do not require the categorization of digital files by types of collection material; this categorization is explicitly called for in the optional counts. The types include an "Other Collection Material" category for measuring Digital Space Occupied by files for which one cannot accurately and/or confidently discern the type of collection material represented by the files

The following resources may be helpful for calculating a measure of Digital Space Occupied:

- GbMb.org -- Data Storage Unit Conversion Calculators
  https://www.gbmb.org/

- MBtoGB.com -- Megabytes to Gigabytes and Vice Versa
  https://www.mbtogb.com/

- ConvertUnits.com -- Measurement Unit Converter
  https://www.convertunits.com/from/MB/to/GB

CONDUCTING THE COUNTS AND MEASURES

Below are listed basic considerations and general instructions for conducting the recommended and optional counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied. A corresponding table for each of the three counts and measures is provided in Appendix B.

Intellectual Units Held (Table 1)

Conducting a count of Intellectual Units Held requires taking into consideration the following three characteristics of the collection material: Type, Discoverability, and How Managed.

For the Recommended Counts: Consider only collection material that is Discoverable. Then consider Type and How Managed.

1. Categorize "online descriptions" as representing one of the following types of collection material:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material

- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

2. Further characterize “online descriptions” according to how the collection material they represent is managed:

- As Items
- As Collections

For the Optional Counts: Consider only collection material that is not yet Discoverable. Then consider Type.

1. Categorize “not yet online” descriptions as representing one of the following types of collection material:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

Physical Space Occupied (Table 2)

Conducting a measure of Physical Space Occupied requires taking into consideration the following two characteristics of the collection material: Type and Discoverability.

For the Recommended Measures: Consider Type only.

1. Categorize all collection material occupying physical space as one of the following:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material

- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings
- Other Collection Material

For the Optional Measures: Consider Type and Discoverability.

1. Categorize collection material occupying physical space as one of the following:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings
- Other Collection Material

2. Additionally, characterize collection material occupying physical space as one of the following:

- Discoverable
- Not Yet Discoverable
- Discoverability Mixed/Unknown

Digital Space Occupied (Table 3)

Conducting a measure of Digital Space Occupied requires taking into consideration the following three characteristics of the collection material: Type, Origination, and Discoverability.

For the Recommended Counts: Consider Origination and Discoverability only.

1. Categorize all files to be counted as one of the following:

- Born Digital

- Digitized
- Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin

2. Additionally, characterize all files to be counted as one of the following:

- Discoverable
- Not Yet Discoverable
- Discoverability Mixed/Unknown

For the Optional Counts: Consider Type, Origination, and Discoverability.

1. Categorize all files to be counted as representing one of the following types of collection material:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings
- Other Collection Material

2. Additionally, categorize all files to be counted as one of the following:

- Born Digital
- Digitized
- Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin

3. Further, characterize all files to be counted as one of the following:

- Discoverable
- Not Yet Discoverable
- Discoverability Mixed/Unknown

APPENDIX A: CATEGORIES/TYPES OF COLLECTION MATERIAL

Archival and Manuscript Material

Definition: Documents, or aggregations of documents, in any form or medium, created or received by a person, family, or organization, public or private, in the conduct of its affairs and preserved because of their continuing value.

Scope: Includes organic collections, artificial collections (including vertical files), records, and manuscripts. Manuscripts may take the form of fragments, scrolls, codices, or single or multiple sheets. Also includes data, email, and archived web content.

Published Language Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for language and intended for distribution.

Scope: Includes books, e-books, pamphlets, single-sheet publications, and other formats of textual material, as well as formats that present non-textual content in book form, including artists' books and graphic novels.

Cartographic Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content that represents the whole or a part of the Earth, any celestial body, or an imaginary place.

Scope: Includes cartographic datasets, images, moving images, and three-dimensional forms. Also includes atlases, diagrams, globes, maps, models, profiles, remote-sensing images, sections, and views.

Computer Programs

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through digitally encoded instructions intended to be processed and performed by a computer.

Scope: Includes operating systems and applications software.

Graphic/Visual Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through line, shape, shading, pigment, etc., intended to be perceived primarily in two dimensions.

Scope: Includes material in opaque and transparent formats, including those intended to be projected. Includes conventional still images as well as still images that give the illusion of depth or motion. Includes charts, collages, drawings, paintings, photographs (positives and negatives), postcards, posters, and prints. Includes interactive and/or dynamic materials such as advent calendars, anatomical flap books, paper dolls, volvelles, and computer aided design (CAD) and building information modeling (BIM) files.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through images intended to be perceived as moving, and in two or three dimensions.

Scope: Includes motion pictures using live action and/or animation; film and video recordings, including digitally streamed content; and video games.

Notated Movement

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for movement.

Scope: Includes forms of notated movement for dance and game play.

Notated Music

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of musical notation.

Scope: Includes choir books; table books; sheet music; vocal, instrumental, and conductor parts; and complete scores.

Objects/Artifacts

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form or forms intended to be perceived in three dimensions

Scope: Includes artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose) and naturally-occurring objects.

Sound Recordings

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through language or music in an audible form, or recorded content other than language or music expressed in an audible form.

Scope: Includes recordings of readings, recitations, speeches, interviews, oral histories, performed music, and natural and artificially-produced sounds, as well as computer-generated speech and music.

		Intellectual Units
Archival and Manuscript Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Published Language Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Cartographic Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Computer Programs		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Graphic/Visual Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Moving Image Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Notated Movement		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Notated Music		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Objects/Artifacts		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Sound Recordings		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	

RECOMMENDED MEASURES		In Linear Feet	In Cubic Feet
All, regardless of discoverability:			
Archival and Manuscript Material			
Published Language Material			
Cartographic Material			
Computer Programs			
Graphic/Visual Material			
Moving Image Material			
Notated Movement			
Notated Music			
Objects/Artifacts			
Sound Recordings			
Other Collection Material (Not Categorized)			
OPTIONAL MEASURES		**In Linear Feet**	**In Cubic Feet**
Archival and Manuscript Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Published Language Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Cartographic Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Computer Programs			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Graphic/Visual Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Moving Image Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Notated Movement			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Notated Music			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Objects/Artifacts			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Sound Recordings			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Other Collection Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		

RECOMMENDED COUNTS		Born Digital	Digitized	Mixed or Unknown Origin
Discoverable				
Not Yet Discoverable				
Discoverability Mixed/Unknown				
OPTIONAL COUNTS		**Born Digital**	**Digitized**	**Mixed or Unknown Origin**
Archival and Manuscript Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Published Language Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Cartographic Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Computer Programs				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Graphic/Visual Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Moving Image Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Notated Movement				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Notated Music				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Objects/Artifacts				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Sound Recordings				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Other Collection Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			

APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY

This glossary identifies and provides a definition for the key terms that are employed in these guidelines. Although most of the definitions are adopted or adapted from existing, commonly-used standards and resources, in some cases the formulation of an original definition was necessary for the purposes of these guidelines. The standards and resources from which the definitions have been drawn include the following:

National and International Standards

- ANSI/NISO Z39.7-2013 Information Services and Use: Metrics & Statistics for Libraries and Information Providers -- Data Dictionary
- ISAD(G): General International Standard Archival Description -- Second edition
- ISO 2789:2013 Information and Documentation -- International library statistics
- ISO 5127:2017 Information and Documentation -- Foundation and vocabulary

Glossaries, Guidelines, Surveys, and Other Resources

- ACRL Academic Library Trends and Statistics Survey
- Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS)
- Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM)
- Resource Description and Access (RDA)
- SAA Glossary
- SAA Word of the Week

Born Digital Created and managed in a digital form.

Byte A group of binary digits or bits (usually eight) operated on as a unit. Typically expressed in the following multiples:

- 1 kilobyte (KB) = 1000 bytes, commonly calculated as 2^{10} or 1024 bytes
- 1 megabyte (MB) = 1 million bytes, commonly calculated as 2^{20} bytes or 1,048,576 bytes
- 1 gigabyte (GB) = 10^{9} or 1 billion bytes, commonly calculated as 2^{30} bytes
- 1 terabyte (TB) = 10^{12} or 1,000,000,000,000 bytes, commonly calculated as 2^{40} bytes

Container An enclosure for holding and protecting collection material and from which collection material is typically separated for use. Examples of containers include boxes, drawers, envelopes, folders, portfolios, and slipcases.

Copy A single exemplar or instance of a manifestation.

Derivative A digital file created from another digital file, intended for a purpose different than that of the original file.

Digital Expressed through a sequence of discrete units, especially binary code (i.e. the digits 0 and 1).

Digitized Converted to and managed in a digital form.

Discoverable Refers to any description of collection material that can be discovered by way of the web. Extends well beyond catalog records and finding aids to include a wide range of web content (blog posts, online exhibits, databases, lists of collections, etc.) as well as web-accessible content (documents, spreadsheets, etc.).

Holdings Collection material for which the repository provides sustained stewardship. Holdings consist primarily of collection material that has been formally accessioned by the repository. At the discretion of the repository, holdings may also include collection material that is on deposit at the repository and/or remote resources for which access rights have been acquired, at least for a certain period of time.

Intellectual Unit A coherent set of content, in any form, that can be understood and described as a unit.

Physical Unit A coherent document unit, inclusive of any protective devices, freely movable against other document units. Coherence may be achieved by, for example, binding, encasement, or digital containment. Examples of physical units include audio cassettes, computer discs, microfilm reels, rolls, sheets, video cartridges, and volumes.

Published Offered for sale or issued publicly by a creator or issuing body.

Surrogate A digital or physical copy created for the purpose of minimizing handling of the original and, once created, is what is delivered to users unless their research needs cannot be met by the surrogate.

Title A word or phrase by which the material being described is known or can be identified.

Agenda Item III.A.

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
January 23 – 26, 2014
Chicago, Illinois

Standards Committee: Proposal for SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by Meg Tuomala, Standards Committee)

The Standards Committee recommends approval of a proposal for creation of a SAA-Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL)/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries. The idea originated with RBMS, was carried forward by a liaison from RBMS to SAA (Martha Conway), and was proposed for SAA approval by the SAA Manuscript Repositories Section. The proposal (Appendix A) follows SAA's standards development procedures.

Should the proposal be approved, a draft description for the group, prepared by the RBMS liaison and Standards Committee co-chairs, is provided for consideration and approval (Appendix B).

BACKGROUND

There is no standard for quantifying holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. A key finding of *Taking Our Pulse: The OCLC Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives* (2010)[1] was the lack of established metrics for counting collection material. It called for the development and promulgation of metrics that enable standardized measurement of key aspects of special collections use and management.

The RBMS Task Force on Metrics and Assessment[2] was established in 2012 to examine current practices for gathering and reporting information to demonstrate the value and impact of special collections and archives. One action item in its June 2013 final report[3] was a "motion to charge an appropriate member of the RBMS Executive Committee or delegate to initiate contact with appropriate SAA leaders…regarding the formation of a joint ACRL/RBMS-SAA task force to develop a series of metrics and corresponding

[1] http://oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2010/2010-11.pdf
[2] http://www.rbms.info/committees/task_force/metrics_assessment/
[3] http://www.rbms.info/committees/task_force/metrics_assessment/metrics_final_report.pdf

definitions for counting special collections and archival materials to complement the generalized collection metrics in the annual ARL statistical survey."

DISCUSSION

The Standards Committee recommends this proposal because of the void in standardized holdings counts and measures and the potential to develop metrics that could foster confidence in local data gathering practices, facilitate meaningful comparisons among institutions and across the community at large, and enable a culture of assessment and the demonstration of value. Furthermore, the metrics would be relevant to a variety of repositories that collect unique research materials.

Standardized holdings counts and measures have the potential to go beyond simply tallying up the extent of our holdings and get at the operational capacity and *significance* of archives and special collections.

Additionally, individual repositories will gain the confidence of knowing that their local data gathering practices are informed by and meet national standards. The metrics will be accompanied by guidelines designed to help repositories gather statistics pertaining to their holdings and analyze the data in meaningful ways to support collection management, assessment, and development initiatives.

Furthermore, the metrics will allow repositories to demonstrate locally that stakeholders are well served or identify gaps, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. They will also facilitate meaningful analyses and comparisons across multiple repositories and the archival community.

Having contributed to or consulted the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) annual statistical reports, we know they are problematic. They do not provide standard guidance or definitions, yet the results are reported in a comparative framework. By partnering with ACRL/RBMS, we will have greater weight with ARL in instituting a new set of use metrics. Indeed, members of ACRL/RBMS have maintained contact with ARL and its program for Statistics and Assessment and Special Collections Working Group.

To the extent deemed possible and mutually desirable, the Task Force will coordinate the development of the standard with the International Council on Archives (ICA) and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) Subcommittee on Quality - Statistics and performance evaluation (TC464/SC8),[4] which is currently reviewing a proposal to create an international archives standard for the description of archival repositories similar to ISDIAH, the International Standard for Describing Institutions with Archival Holdings, promulgated by ICA.[5] Preliminary contact with the incoming

[4] ISO TC464/SC8 is "currently assessing the forthcoming revision to the ISO standard on International library statistics (ISO 2789) for areas where the standards can be better aligned and for proposed new statistics and methods"; see: http://www.niso.org/news/pr/view?item_key=4bab6c0503ed5d9f392f862e9d32ce346eef6c69.
[5] See: http://www.ica.org/?lid=10198.

chair of TC464/SC8 by members of the recent ACRL/RBMS Task Force on Metrics and Assessment has suggested possibilities for collaboration since the two standards are likely to be complementary rather than overlapping.[6]

We should note that the RBMS Task Force on Metrics and Assessment had four final recommendations, of which this is one. A second, on metrics for public services, is also on the agenda for this Council meeting (see 0114-III-C-StdsComm-UserMetrics). A third, on primary source literacy/teaching, may be proposed to the Standards Committee in 2014. Approval of more than one of these proposals may stretch SAA's bandwidth, but we think that SAA can find the capacity to manage multiple groups working on significant standards development projects such as this.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT a SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries be established; and

THAT the description of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries be approved.

Support Statement: The Task Force will develop a standard for quantifying holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries and prepare this standard for approval and adoption by both SAA and ACRL/RBMS. The benefits of having standardized metrics for quantifying holdings are numerous and include fostering confidence in local data gathering practices, facilitating meaningful comparisons among institutions and across the community at large, and enabling a culture of assessment and the demonstration of value. SAA participation in the development of this standard will fill a deficiency in how these basic statistical measures are gathered.

Relation to Strategic Plan: The Task Force will address the Society's Strategic Goals of providing content, via education and publications, that reflects the latest thinking and best practices in the field (2.1); identifying the need for new standards, guidelines, and best practices and lead or participate in their development (3.1); actively participating in relevant partnerships and collaborations to enhance professional knowledge (3.3); and creating opportunities for members to participate in SAA (4.2).

Fiscal Impact: The Task Force will require meeting space at the SAA Annual Meeting. Funding for the work of the Task Force is neither requested nor anticipated; its description is written to negate the need for financial support.

[6] Incoming chair TC464/SC8 Steve Hiller had several email exchanges and a conference call with ACRL/RBMS Task Force on Metrics and Assessment co-chair Martha Conway and member Christian Dupont in October 2013. For background on the ACRL/RBMS Task Force on Metrics and Assessment including its final report see: http://rbms.info/committees/task_force/metrics_assessment/index.shtml

Appendix A

Proposal from the Manuscript Repositories Section

Submitted on Wednesday, November 6, 2013 - 8:59am
Submitted by user: tzachar
Submitted values are:

Proposal type: Development of a new SAA standard
--Contact Information--
Name of submitting group: Manuscript Repositories Section
Date submitted: November 6, 2013
--Contact Person--
First Name: Tara
Last Name: Laver
Position Title: Curator of Manuscripts
Institution: Louisiana State University Special Collections
Address 1:
Address 2:
City:
State/Province:
Zip/Postal Code:
Country:
Daytime phone:
Email: tzachar@lsu.edu

Title of Standard: Collection Metrics for Archives and Special Collections
Type of Standard: Convention and/or Rules
Topic(s): Administration and Management

Description of Standard:
Archivists and special collections librarians are becoming increasingly mindful of (1) the need to gather, analyze, and share evidence concerning the value of the collections we hold, the effectiveness of the operations we manage, and the impact of the services we provide and (2) the absence of commonly accepted definitions, metrics, guidelines, and best practices to enable, guide, and inform the meaningful assessment of our collections, operations, and services.

In a paper summarizing the outcomes of the 2009 OCLC Research survey of 275 North American research libraries regarding the current status of their special collections and archives, Jackie Dooley notes, “We were not surprised that the data confirmed a lack of established metrics for measuring special collections circumstances.” In addition to limiting the collecting,

analyzing, and comparing of information across the research library community, the absence of established metrics – for counting collection material, characterizing users and use, and assessing cataloging, processing, digitization, and other activities – means that special collections libraries and archives find it difficult if not impossible to measure themselves against community norms and to demonstrate locally that primary constituencies are being well served.

In keeping with the first of thirteen recommendations emanating from the OCLC Research survey – "establish and promulgate metrics for the standardized measurement of key measures" – we are proposing the development of guidelines or a standard that would consist of definitions and metrics for counting the wide range of collection material held in special collections and archives. These could be used in a variety of ways, including as a complement to the ARL Statistics and the ACRL Academic Library Trends and Statistics Survey and as both a foundation and a launch pad for institutions that wish to engage in archival and other collections assessment activity. The benefits of having standardized metrics for quantifying our collections are numerous and include fostering confidence in local data gathering practices, facilitating meaningful comparisons among institutions and across the community at large, and enabling a culture of assessment and the demonstration of value.

The definitions and metrics will be formulated so that they are relevant to and useful for all types of institutions, including archival repositories, special collections libraries, historical societies, independent research libraries -- essentially any institution that provides supervised or mediated access to collections of unique, rare, primary source, and other material. Although the content and the format of the standard will be determined by the leadership of the task force that is appointed to develop it, we suggest that two resources in particular will prove to be very useful in the development of the guidelines, definitions, and metrics of which it will consist: the work of the ACRL/RBMS Task Force on Metrics & Assessment (in particular the work of "Group 1," which had "collections" as its activity domain) and the instrument (in particular the lists of types of material) that was used to collect the data for the 2009 OCLC Research survey.

References:

ACRL/RBMS Task Force on Metrics & Assessment. "Final Report." 14 June 2013.

Dooley, Jackie M. "The OCLC Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives." Liber Quarterly 21 (1) November 2011: 125-137.

Dooley, Jackie M. and Katherine Luce. "Taking Our Pulse: The OCLC Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives." Dublin, OH: OCLC Research,

2010.

Related Standards:
While related standards as such do not exist, there are glossaries and survey instruments that may inform the development of the proposed standard. These include:

* ARL Statistics (survey instrument)
* ACRL Academic Library Trends and Statistics (survey instrument)
* A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology
* OCLC Research "Taking Our Pulse" (survey instrument)
* NISO Z39.7-2013 Information Services and Use: Metrics & Statistics for Libraries and Information Providers (data dictionary)

Although the ARL and ACRL surveys capture statistical data about collections held in archives and special collections units administered by academic libraries, they aggregate that reporting and so do not permit the comparison of that information across institutions. Additionally, while those surveys incorporate some of the definitions provided by NISO Z39.7-2013, those definitions are not sufficient for representing either the range or the depth of the collection material that is held in archives and special collections. Moreover, because they do not offer guidelines for how to collect the data, many different methods and measures are used. ARL and ACRL have both signaled their interest in having RBMS and SAA work together to develop community-based definitions and guidelines for capturing collection-related information that would complement their annual statistical surveys.

Developed by the International Council on Archives (ICA) Committee on Best Practices and Standards in 2008, the International Standard for Describing Institutions with Archival Holdings (ISDIAH) provides general rules for the standardization of descriptions of institutions with archival holdings. It does not provide any guidance or specify any definitions or metrics for collecting quantitative or qualitative data about collections, services, etc.

The proposed standard would complement the ARL and ACRL surveys and the ISDIAH, and fill a current void in definitions and guidelines for capturing and sharing collection-related information.

Related organizations for consultation and review:
This proposal is prompted by recommendations that issued from the ACRL/RBMS Task Force on Metrics & Assessment, which was charged with identifying the areas of special collections library and archival practice that would most benefit from the development of community-based metrics and assessment guidelines. The first recommendation proposes a jointly charged and jointly appointed (by ACRL/RBMS and SAA) task force to develop a standard consisting of guidelines, definitions, and metrics for counting the wide range of

collection material held in special collections and archives. Groups and organizations that have a vested and, in some cases, expressed interest in that work include:

- College & University Archives Section (SAA)
- Description Section (SAA)
- Electronic Records Section (SAA)
- Archives Management Roundtable (SAA)
- Research Libraries Roundtable (SAA)
- Standards Committee (ACRL)
- Statistics and Assessment Committee (ARL)
- Transforming Special Collections in the Digital Age Working Group (ARL)
- Subcommittee on Quality: Statistics and Performance Evaluation (TC 464/SC 8) (ISO)
- Z39.7 (Information Services and Use: Metrics & Statistics for Libraries and Information Providers) Standing Committee (NISO)

Precedents for SAA and ACRL/RBMS working together in this way include development of the ALA-SAA Joint Statement on Access: Guidelines for Access to Original Research Materials and SAA's recent endorsement of the ACRL/RBMS Guidelines Regarding Security and Theft in Special Collections and the ACRL/RBMS Guidelines for Interlibrary and Exhibition Loan of Special Collections Material.

Please find attached[7] a copy of the final report of the ACRL/RBMS Task Force on Metrics & Assessment, which includes the recommendation, approved in July 2013 by the RBMS Executive Committee, to approach SAA about forming a joint task force that would be charged with developing guidelines or a standard that would consist of definitions and metrics for counting the wide range of collection material held in special collections and archives.

Projected timetable: Because the chair and immediate past chair of the SAA Standards Committee and the SAA Council liaison to the Standards Committee have expressed their interest in supporting this proposal, and if the proposal can be forwarded through the next stages of the review and approval process in a timely manner, then it is reasonable to expect that SAA Council could act on it during its January 2014 meeting. This would coincide well with the beginning of the 2014 committee and task force appointment process for ACRL, making it feasible that a joint task force could be appointed, charged, and ready to begin its work by July 2014. If given a typical two-year mandate, the task force could aim to have a draft standard ready for initial public hearings by the 2015 ALA Annual and SAA annual meetings. The task force could then focus on integrating feedback and soliciting additional comments from the broader community during 2014-2015, with the goal of

[7] Note added by Standards Committee: This report is not attached here. It is available at http://www.rbms.info/committees/task_force/metrics_assessment/metrics_final_report.pdf.

presenting by July 2015 a final draft for review and approval by the appropriate ACRL and SAA committees and leadership during 2015-2016. Budgetary implications: We do not envision any particular budgetary implications associated with the development of this standard. Even though it will require the coordination of a jointly appointed task force, we expect that task force members will be able to communicate with each other electronically using equipment furnished by their local institutions or personally owned. Ideally, members will be appointed who have the financial resources at their disposal to be able to attend the annual meetings of both SAA and ALA to facilitate face-to-face meetings, but this should not be made a requirement for membership, especially if other members can host audio or video-conferencing session with their own equipment. Since drafts and documents can be shared electronically via email and free online collaboration sites, there should not be any expenses incurred for photocopying or postage. Also, since the review and approval of the standard will be managed by appointed and elected SAA members, there should not be any impact on SAA staff time.

File attachment: [link to the Final Report of the RBMS Task Force on Metrics and Assessment]
http://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/webform/RBMS%20Task%20Force%20on%20Metrics%20%26%20Assessment%20%28Final%20Report%29.pdf

The results of this submission may be viewed at:
http://www2.archivists.org/node/15584/submission/14721

Appendix B

Proposed Description of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

I. Purpose

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "Task Force") is responsible for the development of guidelines (hereafter "Guidelines") that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held--including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials--and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

The Guidelines will be submitted to the Society of American Archivists Standards Committee (hereafter "SAA Standards"), the Association of College and Research Libraries Standards Committee (hereafter "ACRL Standards"), and the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Executive Committee (hereafter "RBMS Exec"). The Task Force will recommend a plan for maintenance and review of the Guidelines when the Guidelines are submitted to SAA and ACRL/RBMS for approval.

II. Task Force Selection, Size, and Length of Term

The Task Force is charged for a two-year period that begins in September 2014 and continues through the 2016 SAA Annual Meeting. The Task Force may be charged for an additional year if SAA Standards, ACRL Standards, and/or RBMS Exec determine that the Guidelines need further development before they can be approved. The Task Force will include between eight and twelve members with an equal number of members appointed by SAA and ACRL according to their normal appointment procedures. A Task Force member may be a member of both organizations but will be appointed to the Task Force representing one organization only. In addition to the committee members, *ex officio* members and liaisons will be appointed by each organization according to its normal procedures.

SAA and ACRL will consider the following when appointing individuals as members of the Task Force:

- Experience managing collections in an archival repository or special collections library;
- Familiarity with the wide range of types and formats of material typically held;
- Knowledge of or involvement with the standards development process; and
- Ability to fulfill *ex officio* and/or liaison roles for SAA or ACRL.

One member appointed by each organization will be designated to serve as a Task Force co-chair. The co-chairs will be responsible for convening Task Force meetings, leading Task Force work, ensuring that deadlines are met, following procedures of their respective organizations, and communicating as needed or required with both organizations.

III. Reporting Procedures

The Task Force co-chairs will report at least semi-annually to the appropriate groups within both organizations. In conjunction with SAA Standards and RBMS Exec and in coordination with each other, the co-chairs may also schedule public hearings or conduct public comment periods or both to solicit input on draft versions of the Guidelines. The public hearings may be conducted at the SAA Annual Meeting, the midwinter or annual meeting of the American Library Association, a biennial ACRL conference, and/or the annual RBMS preconference. Public hearings may also be conducted virtually. If the Task Force is granted funding support from its parent and/or extramural organizations, the co-chairs will ensure that reporting requirements are met.

IV. Duties and Responsibilities

To fulfill its purpose as described above, the Task Force is specifically charged to:

- Develop a set of guidelines -- metrics, definitions, and best practices -- for quantifying holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries, paying particular attention to both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described.
- Ensure that the language and scope of the Guidelines are appropriate to archival repositories and special collections libraries in the United States, with due consideration given to aligning the Guidelines with terminology, definitions, and measures employed in other relevant national and international standards.
- Publicize and conduct public hearings, public comment periods, or both to ensure that members of the archives and library professions have adequate opportunities to become aware of and contribute to the development of the Guidelines.
- Follow procedures outlined in SAA's *Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard* and ACRL's *Procedures for Preparation of New Standards and Guidelines* to ensure that SAA Standards, ACRL Standards, and RBMS Exec can approve and adopt the Guidelines in a timely manner.

V. Meetings

The Task Force will carry out its charge primarily via electronic mail, conference calls, and online meetings in accordance with the meeting policies of the respective organizations. Face-to-face meetings will also be scheduled during the SAA Annual Meeting and the midwinter and annual meetings of the American Library Association, which is when ACRL/RBMS business meetings are conducted. Task Force members will be encouraged but not required to attend face-to-face meetings in person; if possible, however, the co-chairs will make arrangements for virtual participation in these meetings via conference call or online meeting software. Co-chairs will be required to attend (in person) the face-to-face meetings held during the regular meetings of their respective organizations and will be strongly encouraged to attend (in person) the face-to-face meetings of the other organization. Minutes will be prepared for each face-to-face meeting and any conference call or online meeting that meets policy definitions for a meeting, and the minutes will be posted within thirty days to the public websites of the respective organizations.

Agenda Item TK

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
November 2015
Chicago, Illinois

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)

Annual Report to Council

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") is responsible for the development of guidelines (hereafter "Guidelines") that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held--including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials--and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

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, seventeen times between 13 August 2014 and 1 October 2015. Meeting minutes are available on the Task Force's microsite http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/jtf-hcm-meetings). Minutes include two joint SAA-RBMS meetings at the Annual Meeting of the American Library Association in San Francisco on 28 June 2015 and the Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archivists in Cleveland on 13 August 2015.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force is currently engaged in:

1. **Determining the categories/types of collection material for which we will develop guidelines regarding metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying holdings.**

Please see *Appendix A* of this report for the current, annotated version of *Categories/Types of Collection Material: Working Definitions.*

2. **Defining and scoping the categories/types of collection material to be counted**

Please see *Appendix A* of this report for the current, annotated version of *Categories/Types of Collection Material: Working Definitions]*

3. **Proposing metrics, best practices, and/or guidelines for getting at the following three counts/measures (a) bibliographic units (e.g. titles); (b) physical units (e.g. volumes, sheets, audiocassettes, film reels); and (c) physical and virtual space occupied (e.g. linear feet, cubic feet, gigabytes).**

JTF-HCM has tentatively adopted a three-tiered approach to counting holdings, and would appreciate feedback from the Council on these prospective levels of reporting, as follows:

<u>Level 1 Count ("Minimal")</u>
At a minimum, repositories should be able to communicate:

- The number of printed works held and, in the broadest sense, the number of records (manuscripts, archives, other formats) intentionally maintained and managed by the repository as either single items or in groups (a "collection," an "archival series," a "photograph collection," a "codex," etc.)
- The number of physical units/containers held
- The physical footprint of their collections

- The digital footprint for their collections

Please see *Appendix B* for a draft "wireframe" of this reporting level.

Level 2 Count ("Optimal")
Level 2 counts should include all Level 1 counts, plus item counts for all categories of materials (those in Appendix A). Please use the "Reporting Categories Definitions" and "Level 2 Examples" to match the terminology employed by your repository to one of the designated reporting categories.

Level 3 Count ("Added Value")
Level 3 counts should include Level 1 and 2 counts, and are intended to capture specific attributes of items in each reporting category. A repository may know that is has 15 collections containing 56 audio cassettes, but may *also* wish to count and express specific extents or attributes to satisfy an internal need, such as preparing for a grant or capturing additional information to cost a digitization initiative. For example, the recording hours of each cassette (30 minutes, 60 minutes, 90 minutes, 120 minutes).

4. Accounting for and addressing the need to distinguish: a) Material managed and described at the collection level from material managed and described at the item level and b) Material that has been described and is available for use from material that has not been described/is not available for use.

The draft levels seek to address collection/item level management. However, the JTF-HCM has only recently started to discuss processed vs. unprocessed holdings and if this is part of our mandate. The Level 1 count "wireframe" (Appendix B) currently requests that users indicate whether they are reporting on everything they have or just what is available to researchers/patrons.

Articulation of these levels will potentially require the JTF-HCM to prepare the following reference documents to accompany the recommendations:

- Reporting Categories Definitions
- Reporting Categories Definitions – Level 1 Examples, with possible encoding/cataloging examples
- Reporting Categories Definitions – Level 2 Examples, with possible encoding/cataloging examples
- Reporting Categories Definitions – Level 3 Examples, with possible encoding/cataloging examples
- A chart of material types/record types commonly found in other surveys and controlled vocabularies grouped by JTF-HCM reporting categories
- List of obsolete electronic media storage capacities normalized to GB
- Adequate linear to cubic feet and cubic to linear feet conversion formula
- List of controlled terminology for containers, their dimensions, and capacity in both linear and cubic feet (a "master chart of container equivalencies")

The above four tasks have been envisioned with the understanding that the JTF-HCM must account for:

- Different reasons why repositories count collections (for which the JTF-HCM initiated work on user stories)

- Different vocabularies and expressions of extent specific to the variety of content standards in play across repositories (for which the JTF-HCM conducted initial landscape reviews of language employed by various controlled vocabularies and thesauri and cataloging examples)

- The impact of common collections management systems on counting and reporting (for which the group will consider the impact of ArchivesSpace and other management systems on formulating expressions of extent)

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES

To accomplish its objectives, the Joint Task Force has thus far:

- 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. An initial review of these survey instruments, worksheets, and methodologies received was conducted earlier this year.

- Drafted proposed categories/types of collection material and working definitions for aiding in data compilation. Draft definitions were circulated at the public forum for the SAA-RBMS joint task forces on Thursday, August 20, 2015. The group will be

building on this work, with special consideration for born digital records. At this time, we have received no feedback from those in attendance at the forum.

- Drafted sample user stories/use cases to support the application of a tiered reporting strategy for holdings counts that is informed by the various levels of data collection needed by members of our community.

- Scheduled a full-day meeting at the Center for the History of Medicine, Countway Library, on Friday, 8 January 2016 to coincide with the ALA Midwinter meeting in Boston

- Engaged in the following outreach activities:

    - Task Force co-chair Martha O'Hara Conway presented at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Archives Conference, 7 May 2015 as part of the session *Assessment in Action: Using Results to Improve the Archival Experience part of the session.*

    - Held an SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Forces Public Forum on 20 August 2015 at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archivists.

    - Task Force member Katy E. Rawdon presented on the work of the JTF-HCM at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archivists (20 August: SAA 204: *Measure Up: Assessment Tools and Techniques from the Field*).

    - Task Force co-chair Martha O'Hara Conway presented on the work of the task force at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archivists (22 August: SAA 605: *Collecting, Analyzing, and Acting with Assessment Data: A Community Conversation*).

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- Finalize reporting categories/types of collection material.

- Consider the implications of reporting categories and determine and flesh out requirements for all categories of material by level.

- Determine minimum supporting documentation needed to create and distribute user-friendly best practices.

- Consider the implications of how specific systems (such as ArchivesSpace) will affect reporting categories and expressions of extent.

- Ramp up outreach/publicity related to the group's activities through regional outlets.

QUESTIONS/CONCERNS

We will be time lining our upcoming activities this winter, but at this time, it is expected that we will need the optional one-year extension.

APPENDIX A

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Categories/Types of Collection Material: Working Definitions

Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections)

Definition Materials created, assembled, or received by a person, family, or organization (including the holding institution itself), published or unpublished, in any format or formats, described and managed at the collection level as opposed to at the item level.

Objects and Artifacts

Definition: Material things that can be seen and touched.

Scope: Natural objects, artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose), and three-dimensional works of art.

Books and Other Printed Material

Definition: Materials produced for distribution, reproduced mechanically, and intended to be read.

Scope: Materials included in this category are frequently printed on paper but may be printed on other substances, such as vellum or cloth. Most materials in this category are textual, but the category also incudes works that present non-textual content in book form.

Examples: Monographs, serials, music, pamphlets, broadsides, ephemera, graphic novels, artists' books, color-plate books, atlases, and materials embossed for the use of the visually impaired.

Cartographic Material

Definition: Two- and three-dimensional representations of the whole or part of the Earth or another celestial body.

Scope: Cartographic materials include maps (graphic or photogrammetric representations on a flat medium, such as paper) and globes (representations in the form of a [ball or sphere]).

Digital Material

Definition: Items created, managed, or stored in binary format requiring a computer or other electronic device to render it intelligible by a person.

Scope: Digital material can be counted in bytes. This category includes born-digital materials, digital derivatives, and digital surrogates.

Examples: Born-digital material may include documents, images, sound and video, data sets, web sites, and email created in electronic form and saved as digital data, having had no initial or interstitial state as an analog or physical product. Digital derivatives include reformatted, enhanced, or access copies of physical or digital material. Digital surrogates include digitized documents and/or transcripts of such documents created via OCR, whether the digital forms were produced by the record creator or for access by the holding institution.

MARTHA: From my notes from our meeting at ALA Annual in SF (June 2015): Can or should we distniguish "digital that lives in a managed environment (e.g. on a server)" from "digital that exists on removable media (optical discs, magnetic tapes, etc.) and storage devices (USB flash drives, external hard drives, etc.)?"

Comment [1]: Something to think about!

Comment [2]: EMILY: I think we need this. Here are some prospective scenarios:

- A gross survey of holdings, for example of physical and virtual space occupied would require just the cubic feet (for records) and linear feet (for books) and a GB count on a network and/or active peripheral and/or cloud storage devices **(a Level 1 holdings count)**

- A survey of holdings as part of planning for a new physical space and electronic storage environment would require a gross physical space survey, and an electronic storage survey, in which case you would need to account for current GB used and account for future space to facilitate the migration of electronic records from external media AND account for what is currently on network or cloud storage (and maybe a projected rate of use). In this case, you would need to do a count of your external media and create a prospective GB amount using a conversion formula (I have one we use at the Center). What is on the media doesn't count, only its prospective storage capacity – but knowing x number of floppy disks, x number of CDs, etc. are crucial to using this formula **(a Level 2 holding count)**

- A survey of all electronic formats for a specific kind of grant project may ask you, for example to count the number of oral histories you have. In this case they want to know how many audio recordings you have on audio cassette, how many on CD, how many on DVD, and how many of them are on digital audio. They also want to know if you have any filmed histories on VHS, Beta, and all the other digital formats so that you can price out the cost of conversion. In this case, the media AND the type content (which falls in to both sound recordings and moving image

Graphic/Visual Material

Definition: Materials that communicate primarily visually, rather than textually.

Scope: Includes originals or reproductions. Includes opaque and transparent material. Separate categories exist for counting moving images and objects.

Examples: Architectural materials, charts, drawings, ephemera, paintings, postcards, posters, prints, photographs/still images (positives or negatives), slides, transparencies, and filmstrips.

Manuscripts (managed as items)

This definition 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

Definition: Any medium, transparent or opaque, that holds highly reduced photographic reproductions (microreproductions).

Scope: Microforms include microfilm, microfiche, ultrafiche, aperture cards, and microcards.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Any sequence of visual images recorded or registered, by whatever means and on whatever medium, that create the illusion of movement when projected, broadcast, or played back, whether or not accompanied by sound.

Scope: It encompasses both live action and animation meant to be viewed as two or three dimensional works and includes all analog and digital formats.

Examples: Includes moving images of all types, e.g., features, shorts, news footage, trailers, outtakes, screen tests, experimental or independent productions, study films or video, home movies, unedited materials, television broadcasts, commercials, spot announcements, ephemeral film (films produced for educational, industrial, training, or promotional purposes), cartographic images intended to be perceived as moving in two dimensions (such as satellite images of the Earth or other celestial bodies in motion), recorded performances of concerts, ballets, plays, etc., and cartridge/disk ("video") and interactive online games that are predominantly comprised of moving images.

Does not include: flipbooks (a book) or time-lapse photography (visual/graphic)

Sound Recordings

Definition: Materials onto which sound has been recorded via analog or digital methods.

Scope: Sound recordings encompass a wide range of formats, including phonograph records, magnetic tape, compact discs, and digital audio files.These contain spoken words, sound, and/or performed music.

Examples: Cylinders, 78 rpm discs, wire recordings, reel-to-reel tape recordings, cassette tapes, vinyl records, compact discs, mini discs, 8-tracks, Digital Audio Tapes, etc.

LEVEL 1 COUNT ("Minimal"): At a minimum, repositories should be able to communicate **1)** the number of printed works held and, in the broadest sense, the number of records (manuscripts, archives, other formats) intentionally maintained and managed by the repository as either single items or in groups (a "collection," an "archival series," a "photograph collection," a "codex," etc.); **2)** the number of physical units/containers held; **3)** the physical footprint of their collections; and **4)** the digital footprint for their collections.

(!) Before counting, please answer the following four questions:

1) What are you counting for intellectual units?	____ Everything held regardless of processing / discoverability / cataloging status	____ Only what is cataloged or processed (however I define cataloged or processed)		
2) What are you counting for physical units?	____ Every container or volume held regardless of the processing / discoverability / cataloging status	____ Only containers or volumes that I consider cataloged or processed (however I define cataloged or processed)		
3) What are you counting for physical space?	____ All storage locations regardless of the processing / discoverability / cataloging status of what is kept there	____ Only storage locations that house what I consider cataloged or processed (however I define cataloged or processed)		
4) What are you counting for digital space?	_____ Born digital and digital surrogates	___ Just born digital	__ Just digital surrogates	

Reporting Category	Explanation
Number of Intellectual Units Held	Counts should reflect the highest level of descriptive aggregation available. This may be a collection-level description, a series-level description, a book title [use NISO definion]; a group of things of one format that are described together, etc. Potential sources of data include: MARC and/or other catalog/database records, such as a collection level description in ArchivesSpace; finding aids; paper lists of collections held; accession records; and card catalog entries. **Please see appendix [X] for example responses in this category.**

Type of Collection Material	Count (in numerals)	Notes
Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections)		
Titles for Books and Other Printed Material		
Digital Material		
Cartographic Material		
Manuscripts (managed as items)		
Graphic/Visual Material		
Microforms		
Moving Image Material		
Objects and Artifacts		
Sound Recordings		

Physical Units Held

Number of individual volumes and containers comprising all categories/types of collections. This includes each volume in multi-volume titles, number of archival boxes, number of records center containers, number of drawers containing collections, etc. If you have objects, film reels, papers, or other collection materials loose on a shelving unit, measure shelves occupied and report holding by shelf dimension, for example 2 shelves (36" x 12" x 15"). You may add additional reporting units to the worksheet provided below. **Please see appendix [X] for example responses in this category.**

Type	Count (in numerals)	Type	Count (in numerals)	Type	Count (in numerals)	Type	Count (in numerals)
Volumes		Legal size document case		Shelf (L" x W" x H")		Another...	
Records Center Cartons (L" x W" x H")		Half size legal document case		Another...		Another...	
Letter size document case		Flat File Drawers (L" x W" x H")		Another...		Another...	
Half size document case		Rolled items		Another...		Another...	

Physical Space Occupied

Total footprint for all materials held. For volumes, measure shelf space occupied in linear or cubic feet, whichever is preferred, and **use formula provided to enable reporting in both measurements**. For materials in containers, drawers, etc., either measure in cubic feet or linear feet all shelving units occupied, or use **Appendix X, "Containers to Cubic and Linear Feet"** to use your physical unit couts to approximate physical space occupied. **Please see appendix [X] for example responses in this category.**

Physical space for volumes	Cubic feet:	Linear feet:	Formula:
Physical space for all else	Cubic feet:	Linear feet:	
Digital Space Occupied	Total digital extent in gigabytes (GB) for files created, managed, or stored in binary format requiring a computer or other electronic device to render it intelligible by a person, in either. Examples include documents, images, sound and video, data sets, web sites, and email on local servers, in cloud storage, in preservation repositories, and/or on external media (if known). Count either disk images or extracted records for a collection, but do not count both. **Please see appendix [X] for example responses in this category.**		
Digital Space	(GB)		

Agenda Item TK

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
November 2016
Chicago, Illinois

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)

Annual Report to Council

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") is responsible for the development of guidelines (hereafter "Guidelines") that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held--including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials--and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

Officers

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

Membership

- Adriana Cuervo (SAA), Rutgers University
- Elizabeth Haven-Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida
- 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

During this reporting period, ACRL/RBMS representative Alvan Bregman (Queen's University, Canada) stepped down from the Task Force. He was replaced by Elizabeth Haven-Hawley, University of Florida.

SUMMARY OF MEETING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force met 17 times between October 2, 2015 and August 31, 2016. This includes:

- 12 conference calls
- 2 full-day working meetings scheduled during ALA Midwinter (January 8, 2016) and SAA Annual (August 3, 2016)
- 3 open meetings for ALA (January 10, 2016 and June 25, 2016) and SAA membership (August 4, 2016)

Minutes are available on the SAA microsite: http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/jtf-hcm-meetings.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force is currently engaged in:

1. **Creating documentation to support the upcoming September 2016 public release of the Task Force's draft *Reporting Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries*.** While the "core" guidelines were distributed in handout form at the Task Force's open forum at SAA in Atlanta on August 5, 2016 (see pdf accompanying report, "SAAHandout2016") representative bibliographic examples for categories of material, enhanced front matter, and a brief review of available data sources useful to conducting the work are necessary to create a user-friendly presentation of the guidelines for distribution.

2. **Planning for publicizing and soliciting feedback for the Reporting Guidelines once they are published on the SAA microsite.** The Task Force has compiled a list of venues to promote the draft guidelines and solicit feedback from members of different professional and regional organizations.

3. **Preparing to solicit members of the SAA and ACRL/RBMS communities to test the draft reporting guidelines and provide feedback.**

4. **Developing and articulating Level 2 (and possibly Level 3) reporting guides.**

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES

During the reporting period, the Task Force:

- Identified eight categories or types of collection material to guide reporting, regardless of whether those materials are physical or electronic (see below, as distributed at SAA in August 2016)

- Articulated three types of counts or measures that are appropriate for and relevant to the quantification of holdings information:

    - Intellectual Units Held (titles or title-equivalents)
    - Physical Units Held (volumes, sheets, audiocassettes, film reels, etc.)
    - Space Occupied (linear feet, cubic feet, or gigabytes)

- Considered the need to distinguish between the following:

    - Material described and managed at the collection level from material described and managed at the item level
    - Material that is described online and therefore discoverable from material that is not [yet] described online or discoverable

- Focused on developing and promoting a common language to communicate holdings so that archival repositories and special collections libraries can talk about and share information about what they hold, not on prescribing a methodology for obtaining that data. This included developing a number of "principles" and definitions that govern the use of the guidelines (see pdf accompanying report)

- Articulated the counts and measures necessary to a Level 1 count:

    - Titles/title equivalents representing collection material described and managed at the collection level that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material
    - Titles/title equivalents representing collection material described and managed at the item level that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material
    - Physical space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material, in cubic or linear feet as appropriate
    - Digital space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material, in gigabytes

- Requested and received a one year extension from both SAA and ACRL/RBMS

To accomplish its objectives, the Joint Task Force has thus far:

- Authored the core components of the Task Force's *Reporting Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* (see pdf accompanying report, "SAAHandout2016")

- Engaged in the following outreach activities:

    - Held an SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Metrics Open Forum in partnership with the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Public Services at the SAA Annual Meeting August 4, 2016. An estimated 40+ people attended the open forum; 5 people later attended the open working meeting later that day

- Task Force co-chair Emily Gustainis presented as part of the panel session, *Standards and Best Practices for Metrics: Reports from the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Forces* at the Spring Meeting of the New England Archivists (April 2, 2016, Portland, Maine)

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- Post the draft guidelines on the SAA microsite and solicit feedback on the Level 1 reporting requirements
- Recruit participants to test the Level 1 reporting requirements
- Develop and solicit feedback on Level 2 reporting requirements and propose additional reporting levels as appropriate for future efforts
- Prepare documentation necessary to submit the guidelines to Standards

Reporting Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures
for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Introduction
The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is responsible for the development of guidelines that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum (Level 1) counts and measures and advanced/optimum counts and measures (Level 2) and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

With this charge in mind, we:

- Identified eight categories or types of collection material to guide reporting, regardless of whether those materials are physical or electronic (see attached)

- Articulated three types of counts or measures that are appropriate for and relevant to the quantification of holdings information

    - Intellectual Units Held (titles or title-equivalents)
    - Physical Units Held (volumes, sheets, audiocassettes, film reels, etc.)
    - Space Occupied (linear feet, cubic feet, or gigabytes)

- Considered the need to distinguish between the following:

    - Material described and managed at the collection level from material described and managed at the item level
    - Material that is described online and therefore discoverable from material that is not [yet] described online or discoverable

Our focus has been on developing and promoting *a common language to communicate holdings* so that we can talk about and share information about what we hold, *not on prescribing a methodology for obtaining that data.*

About the Level 1 Count
The myriad of systems, standards, and local practices governing how archival repositories and special collections libraries perform their work has created a unique information environment that prohibits any one practice for individual entities to compile the data necessary to satisfying Level I reporting criteria (described below). Our institutions vary, not just by collection management system or ILS (if one is even available), but by purpose of the repository, size and types of collect held, staffing levels, financial resources, and communities served. Most important, the data we collect--including data compiled about our holdings--reflects specific local needs and utilities. As a Task Force, we recognize that repositories will seek to utilize pre-existing data for the purpose of meeting Level I reporting criteria.

The following principles govern the use of the guidelines:

- Online descriptions of holdings need not be limited to catalog records or finding aids to be discoverable. To achieve the broadest participation possible, a description can be web content (such as a blog post or list of collections on a website), a PDF, a spreadsheet, or another declaration of holdings, as long as it is publicly available online

- Do not count bibliographic units or space occupied for any holding more than once

- Do not count surrogates of collection materials held by the repository and counted elsewhere, or derivatives in general, including access copies and/or preservation masters of digital objects, microfilmed collections, microfiche, or photocopies of holdings created post-acquisition

- Specific format categories of materials apply only if a holding is comprised of a single format

- Cubic feet should be used to report all holdings except for books and other printed material, which should be reported in linear feet

- A container count (number of manuscript cases, records center cartons, shelving units, other) is not part of reporting physical space occupied; however, container counts are useful for the purposes of calculating cubic feet occupied and using existing conversion tools. Containers are not holdings

Level 1 Count
The Task Force is proposing a Level 1 Count that consists of the following counts and measures (only):

- Titles/title equivalents representing collection material described and managed at the collection level that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material

- Titles/title equivalents representing collection material described and managed at the item level that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material

- Physical space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material, in cubic or linear feet as appropriate

- Digital space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material, in gigabytes

Level I count summary:

- Provide/report counts and measures only for collection material that is described online and therefore discoverable

- Distinguish collection material that is described and managed at the item level from collection material that is described and managed at the collection level

- Provide/report counts of intellectual units held

- Provide/report measures of space occupied

- Do not provide/report counts of physical units held

Level 2 Count (Proposed)

- Counts and measures for collection material that is not yet described online or discoverable will be reported in a Level 2 Count

- Counts of physical units held are to be provided/reported in a Level 2 Count

- Level 2 counts can be considered analogous to parallel and/or multiple extent statements

Agenda Item TK

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
August 1, 2016
Atlanta, Georgia

Standards Committee: Extension Request for the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by: Emily Novak Gustainis, SAA co-chair)

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") requests an extension of one year to complete the work of the Task Force. JTF-HCM is responsible for the development of guidelines that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the wide range of types and formats of material typically held by archival repositories and special collections libraries, including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials.

Officers

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

Membership

- 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
- Elizabeth Haven Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida
- Lisa Miller (SAA rep), Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University
- Katy Rawdon (ACRL/RBMS), Temple University
- Cyndi Shein (SAA), University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries

BACKGROUND

The Task Force was organized in 2014 with a two year term and one year extension option. Members met for the first time at the 2014 SAA Annual Meeting in advance of the official September 1, 2014 start date. Subsequently, over the past twenty-two months, JTF-HCM members have met, either in person or via conference call, twenty-eight times. This includes: two open meetings at SAA annual conferences in partnership with the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Public Services Metrics (2014, 2015) and the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Primary Source Literacy (2015); four open meetings at ALA (one Annual, two Midwinter); and one full-day meeting on January 8, 2016. Forthcoming open meetings at ALA (June 2016) and SAA (August 2016), as well as one full-day working meeting on August 3 during the upcoming SAA Annual Meeting have also been scheduled. Open meetings have served to

introduce ALA and SAA memberships to the work of the task force and its progress, as well as offer an open forum for Q&A.

In its October 2015 annual report to SAA Council, the JTF-HCM indicated that it anticipated needing a one year extension to complete its work. In April, Martha O'Hara Conway, Co-Chair, ACRL/RBMS, requested an extension for the five ACRL/RBMS JTF-HCM participants. This request was approved; ACRL/RBMS members have already been reappointed as Task Force members for a one year extension through August 2017.

DISCUSSION

The Standards Committee supports the one year extension request for the Task Force, which would give the Task Force time to review feedback on its Minimal (or Level I) counting requirements, revise and expand the guidelines to include Optimal (container/item counts or Level II) counting guidelines, as well as articulate the work necessary to draft Added Value (special attributes or Level III) holdings counts and move the guidelines closer to becoming a standard for adoption by SAA and ACRL/RBMS.

The draft guidelines will be published online via the SAA JTF-HCM microsite for the first round of public comment in late July in advance of the 2016 SAA Annual Meeting. Commenting on the guidelines via the site will be enabled or can be submitted via email, and must be received by August 31, 2016. In advance of the release, we will encourage attendance at the upcoming ALA Annual Meeting in Florida on June 25 to test the categorization of materials using definitions established as part of the guidelines. The exercise, in addition to the feedback from the SAA Annual Meeting, will be used to revise the guidelines in advance of soliciting volunteers to test them in their own repositories and inform the second version.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the length of term of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries be extended for one year, so that the Task Force will now complete its work by the time of the 2017 SAA Annual Meeting.

Support Statement:

Extending the appointment of the Task Force will enable the JTF-HCM to recruit repositories to engage, test, and provide feedback on the guidelines. Additionally, it will enable the JTF-HCM to articulate its proposed "Optimal" and "Added Value" counts.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: The proposed extension will enable the Task Force to meet Goal 3.1 (identify the need for new standards, guidelines, and best practices and lead or participate in their development), which will promote the consistent compilation of holdings information at the local level, as well as provide a low-barrier approach to aggregating data about holdings across the profession. It is the Task Force's hope that this work will enable the Society to ultimately express the extent of the cultural heritage stewarded by its membership (Goal 1.1, Provide leadership in promoting the value of archives and archivists to institutions, communities, and society and Goal 1.2, Educate and influence decision makers about the importance of archives and archivists).

Fiscal Impact: None anticipated.

Agenda Item TK

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
July 2017
Chicago, Illinois

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)

Annual Report to Council

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") is responsible for the development of guidelines (hereafter "Guidelines") that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held--including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials--and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

Officers

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

Membership

- Adriana Cuervo (SAA), Rutgers University
- Elizabeth Haven-Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida
- Rachel D'Agostino (ACRL/RBMS), Library Company of Philadelphia
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (ACRL/RBMS), University of Minnesota
- Angela Fritz (SAA), University of Notre Dame
- 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 thirty-one times between September 1, 2016 and July 25, 2017. This includes:

- 14 standing meetings via conference call
- 12 working sessions via conference call
- 2 working meetings scheduled during ALA Midwinter (January 22, 2017) and SAA Annual (July 25, 2017)
- 3 open meetings for ALA (January 22, 2017 and June 25, 2017) and SAA membership (July 25, 2017)

Minutes through March 2 are available on the SAA microsite: http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/jtf-hcm-meetings; post-March 2, meeting discussion points were generally recorded in draft documents. Should the Committee be renewed, the posting of formal minutes for its standing meetings will resume in September.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force is currently engaged in:

1. Refining its draft timeline for proposed 2017-2018 activities (attached)

2. Revising core documentation and drafting guidance in response to feedback received for the draft *Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* distributed January 11, 2017

3. Preparing scenarios for the application of the Level 1 rubric to accompany (or potentially replace) distributed "Examples and Explanations" document

4. Preparing responses to feedback received from RBMS and SAA communities

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES

During the reporting period, the Task Force:

- Completed and posted draft *Level 1 Guidelines* to SAA microsite

- Distributed call for comments and feedback on the draft Guidelines to thirty professional organizations and listservs, with comment period open from January 11, 2017 – March 3, 2017

- Compiled, categorized, and conducted preliminary review of feedback received from eighteen individual RBMS and SAA members and collectively from members of the

Special Collections and Archives Council of the Harvard University Library. Comments and corresponding issues extracted from feedback received can be summarized as follows:

- Born digital and digitized content-related (19 comments)
- Categories/types of collection material (7 comments)
- Containers (1 comment)
- Determining physical and digital space occupied/conducting count and units of measure (21 comments)
- Discoverability requirement (5 comments)
- Other (15 comments)

- Revised core document, "Categories/Types of Collection Material" in response to feedback (attached)

- Revised core document, "Level 1 Count" Rubric in response to feedback (attached)

- Drafted outline for *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (Level 1 and 2 Counts)*

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- Consult with SAA Standards Liaison John Bence regarding extension/renewal request procedures

- Submit extension request/renewal with smaller Task Force membership (attached)

Society of American Archivists

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Metrics

Date Submitted: 17 August 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, fifteen times between 13 August 2014 and 23 July 2015. Meeting minutes are available on the Task Force's microsite and include one joint SAA-RBMS at the Annual Meeting of the American Library Association in June of this year.

Ongoing Activities

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

- 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.
- Drafted proposed categories/types of collection material and working definitions for aiding in data compilation. These draft definitions will be circulated at the public forum for the SAA-RBMS joint task forces on Thursday, August 20. The group will be building on this work, with special consideration for born digital records, at its meeting on Friday, August 21
- Reviewed survey instruments, worksheets, and methodologies received; started mapping points of data collection to the draft definitions
- Prepared sample user stories/use cases to support the application of a tiered reporting strategy for holdings counts that is informed by the various levels of data collection needed by members of our community

New/Upcoming Activities

- Finalize reporting categories/types of collection material, using comments received at SAA to inform revisions
- Consider the 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.)
- Consider the implications of how specific systems (such as ArchivesSpace) will affect reporting categories and expressions of extent
- Ramp up outreach/publicity related to the group’s activities through regional outlets

Questions/Concerns

None.

Agenda Item TK

Society of American Archivists
Standards Committee
July 20, 2017

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)

Annual Report to Standards Committee

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") is responsible for the development of guidelines (hereafter "Guidelines") that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held--including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials--and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

Officers

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

Membership

- Adriana Cuervo (SAA), Rutgers University
- Elizabeth Haven-Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida
- 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 thirty-one times between September 1, 2016 and July 25, 2017. This includes:

- 14 standing meetings via conference call
- 12 working sessions via conference call
- 2 working meetings scheduled during ALA Midwinter (January 22, 2017) and SAA Annual (July 25, 2017)
- 3 open meetings for ALA (January 22, 2017 and June 25, 2017) and SAA membership (July 25, 2017)

Minutes through March 2 are available on the SAA microsite: http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/jtf-hcm-meetings; post-March 2, meeting discussion points were generally recorded in draft documents. Should the Committee be renewed, the posting of formal minutes for its standing meetings will resume in September.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force is currently engaged in:

1. Refining its draft timeline for proposed 2017-2018 activities (attached)

2. Revising core documentation and drafting guidance in response to feedback received for the draft *Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* distributed January 11, 2017

3. Preparing scenarios for the application of the Level 1 rubric to accompany (or potentially replace) distributed "Examples and Explanations" document

4. Preparing responses to feedback received from RBMS and SAA communities

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES

During the reporting period, the Task Force:

- Completed and posted draft *Level 1 Guidelines* to SAA microsite

- Distributed call for comments and feedback on the draft Guidelines to thirty professional organizations and listservs, with comment period open from January 11, 2017 – March 3, 2017

- Compiled, categorized, and conducted preliminary review of feedback received from eighteen individual RBMS and SAA members and collectively from members of the Special Collections and Archives Council of the Harvard University Library. Comments and corresponding issues extracted from feedback received can be summarized as follows:

- Born digital and digitized content-related (19 comments)
- Categories/types of collection material (7 comments)
- Containers (1 comment)
- Determining physical and digital space occupied/conducting count and units of measure (21 comments)
- Discoverability requirement (5 comments)
- Other (15 comments)

- Revised core document, "Categories/Types of Collection Material" in response to feedback (attached)

- Revised core document, "Level 1 Count" Rubric in response to feedback (attached)

- Drafted outline for *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (Level 1 and 2 Counts)*

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- Consult with SAA Standards Liaison John Bence regarding extension/renewal request procedures

- Submit extension request/renewal with smaller Task Force membership (attached)

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)

Proposed Timeline: August 1, 2017 – August 31, 2018

Aug. 2017	Review feedback received during the Annual SAA meeting, Portland, Oregon; Prepare Task Force extension request
Sept. 2017	Submit extension request
Sept. 2017 – Jan.2018	Finalize level 1 documentation; develop and prepare supporting documentation for Level 2
Feb. 2018	Post revised *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* to SAA microsite, incorporating final revisions to Level 1 Guidelines and introducing Level 2 rubric and supporting documentation; issue call for comments and feedback through March 16, 2018
Mar.-June. 2018	Compile, categorize, review, and respond to community feedback; make revisions as necessary
July 2018	Prepare *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (Level 1 and 2)* and supporting documentation for submission to SAA Standards Committee
Aug. 2018	Hold open meeting at SAA to present Guidelines release; meet with Standards Committee; submit final annual report to SAA Council

Categories/Types of Collection Material

Archival and Manuscript Material

Definition: Documents, or aggregations of documents, in any form or medium, created or received by a person, family, or organization, public or private, in the conduct of its affairs and preserved because of their continuing value.

Scope: Includes organic collections, artificial collections (including vertical files), records, and manuscripts. Manuscripts may take the form of fragments, scrolls, codices, or single or multiple sheets. Also includes data, email, and archived web content.

Published Language Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for language and intended for distribution.

Scope: Includes books, pamphlets, single-sheet publications, and other formats of textual material, as well as formats that present non-textual content in book form, including artists' books and graphic novels.

Cartographic Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content that represents the whole or a part of the Earth, any celestial body, or an imaginary place.

Scope: Includes cartographic datasets, images, moving images, and three-dimensional forms. Also includes atlases, diagrams, globes, maps, models, profiles, remote-sensing images, sections, and views.

Computer Programs

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through digitally encoded instructions intended to be processed and performed by a computer.

Scope: Includes operating systems and applications software.

Graphic/Visual Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through line, shape, shading, pigment, etc., intended to be perceived primarily in two dimensions.

Scope: Includes material in opaque and transparent formats, including those intended to be projected. Includes conventional still images as well as still images that give the illusion of depth or motion. Includes charts, collages,

drawings, paintings, photographs (positives and negatives), postcards, posters, and prints. Includes interactive and/or dynamic materials such as advent calendars, anatomical flap books, paper dolls, volvelles, and computer aided design (CAD) and building information modeling (BIM) files.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through images intended to be perceived as moving, and in two or three dimensions.

Scope: Includes motion pictures using live action and/or animation; film and video recordings, including digitally streamed content; and video games.

Notated Movement

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for movement.

Scope: Includes forms of notated movement for dance and game play.

Notated Music

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of musical notation.

Scope: Includes choir books; table books; sheet music; vocal, instrumental, and conductor parts; and complete scores.

Objects/Artifacts

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form or forms intended to be perceived in three dimensions

Scope: Includes artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose) and naturally-occurring objects.

Sound Recordings

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through language or music in an audible form, or recorded content other than language or music expressed in an audible form.

Scope: Includes recordings of readings, recitations, speeches, interviews, oral histories, performed music, and natural and artificially-produced sounds, as well as computer-generated speech and music.

		Intellectual Units Held
		Number of Titles/Title Equivalents
Archival and Manuscript Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Published Language Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Cartographic Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Computer Programs		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Graphic/Visual Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Moving Image Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Movement		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Music		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)

		Intellectual Units Held
		Number of Titles/Title Equivalents
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Objects/Artifacts		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Sound Recordings		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)

		Physical Space Occupied	
		In Linear Feet	**In Cubic Feet**
Archival and Manuscript Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Published Language Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Cartographic Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Computer Programs			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Graphic/Visual Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Moving Image Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Movement			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Music			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Objects/Artifacts			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Sound Recordings			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)

		Physical Space Occupied	
		In Linear Feet	**In Cubic Feet**
Other Physical Space Occupied			
described online/discoverable		as needed	as needed
not [yet] described online/discoverable		as needed	as needed

Note: For the purpose of conducting the count at the local level, institutions are encouraged to record physical space occupied per local practice. For the purpose of aggregating data across multiple institutions, physical space occupied for all categories/types of collection material should be aggregated and reported in cubic feet, except for Published Language Material, which should be aggregated and reported in linear feet.

		Digital Space Occupied
		In Multiples of Bytes
Archival and Manuscript Material		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Published Language Material		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Cartographic Material		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Computer Programs		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Graphic/Visual Material		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Moving Image Material		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Movement		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Music		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Objects/Artifacts		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Sound Recordings		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)

		Digital Space Occupied
		In Multiples of Bytes
Other Digital Space Occupied		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		as needed
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		as needed

Note: For the purpose of conducting the count at the local level, institutions are encouraged to record digital space occupied per local practice (bytes, megabytes, gigabytes, or terabytes). For the purpose of aggregating data across multiple institutions, digital space occupied for all categories/types of collection materials should be aggregated and reported in gigabytes.

JTF-HCM: Proposed Membership for Task Force Extension, 2017-2018

Officers

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

Membership

- Adriana Cuervo (SAA), Rutgers University *(rotating off 8/31/17)*
- Elizabeth Haven-Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida *(staying on)*
- Rachel D'Agostino (ACRL/RBMS), Library Company of Philadelphia *(staying on)*
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (ACRL/RBMS), University of Minnesota *(staying on as an SAA rep)*
- Angela Fritz (SAA), University of Arkansas Libraries *(rotating off)*
- Lisa Miller (SAA rep), Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University *(staying on)*
- Katy Rawdon (ACRL/RBMS), Temple University *(rotating off 8/31/17)*
- Cyndi Shein (SAA), University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries *(rotating off 8/31/17)*

Agenda Item TK

Society of American Archivists
Standards Committee
July 02, 2018

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)

Annual Report to Standards Committee

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") is responsible for the development of guidelines (hereafter "Guidelines") that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held--including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials--and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

Officers

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

Membership

- Elizabeth Haven-Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida
- Rachel D'Agostino (ACRL/RBMS), Library Company of Philadelphia
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (ACRL/RBMS), University of Minnesota
- Lisa Miller (SAA rep), Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University

SUMMARY OF MEETING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force met 42 times between July 25, 2017 and July 02, 2018. This includes:

- 37 standing/working meetings via conference call between August 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018
- 2 in-person working meetings (SAA Annual Meeting, July 25, 2017; University of Michigan, November 13-14, 2017)

- 3 open meetings (SAA Annual Meeting, July 25, 2017; ALA Midwinter, February 11, 2018; RBMS Annual Conference, June 24, 2018)

Due to the nature of the meeting discussions, formal minutes were not generated during this reporting period; activities were generally recorded in the form (or as part) of working documents.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES
The Joint Task Force is currently:

1. Collecting responses to its 2018 revised draft *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries*, which was released on May 24, 2018. As of July 2, 2018, no comments have been received.

2. Awaiting RBMS approval of the revised *Guidelines* as the first step in submitting the *Guidelines* to the Standards Committee for review.

3. Initiating work on the review package to submit to the Standards Committee for the revised *Guidelines* for a post-RBMS approval, post-2018 SAA Annual Meeting submission.

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES
During the reporting period, Task Force members:

- Conducted an exhaustive review of the community feedback received in response to the circulation of the 2017 draft *Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries*.

- Substantially revised the 2017 draft *Guidelines*, collapsing the concept of reporting levels in favor of an easier to implement "Recommended" and "Optional Counts" approach. To do so, the Task Force updated its approach to the three counts/measures (Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, Digital Space Occupied).

- Jointly authored the components of the revised draft *Guidelines*:

    - A *Background* section briefly describing the context within which the guidelines were called for and developed
    - An *Audience and Purpose* section to remind readers that the guidelines are intended to be used by repositories of all types and sizes and to account for all varieties of collection material typically held
    - An *Overarching Approach* section that outlines the four fundamental considerations of the guidelines (Type, Discoverability, How Managed, Origination)
    - *Intellectual Units Held*, *Physical Space Occupied*, and *Digital Space Occupied* sections that provide a rationale and guidance for conducting each of these counts
    - A *Counts and Measures* section that offers basic considerations and general

instructions for conducting the recommended and optional counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied
    - *Appendix A: Categories/Types of Collection Material*, which provides a definition and a scope statement for each of the ten categories of collection material identified in the guidelines
    - *Appendix B: Tables for Recording Counts and Measures*, which consists of three tables for recording the recommended and optional counts and measures.
    - *Appendix C: Glossary*, which identifies and provides a definition for the key terms that are employed in the guidelines

- Completed and posted the 2018 revised draft *Guidelines* to its SAA microsite.

- Distributed a call for comments/feedback on the 2018 revised draft *Guidelines* to twenty-eight professional organizations and listservs, with the invitation to comment open from May 24 through July 31, 2018.

- Held one poster session at the 2018 RBMS Annual Conference (June 21, 2018,;Martha O'Hara Conway, presenter)

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

The term of service for the Task Force and its charge ends on August 31, 2018. Emily Novak Gustainis will continue to consult with her ACRL/RBMS Co-Chair, Martha O'Hara Conway, regarding the RBMS approval process, community feedback on the *Guidelines*, and the submission to the Standards Committee. Novak Gustainis will also continue to liaise with John Bence, Co-Chair of the Standards Committee regarding the *Guidelines* and prepare the documentation necessary to submit the revised *Guidelines* to Standards for review after their approval by RBMS.

<u>Report Appendices</u>

A. 2018 revised draft *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries*, as released on May 24, 2018.
B. PDF of the poster for the 2018 RBMS Poster Session (presented by Martha O'Hara Conway)

Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

INTRODUCTION

The guidelines embodied in this document were developed to help archival repositories and special collections libraries quantify and communicate information about holdings. The guidelines are presented, and the document is organized, as follows. A **Background** section briefly describes the context within which the guidelines were called for and developed. **Audience and Purpose** serves to remind that the guidelines are intended to be used by repositories of all types and sizes and to account for all varieties of collection material typically held. In the section titled **Overarching Approach,** four fundamentals that are essential to understanding and using the guidelines are explained. **Intellectual Units Held** provides a rationale and guidance for conducting the first of the three counts and measures described in these guidelines; **Physical Space Occupied** and **Digital Space Occupied** provide the same for the second and third. Under the heading **Conducting the Counts and Measures**, basic considerations and general instructions are set out for conducting the recommended and optional counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied. **Appendix A: Categories/Types of Collection Material** provides a definition and a scope statement for each of the ten categories of collection material identified in these guidelines. **Appendix B: Tables for Recording Counts and Measures** consists of three tables, for recording the recommended and optional counts and measures. Finally, **Appendix C: Glossary** identifies and provides a definition for the key terms that are employed in the guidelines.

BACKGROUND

Archivists and special collections librarians are becoming increasingly mindful of the need to gather, analyze, and share evidence concerning the value of the collections we hold, the effectiveness of the operations we manage, and the impact of the services we provide. The absence of commonly accepted definitions, metrics, guidelines, and best practices, however, has impeded our ability to undertake meaningful assessment activities and to engage in productive, cross-repository conversations about our collections, operations, and services.

Recognition of these challenges has manifested itself in a number of ways in recent years, including the 2010 publication of *Taking Our Pulse: The OCLC Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives*; an assessment-themed issue of *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* (13:2, Fall 2012), published by the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL); assessment-related sessions at the meetings of allied professional associations, including the Society of American Archivists (SAA), American Library Association (ALA), and ACRL's Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS); presentations centered on special collections at the biennial Library Assessment Conference sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL); and grant-supported initiatives led by ACRL, ARL, and

other organizations aimed at building and fostering cultures of assessment and demonstrating the value that libraries and archives bring to their communities and to society at large.

Within this context, SAA and ACRL/RBMS constituted a joint task force in 2014 and charged it with developing guidelines that will provide definitions and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries consisted initially of ten members, five appointed by SAA and five by ACRL/RBMS, including co-chairs representing each organization. Members were appointed for two-year terms, which were renewed in 2016 for an additional year. Six members agreed to serve for a fourth year.

Representing SAA:

- Emily R. Novak Gustainis (Harvard University) (co-chair) (2014 - 2018)
- Adriana Cuervo (Rutgers University) (2014 - 2017)
- Angela Fritz (University of Notre Dame) (2014 - 2017)
- Lisa Miller (Stanford University) (2014 - 2018)
- Cyndi Shein (University of Nevada Las Vegas) (2014 - 2017)

Representing ACRL/RBMS:

- Martha O'Hara Conway (University of Michigan) (co-chair) (2014 - 2018)
- Alvan Bregman (Queen's University) (2014 - 2016)
- Rachel D'Agostino (Library Company of Philadelphia) (2014 - 2018)
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (University of Minnesota) (2014 - 2018)
- Elizabeth Haven Hawley (University of Florida) (2016 - 2018)
- Katy Rawdon (Temple University) (2014 - 2017)

AUDIENCE AND PURPOSE

These guidelines were developed to provide archivists and special collections librarians with a set of practical, well-defined counts and measures that can be used to quantify and communicate holdings information. The counts and measures were also formulated to support the aggregation of holdings information from multiple repositories. It was beyond the charge of the task force that developed these guidelines, however, to create either a survey instrument or a data repository.

Careful attention was given to formulating the counts and measures so that any type of repository that manages and provides access to archival and special collections material -- including academic, corporate, and government archives; public and independent research libraries; and historical societies -- can use the counts and measures to quantify holdings in a manner that is consistent with their

application by other repositories. The counts and measures were also designed so that repositories of any size and with any level of financial, human, and/or technological resources can implement them.

Careful attention was also given to developing guidelines that consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of collection material typically held and the different ways collection material is managed and described. The guidelines also recognize the value of an approach to quantifying holdings information that accommodates both recommended and optional counts and measures.

The guidelines do not suggest or recommend any particular methods or even best practices regarding the "hows" of counting or measuring. One of the goals of the guidelines is to encourage the use of a common language for sharing information about holdings, rather than to prescribe a methodology for obtaining that information. Another is to enable their use by a wide variety of repositories, and to account for the many differences that exist among those repositories, especially those having to do with local practices (for accessioning, describing, and managing collection material); available resources (for counting, measuring, generating reports, etc.); and existing systems and sources of information (including integrated library systems, content management systems, databases, and archival collection management systems).

Finally, it is hoped that the existence of these guidelines will encourage the emergence of communities of practice through which groups of archivists and special collections librarians who are using the guidelines to quantify and communicate holdings information document their experience and interact regularly with the goal of developing and sharing best practices.

OVERARCHING APPROACH

Described below are four "fundamental principles" or "overarching themes" that are essential to understanding and using the guidelines.

Types of Counts and Measures

There are four counts and measures that are appropriate for and relevant to the quantification of holdings information.

- Intellectual Units Held
- Physical Units Held
- Physical Space Occupied
- Digital Space Occupied

These guidelines provide a rationale and guidance for recommended and optional counts and measures for three of the four above: Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital

Space Occupied. Physical units (volumes, sheets, audio cassettes, film reels, etc.) held are not counted, nor are the containers (boxes, cases, drawers, etc.) in which collection material is housed. Although a container count may be useful (and used) for purposes of calculating Physical Space Occupied, it is not a meaningful point of comparison among repositories. Similarly, while a count of a particular type of physical unit held, such as a volume count, may have purpose or value for an individual repository in a given situation, the considerable variation among repositories in terms of how collection material is bound, housed, and stored makes meaningful comparisons of physical units held problematic.

Each of the three counts and measures described in these guidelines is distinct from and independent of the other. Conducting a count of Intellectual Units Held, getting a measurement of Physical Space Occupied, and determining Digital Space Occupied are three separate activities. Some repositories, in some cases, might be able to get two or all three of the counts and measures by, for example, generating a report from an archival collection management system. Most repositories, however, will do one thing to get a count of Intellectual Units Held, something else to get a measure of Physical Space Occupied, and an entirely different activity to determine Digital Space Occupied.

Categories of Collection Material

The guidelines encourage repositories to categorize collection material, including all physical and digital manifestations, as one of the following:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

The category definitions and scope statements presented in these guidelines (as Appendix A) are intended to be suggestive as opposed to prescriptive. They have been informed and inspired by a variety of standards governing the description of collection material typically held in archival repositories and special collections libraries, including *Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS)*, *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM)*, *Resource Description and Access (RDA)*, and others. The actual categorization of collection material for the purposes called for in these guidelines will vary, in some ways significantly, from one repository to another. Each repository will have to determine, based upon a variety of factors including the nature and scope of its collections and the granularity of available information, how collection material is to be categorized for purposes of preparing a count of

Intellectual Units Held, a measurement of Physical Space Occupied, and a determination of Digital Space Occupied.

Regardless of how a repository chooses to categorize its collection material, internal consistency in understanding and applying the category definitions, coupled with a well-documented approach to undertaking the work, is critical to making the preparation of the counts and measures called for in these guidelines both meaningful for the repository itself and comparable with other repositories.

Discoverability

For all three of the counts and measures called for in these guidelines, repositories are strongly encouraged to distinguish, whenever possible, collection material that is described online (and is therefore discoverable) from collection material that is not yet described online (and is therefore not discoverable). While explicitly acknowledging the increasingly widely-held perception that "if it isn't online it doesn't exist," the guidelines also propose a definition of "described online and therefore discoverable" that encompasses any description of collection material that can be discovered by way of the web. As such, "described online and therefore discoverable" should be understood to extend well beyond online catalog records and finding aids to include a wide range of web content (blog posts, online exhibits, databases, lists of collections, etc.) as well as web-accessible content (documents, spreadsheets, etc.).

Here it must be stressed that discoverability should not be conflated with availability or deliverability. Collection material that cannot be made available because of physical, access, use, or other restrictions is not the same as collection material that cannot be discovered. Repositories are encouraged to include collection material that is discoverable but cannot be made available.

Recommended and Optional Counts

The guidelines describe "recommended" and "optional" counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied. The recommended counts and measures are intended to serve as a baseline for the preparation and sharing of holdings information. The goal for the recommended counts and measures is to identify counts and measures that archival repositories and special collections libraries of any type and size would find useful and practical to obtain and, ideally, to share. All repositories are encouraged to assemble at least the recommended counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied.

The guidelines also describe a variety of optional counts and measures, which repositories may choose to obtain as needs, interest, and/or resources allow. While many repositories will determine that they can conduct only the recommended counts and measures, others may find value in also conducting a few or many of the optional counts and measures. A repository may find it useful to obtain selected optional counts and measures on a regular basis and to conduct other optional counts and measures

on an as-needed basis or not at all. In this respect, the optional counts and measures outlined in these guidelines should be regarded as starting points rather than an exhaustive list.

INTELLECTUAL UNITS HELD

An accurate, up-to-date count of Intellectual Units Held is as fundamental to a description of the repository as the collections are to the repository itself. A count of intellectual units is essentially a title count, which, for all practical purposes, requires the categorization and counting of existing descriptions of collection material. For most repositories, a systematic, well-documented effort to prepare and share a title count is essential to a variety of purposes including outreach, collection development, and resource allocation.

The following three directives are embedded in, and fundamental to, the Intellectual Units Held count that is called for in these guidelines.

1. Descriptions of collection material should be categorized as one of the following: Archival and Manuscript Material, Published Language Material, Cartographic Material, Computer Programs, Graphic/Visual Material, Moving Image Material, Notated Movement, Notated Music, Objects/Artifacts, Sound Recordings.

2. Collection material that is described online and therefore discoverable should be distinguished from collection material that is not yet described online and is therefore not discoverable.

3. Collection material that is described and managed at the collection level should be distinguished from collection material that is described and managed at the item level.

Keeping in mind that what is being counted are descriptions of collection material, and that some of these will not lend themselves to easy categorization, repositories are encouraged to document, as thoroughly as possible, their decisions about how descriptions of particular types of collection material -- scrapbooks, for example, or collections of advertising ephemera -- are categorized for purposes of preparing a count of Intellectual Units Held.

For all three of the counts and measures called for in these guidelines, collection material that is described online and therefore discoverable is to be distinguished from collection material that is not yet described online and is therefore not discoverable. With the exception of accessioned but not yet processed collections of archival and manuscript material, it will be difficult to obtain a title count for collection material that has not yet been cataloged or otherwise described. For this reason, conducting a count of Intellectual Units Held for collection material that has not yet been described online is considered optional.

The rationale for distinguishing, in the preparation of a count of Intellectual Units Held, collection material that is described and managed at the collection level from collection material that is described and managed at the item level is based on an assertion that a title count that includes distinctions between “collections” and “items” is significantly more meaningful than one that does not. “Described and managed at the collection level” suggests that the collection material is represented by a catalog record, finding aid, or other description that represents the material in the aggregate. The aggregate is either an organic or an artificial collection, and the description of it is the product of archival description, bibliographic description, or some other process that results in a collection-level representation of the material that can be used for purposes including discovery and identification.

Similarly, “described and managed at the item level” suggests that the collection material is represented by a catalog record, finding aid, or other description that represents the material as a single exemplar or instance of a manifestation. The exemplar or instance -- the item described -- is either unique or one of multiple copies produced, and may be comprised of more than one physical unit. The description of it is the product of archival description, bibliographic description, or some other process that results in an item-level representation of the material that can be used for purposes including discovery and identification.

More so than for either of the other counts and measures described in these guidelines, conducting a count of Intellectual Units Held will require that the repository identify and account for idiosyncrasies and variations in its practices for accessioning, describing, and managing collection material. Examples of areas where current and past cataloging practices may need to be considered and accounted for include serials, which may be represented by successive-entry records, latest-entry records, or a combination of both; analytics (when a record is created for something that is a part of something for which a record is also made); and “issued withs” and “bound withs” (when more than one bibliographic work is contained in a single physical item).

Finally, decisions regarding titles held in multiple copies are to be made at the discretion of the repository. If it is preferable (because each copy held is considered unique or important for some reason) and/or practical or convenient (because of how the copies are described), the repository can report each copy held as a separate title.

PHYSICAL SPACE OCCUPIED

An accurate measure of Physical Space Occupied by collection material is key to successfully managing and clearly communicating information about holdings and can critically inform collection management, space and facilities planning, and other efforts. Knowing how much space various categories of collection material occupy can be especially helpful for making projections about collection growth and when advocating for additional resources, especially those related to providing ongoing stewardship of collection material over time.

Physical Space Occupied is reported in measures of linear feet or cubic feet at the discretion of the repository. Also at the discretion of the repository is the decision to report Physical Space Occupied by collection material that is on deposit at, as opposed to formally held by, the repository. A consistent and well-documented approach to these and other decisions, and to the work associated with conducting a measure of Physical Space Occupied, will help to ensure that the measure is meaningful for the repository itself and comparable with other repositories.

The following points provide guidance when measuring Physical Space Occupied.

1. Measure space occupied by physical manifestations of all collection material for which the repository provides sustained stewardship. Include all locations at which collection material is shelved, including those that the repository does not itself manage, such as off-site storage facilities. The decision to report Physical Space Occupied by collection material that is on deposit at another repository is at the discretion of the repository, as is the decision to report Physical Space Occupied by collection material that is on loan to another repository, for display or other purposes.

2. Categorize collection material, whenever possible, as one of the following: Archival and Manuscript Material, Published Language Material, Cartographic Material, Computer Programs, Graphic/Visual Material, Moving Image Material, Notated Movement, Notated Music, Objects/Artifacts, or Sound Recordings. When it is not possible or practical to assign holdings to one of these categories, report the Physical Space Occupied as "Other Collection Material (Not Categorized)." The purpose of "Other Collection Material (Not Categorized)" is to account for and accommodate, for example, multiple types of collection material and/or difficult to categorize collection material in the same physical space (such as a map case containing both maps and posters).

3. For purposes of conducting the recommended measures, there is no need to distinguish collection material that is described online and therefore discoverable from collection material that is not yet described online and is therefore not discoverable. This distinction is explicitly called for in the Optional measures, which are intended to encourage repositories to make this distinction whenever possible. When it is not possible or practical to discern discoverability, report the Physical Space Occupied as "Discoverability Mixed/Unknown."

4. A count of shelving units and storage cases, by capacity and/or size, can be used for purposes of obtaining a calculated measure of Physical Space Occupied. Similarly a count of containers, again by type or size, can be used for the same.

The following resources may be helpful for calculating a measure of Physical Space Occupied:

- Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library: Linear Footage Calculator
  http://beinecke.library.yale.edu/linear-footage-calculator

- Ohio State University Libraries: Cubic Footage Calculator
  https://library.osu.edu/document-registry/docs/484/stream

- UNLV University Libraries: Rebel Archives Calculator
  https://www.library.unlv.edu/speccol/rebel_archives_calculator/

DIGITAL SPACE OCCUPIED

While some collection material in digital formats may occupy physical space because of the media on which it is stored, the management of such material, including projecting future storage and preservation requirements, requires an understanding of the space it occupies in multiples of bytes.

Because the acquisition, description, management, and delivery of born-digital collection material differs, often significantly, from the same for collection material that has been digitized for purposes of online exhibition, service as a surrogate, or for generating derivatives, the guidelines encourage repositories to distinguish, whenever possible, “Born Digital” from “Digitized” collection material when conducting a measure of Digital Space Occupied. A third characterization -- “Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin” -- is intended to acknowledge and account for the fact that some repositories, in some cases, may find it difficult to accurately and/or confidently distinguish files representing born-digital collection material from files representing digitized or reformatted collection material.

In the context of these guidelines, born digital refers to collection material that was created and is managed in a digital form. As such, all of the following should be categorized as Born Digital collection material:

- Content such as email, spreadsheets, documents, websites, and other files of any format created, maintained, and acquired from within a computing environment, obtained via server-to-server transfer, forensic imaging, or other process.

- Audio, video, and other file formats imaged, extracted, or otherwise copied from floppy disks, zip disks, external drives, digital cassettes, computer hard drives, or other storage media, in association with the migration of files to new external media, a server, or a cloud storage environment.

- Online exhibitions in which born digital or reformatted digital collection material has been contextualized by additional content (curatorial interpretation, narration, annotations, etc.) such that it constitutes a new resource that will be retained and preserved in perpetuity as collection material.

Similarly, in the context of these guidelines, Digitized refers to collection material that has been converted to and is managed in a digital form. As such, all of the following should be categorized as Digitized collection material:

- Analog audio and video that has been converted to a digital format

- Books, manuscripts, maps, photographs, posters, etc. that have been digitized for preservation, publication, online exhibition, or another purpose and retained and preserved in perpetuity as collection material.

When it cannot be determined if the files represent Born Digital or Digitized collection material, they should be categorized as Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin.

A fundamental assumption to the measure of Digital Space Occupied that is called for in these guidelines is that only files that are actively managed as collection material for which the repository provides sustained stewardship are included. Digital files that are produced during the course of service provision, such as scans created in response to patron requests, are not included, nor are digital files created or received by the repository as part of routine operations (correspondence, administrative files, etc.) unless they have been formally accessioned and are being managed as inactive institutional records.

"Actively managed" implies that the files are in a preservation repository or other regularly backed-up storage environment -- that is, any configuration of hard drives, networked servers, and/or cloud-based storage for which measures to extend or ensure the viability of its contents are undertaken. Also implicit in this characterization of "actively managed" is the expectation that files that exist only on external media as acquired or received by the repository, and that have not yet been imaged or extracted to a managed preservation environment, are not to be included in a count of Digital Space Occupied.

The following points provide guidance when measuring Digital Space Occupied.

1. Digital Space Occupied is reported in multiples of bytes -- bytes, megabytes, gigabytes, and/or or terabytes -- at the discretion of the repository.

2. All collection material in digital formats should be categorized as one of the following: Born Digital, Digitized, or Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin.

3. Digital files that are described online and therefore discoverable should be distinguished from digital files that have not yet been described online and are therefore not discoverable. Digital files do not need to be described at the file level to be considered "Discoverable." When it is

not possible or practical to discern discoverability, report the Digital Space Occupied as "Discoverability Mixed/Unknown."

4. The recommended counts for Digital Space Occupied do not require the categorization of digital files by types of collection material; this categorization is explicitly called for in the optional counts. The types include an "Other Collection Material" category for measuring Digital Space Occupied by files for which one cannot accurately and/or confidently discern the type of collection material represented by the files

The following resources may be helpful for calculating a measure of Digital Space Occupied:

- GbMb.org -- Data Storage Unit Conversion Calculators
  https://www.gbmb.org/

- MBtoGB.com -- Megabytes to Gigabytes and Vice Versa
  https://www.mbtogb.com/

- ConvertUnits.com -- Measurement Unit Converter
  https://www.convertunits.com/from/MB/to/GB

CONDUCTING THE COUNTS AND MEASURES

Below are listed basic considerations and general instructions for conducting the recommended and optional counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied. A corresponding table for each of the three counts and measures is provided in Appendix B.

Intellectual Units Held (Table 1)

Conducting a count of Intellectual Units Held requires taking into consideration the following three characteristics of the collection material: Type, Discoverability, and How Managed.

For the Recommended Counts: Consider only collection material that is Discoverable. Then consider Type and How Managed.

1. Categorize "online descriptions" as representing one of the following types of collection material:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material

- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

2. Further characterize “online descriptions” according to how the collection material they represent is managed:

- As Items
- As Collections

For the Optional Counts: Consider only collection material that is not yet Discoverable. Then consider Type.

1. Categorize “not yet online” descriptions as representing one of the following types of collection material:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

Physical Space Occupied (Table 2)

Conducting a measure of Physical Space Occupied requires taking into consideration the following two characteristics of the collection material: Type and Discoverability.

For the Recommended Measures: Consider Type only.

1. Categorize all collection material occupying physical space as one of the following:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material

- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings
- Other Collection Material

For the Optional Measures: Consider Type and Discoverability.

1. Categorize collection material occupying physical space as one of the following:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings
- Other Collection Material

2. Additionally, characterize collection material occupying physical space as one of the following:

- Discoverable
- Not Yet Discoverable
- Discoverability Mixed/Unknown

Digital Space Occupied (Table 3)

Conducting a measure of Digital Space Occupied requires taking into consideration the following three characteristics of the collection material: Type, Origination, and Discoverability.

For the Recommended Counts: Consider Origination and Discoverability only.

1. Categorize all files to be counted as one of the following:

- Born Digital

- Digitized
- Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin

2. Additionally, characterize all files to be counted as one of the following:

- Discoverable
- Not Yet Discoverable
- Discoverability Mixed/Unknown

For the Optional Counts: Consider Type, Origination, and Discoverability.

1. Categorize all files to be counted as representing one of the following types of collection material:

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings
- Other Collection Material

2. Additionally, categorize all files to be counted as one of the following:

- Born Digital
- Digitized
- Digital of Mixed or Unknown Origin

3. Further, characterize all files to be counted as one of the following:

- Discoverable
- Not Yet Discoverable
- Discoverability Mixed/Unknown

APPENDIX A: CATEGORIES/TYPES OF COLLECTION MATERIAL

Archival and Manuscript Material

Definition: Documents, or aggregations of documents, in any form or medium, created or received by a person, family, or organization, public or private, in the conduct of its affairs and preserved because of their continuing value.

Scope: Includes organic collections, artificial collections (including vertical files), records, and manuscripts. Manuscripts may take the form of fragments, scrolls, codices, or single or multiple sheets. Also includes data, email, and archived web content.

Published Language Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for language and intended for distribution.

Scope: Includes books, e-books, pamphlets, single-sheet publications, and other formats of textual material, as well as formats that present non-textual content in book form, including artists' books and graphic novels.

Cartographic Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content that represents the whole or a part of the Earth, any celestial body, or an imaginary place.

Scope: Includes cartographic datasets, images, moving images, and three-dimensional forms. Also includes atlases, diagrams, globes, maps, models, profiles, remote-sensing images, sections, and views.

Computer Programs

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through digitally encoded instructions intended to be processed and performed by a computer.

Scope: Includes operating systems and applications software.

Graphic/Visual Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through line, shape, shading, pigment, etc., intended to be perceived primarily in two dimensions.

Scope: Includes material in opaque and transparent formats, including those intended to be projected. Includes conventional still images as well as still images that give the illusion of depth or motion. Includes charts, collages, drawings, paintings, photographs (positives and negatives), postcards, posters, and prints. Includes interactive and/or dynamic materials such as advent calendars, anatomical flap books, paper dolls, volvelles, and computer aided design (CAD) and building information modeling (BIM) files.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through images intended to be perceived as moving, and in two or three dimensions.

Scope: Includes motion pictures using live action and/or animation; film and video recordings, including digitally streamed content; and video games.

Notated Movement

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for movement.

Scope: Includes forms of notated movement for dance and game play.

Notated Music

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of musical notation.

Scope: Includes choir books; table books; sheet music; vocal, instrumental, and conductor parts; and complete scores.

Objects/Artifacts

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form or forms intended to be perceived in three dimensions

Scope: Includes artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose) and naturally-occurring objects.

Sound Recordings

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through language or music in an audible form, or recorded content other than language or music expressed in an audible form.

Scope: Includes recordings of readings, recitations, speeches, interviews, oral histories, performed music, and natural and artificially-produced sounds, as well as computer-generated speech and music.

		Intellectual Units
Archival and Manuscript Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Published Language Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Cartographic Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Computer Programs		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Graphic/Visual Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Moving Image Material		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Notated Movement		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Notated Music		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Objects/Artifacts		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	
Sound Recordings		
	Discoverable, Managed as Items (Recommended)	
	Discoverable, Managed as Collections (Recommended)	
	Not Yet Discoverable (Optional)	

RECOMMENDED MEASURES		In Linear Feet	In Cubic Feet
All, regardless of discoverability:			
Archival and Manuscript Material			
Published Language Material			
Cartographic Material			
Computer Programs			
Graphic/Visual Material			
Moving Image Material			
Notated Movement			
Notated Music			
Objects/Artifacts			
Sound Recordings			
Other Collection Material (Not Categorized)			
OPTIONAL MEASURES		**In Linear Feet**	**In Cubic Feet**
Archival and Manuscript Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Published Language Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Cartographic Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Computer Programs			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Graphic/Visual Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Moving Image Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Notated Movement			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Notated Music			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Objects/Artifacts			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Sound Recordings			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		
Other Collection Material			
	Discoverable		
	Not Yet Discoverable		
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown		

RECOMMENDED COUNTS		Born Digital	Digitized	Mixed or Unknown Origin
Discoverable				
Not Yet Discoverable				
Discoverability Mixed/Unknown				
OPTIONAL COUNTS		**Born Digital**	**Digitized**	**Mixed or Unknown Origin**
Archival and Manuscript Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Published Language Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Cartographic Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Computer Programs				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Graphic/Visual Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Moving Image Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Notated Movement				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Notated Music				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Objects/Artifacts				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Sound Recordings				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			
Other Collection Material				
	Discoverable			
	Not Yet Discoverable			
	Discoverability Mixed/Unknown			

APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY

This glossary identifies and provides a definition for the key terms that are employed in these guidelines. Although most of the definitions are adopted or adapted from existing, commonly-used standards and resources, in some cases the formulation of an original definition was necessary for the purposes of these guidelines. The standards and resources from which the definitions have been drawn include the following:

National and International Standards

- ANSI/NISO Z39.7-2013 Information Services and Use: Metrics & Statistics for Libraries and Information Providers -- Data Dictionary
- ISAD(G): General International Standard Archival Description -- Second edition
- ISO 2789:2013 Information and Documentation -- International library statistics
- ISO 5127:2017 Information and Documentation -- Foundation and vocabulary

Glossaries, Guidelines, Surveys, and Other Resources

- ACRL Academic Library Trends and Statistics Survey
- Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS)
- Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (DCRM)
- Resource Description and Access (RDA)
- SAA Glossary
- SAA Word of the Week

Born Digital Created and managed in a digital form.

Byte A group of binary digits or bits (usually eight) operated on as a unit. Typically expressed in the following multiples:

- 1 kilobyte (KB) = 1000 bytes, commonly calculated as 2^{10} or 1024 bytes
- 1 megabyte (MB) = 1 million bytes, commonly calculated as 2^{20} bytes or 1,048,576 bytes
- 1 gigabyte (GB) = 10^{9} or 1 billion bytes, commonly calculated as 2^{30} bytes
- 1 terabyte (TB) = 10^{12} or 1,000,000,000,000 bytes, commonly calculated as 2^{40} bytes

Container An enclosure for holding and protecting collection material and from which collection material is typically separated for use. Examples of containers include boxes, drawers, envelopes, folders, portfolios, and slipcases.

Copy A single exemplar or instance of a manifestation.

Derivative A digital file created from another digital file, intended for a purpose different than that of the original file.

Digital Expressed through a sequence of discrete units, especially binary code (i.e. the digits 0 and 1).

Digitized Converted to and managed in a digital form.

Discoverable Refers to any description of collection material that can be discovered by way of the web. Extends well beyond catalog records and finding aids to include a wide range of web content (blog posts, online exhibits, databases, lists of collections, etc.) as well as web-accessible content (documents, spreadsheets, etc.).

Holdings Collection material for which the repository provides sustained stewardship. Holdings consist primarily of collection material that has been formally accessioned by the repository. At the discretion of the repository, holdings may also include collection material that is on deposit at the repository and/or remote resources for which access rights have been acquired, at least for a certain period of time.

Intellectual Unit A coherent set of content, in any form, that can be understood and described as a unit.

Physical Unit A coherent document unit, inclusive of any protective devices, freely movable against other document units. Coherence may be achieved by, for example, binding, encasement, or digital containment. Examples of physical units include audio cassettes, computer discs, microfilm reels, rolls, sheets, video cartridges, and volumes.

Published Offered for sale or issued publicly by a creator or issuing body.

Surrogate A digital or physical copy created for the purpose of minimizing handling of the original and, once created, is what is delivered to users unless their research needs cannot be met by the surrogate.

Title A word or phrase by which the material being described is known or can be identified.

Counting In A Common Language

Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Martha O'Hara Conway * University of Michigan

THREE COUNTS/MEASURES

- Intellectual Units Held
- Physical Space Occupied
- Digital Space Occupied

FOUR CONSIDERATIONS

- Category/Type of Collection Material **(Type)**
- Described Online or Not Yet Described Online **(Discoverability)**
- How Described and Managed **(How Managed)**
- Born Digital or Digitized **(Origination)**

TEN CATEGORIES/TYPES OF COLLECTION MATERIAL

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

INTELLECTUAL UNITS HELD

Recommended Counts

- Count online descriptions of collection material.
- Categorize by (1) type of collection material and (2) how managed.

Optional Counts

- Count not-yet-online descriptions of collection material.
- Categorize by type of collection material.

PHYSICAL SPACE OCCUPIED

Recommended Measures

- Measure physical space occupied by all collection material.
- Categorize, whenever possible, by type of collection material.

Optional Measures

- Distinguish, whenever possible, physical space occupied by collection material that is discoverable from physical space occupied by collection material that is not yet discoverable.

DIGITAL SPACE OCCUPIED

Recommended Counts

- Categorize all files to be counted as Born Digital, Digitized, or Mixed/Unknown Origin.
- Categorize all files to be counted as Discoverable, Not Yet Discoverable, or Mixed/Unknown Discoverability.

Optional Counts

- Categorize all files to be counted, whenever possible, by type of collection material.

R B M S
Rare Books and Manuscripts Section

https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-HCMGuidelines2018_Draft2_2.pdf

SAA SOCIETY OF American Archivists

Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Introduction

Archivists and special collections librarians are becoming increasingly mindful of the need to gather, analyze, and share evidence concerning the value of the collections we hold, the effectiveness of the operations we manage, and the impact of the services we provide. The absence of commonly accepted definitions, metrics, guidelines, and best practices, however, has impeded our ability to undertake meaningful assessment activities and to engage in productive, cross-repository conversations about our collections, operations, and services.

In recognition of this two-pronged challenge, SAA and ACRL/RBMS jointly constituted a task force and charged it with developing guidelines that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The guidelines to be developed should consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held and the different ways collection material is described and managed. The guidelines should also accommodate both basic and advanced counts or measures, and include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment. With this charge in mind, we took the following approach to our work.

We identified eight categories or types of collection material for which we would develop guidelines for quantifying holdings.

- Archives and Manuscripts (described and managed as collections)
- Manuscripts (described and managed as items)
- Books and Other Printed Material
- Cartographic Material
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

We articulated three types of counts or measures that are appropriate for and relevant to the quantification of holdings information.

- Intellectual Units Held (titles or title-equivalents)
- Physical Units Held (volumes, sheets, audio cassettes, film reels, etc.)
- Space Occupied (linear feet, cubic feet, or gigabytes)

We considered the need to distinguish the following:

- Material described and managed at the collection level from material described and managed at the item level.
- Material that is described online and therefore discoverable from material that is not [yet] described online or discoverable.

We then turned our attention to that aspect of our charge that calls for us to articulate an approach to the quantification of holdings that would accommodate both basic and advanced counts or measures. What follows are our recommendations regarding a basic or “Level 1” count.

The Level 1 Count

The Task Force is proposing a Level 1 count that consists of the following counts and measures:

- Titles/title equivalents representing collection material described and managed at the collection level that is described online/discoverable, by category/type of material.
- Titles/title equivalents representing collection material described and managed at the item level that is described online/discoverable, by category/type of material.
- Physical space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by category/type of material, in cubic or linear feet as appropriate.
- Digital space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by category/type of material, in gigabytes.

The above can be summarized as follows.

1. Count intellectual units held. When counting intellectual units held

- count only collection material that is described online (in a catalog record or finding aid, or by way of a website) and therefore discoverable.
- distinguish collection material that is described and managed at the item level from collection material that is described and managed at the collection level.

2. Measure space occupied. When measuring space occupied

- measure only space occupied by collection material that is described online and therefore discoverable.
- distinguish between physical space occupied and digital space occupied.

We would like to draw your attention in particular to the following regarding the proposed Level 1 count.

Collection material that is not described online is not counted. “Described online,” however, is intended to be interpreted very broadly as “any description of collection material that can be discovered by way of the web.” As such, “described online” extends well beyond catalog records and finding aids to include a wide range of web content (blog posts, online exhibits, databases, lists of collections, etc.) as well as web-accessible content (documents, spreadsheets, etc.).

Physical units held (volumes, sheets, audio cassettes, film reels, etc.) are not counted, nor are the containers (boxes, drawers, etc.) in which collection material is held. A container count may be useful -- and used -- for purposes of calculating cubic or linear feet.

Please also note the following regarding space occupied.

- Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both).
- Physical space occupied is
    - reported in cubic feet for all categories of material except Books and Other Printed Material.
    - reported in linear feet for Books and Other Printed Material (only).
- Digital space occupied is reported in gigabytes.
- Convert linear feet to cubic feet and cubic feet to linear feet as necessary for reporting purposes.

More About the Level 1 Count

We are not recommending any methods or even best practices regarding the “hows” of counting or measuring. Our focus has been on developing and promoting a common language for sharing information about holdings rather than on prescribing a methodology for obtaining that information. We have striven to accommodate the wide variety of repositories and libraries that make up the SAA and RBMS memberships, and to account for the many differences among them, especially those having to do with local practices (for accessioning, describing, and managing collection material); available resources (for counting, measuring, generating reports, etc.); and existing systems and sources of information (including integrated library systems, content management systems, databases, and archival collection management systems).

A variety of methods exist for obtaining the counts and measures that are called for in the Level 1 count. These include

- generating a report (from a catalog, database, archival collection management system, etc.)
- doing an actual/physical count/inventory (of containers, volumes, items, etc.)
- getting an actual/physical measurement (of floor, shelf, online, etc. space occupied)
- tracking and tallying (accretions, additions, deaccessions, withdrawals, etc.)

Finally, we are proposing the following regarding surrogates, derivatives, and titles held in multiple copies.

- Surrogates and derivatives (digitized or microfilmed content, photocopies, access copies, etc.) of intellectual units held are not counted.
- Decisions regarding titles held in multiple copies are to be made at the discretion of the reporting institution. If it is preferable (because each copy held is considered unique or important for some reason) and/or practical or convenient (because of how the copies are described), the holding institution can report each copy held as a separate title.

Looking Ahead to a Level 2 Count

Our current thinking is that the Level 2 count will complement and expand upon the Level 1 count by including the following:

- Counts and measures for collection material that is not yet described online.
- Counts of physical units held (volumes, sheets, audio cassettes, film reels, etc.) and of the containers (boxes, drawers, etc.) in which collection material is held.

	Intellectual Units	Space Occupied	
		Physical Space Occupied	Digital Space Occupied
Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections)			
described online/discoverable	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Manuscripts (managed as items)			
described online/discoverable	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Books and Other Printed Material			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	linear feet	gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level	titles/title equivalents		
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Cartographic Material			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level	titles/title equivalents		
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Graphic/Visual Material			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level	titles/title equivalents		
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Moving Image Material			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level	titles/title equivalents		
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Objects/Artifacts			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	n/a

02_Reporting (Level 1 Count)

		Intellectual Units		Space Occupied		
				Physical Space Occupied		Digital Space Occupied
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level		titles/title equivalents		cubic feet		n/a
not [yet] described online/discoverable		[optional]		[optional]		n/a
Sound Recordings						
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level		titles/title equivalents		cubic feet		gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level		titles/title equivalents				
not [yet] described online/discoverable		[optional]		[optional]		[optional]

Categories/Types of Collection Material

The definitions and scope statements presented below are intended to be suggestive as opposed to prescriptive. They are also intended to encompass all content manifestations -- analog, digital, and microform -- of the category or type of collection material.

The actual categorization of existing bibliographic, archival, and other descriptions and representations of collection material will vary, in some ways significantly, from one repository to another. Each repository will have to determine, based upon a variety of factors including the nature and scope its collections and the granularity of available information, how collection material is to be categorized for purposes of preparing a Level 1 holdings count. Regardless of how a repository chooses to categorize its collection material, consistency in the application of categories is critical to producing a meaningful count of intellectual units held and how much physical or digital space they occupy.

Archives and Manuscripts (Managed as Collections)

Definition: Materials created, assembled, or received by a person, family, or organization (including the holding institution itself) that are described and managed at the collection level.

Scope: Includes organizational records, personal and family papers, and collections of mixed material in which unpublished materials predominate.

Manuscripts (Managed as Items)

Definition: Unpublished, primarily textual, usually handwritten or typed material that is described and managed at the item level.

Scope: Manuscripts may take the form of fragments, scrolls, codices, or single or multiple sheets, and are usually produced on papyrus, parchment, or paper.

Books and Other Printed Material

Definition: Materials produced for distribution and intended to be read.

Scope: Materials included in this category are frequently printed on paper but may be printed on other substances, such as parchment or cloth. Most materials in this category are textual, but the category also includes works that present non-textual content in book form.

Cartographic Material

Definition: Representations of the whole or part of the Earth or another celestial body.

Scope: Cartographic material includes maps, globes, and geographic information systems (GIS) data.

Graphic/Visual Material

Definition: Materials that communicate primarily visually, rather than textually.

Scope: Includes opaque and transparent formats including those intended to be projected.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Materials onto which a sequence of images has been recorded that creates the illusion of continuous movement when projected, broadcast, or played back.

Scope: Moving image materials exist in a variety of formats and include film, video, and interactive games that are predominantly comprised of moving images.

Objects/Artifacts

Definition: Material things that can be seen and touched.

Scope: Natural objects, artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose), and three-dimensional works of art.

Sound Recordings

Definition: Materials onto which sound has been recorded.

Scope: Sound recordings exist in a variety of formats and contain spoken words, performed music, and other sounds.

Examples

The thirty-six examples presented below are intended to be illustrative as opposed to prescriptive. They are provided to show how the repository holding the collection material would categorize its description of it for purposes of preparing a Level 1 holdings count. Nineteen of the examples are accompanied by an explication that explains why the repository holding the collection material has categorized it as it has. The links lead to the catalog record, finding aid, or website in which the collection material is described.

Archives and Manuscripts (Managed as Collections)

Title: Alice P. Broudy Papers on Broudy v United States
Physical Description: 38.77 Cubic Feet (86 boxes)

Title: Occupy Philadelphia Records
Physical Description: 19 linear feet (11 boxes) and 41 gigabytes

> Explication: The holding institution has categorized this collection of mixed material as "Archives and Manuscripts (Managed as Collections)." It would count as one title in that category. The physical space occupied by the 11 boxes of collection material would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Archives and Manuscripts (Managed as Collections);" the 41 gigabytes would be included in the holding institution's report of digital space occupied by "Archives and Manuscripts (Managed as Collections)."

Title: Eesti NSV Riikliku Julgeoleku Komitee records, 1932-1991
Physical Description: 16,010 gigabytes (6501 digitized file units)

Manuscripts (Managed as Items)

Title: Letter, [1609 Aug.] to Sermo Principe [i.e., Leonardo Donato, Doge of Venice]
Physical Description: 1 p. In portfolio.

Title: Niagara Falls travel diary
Physical Description: 1 volume

> Explication: The holding institution has created an item-level description for this manuscript. It would count as one title in the "Manuscripts (Managed as Items)" category. The physical space occupied by the volume would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Manuscripts (Managed as Items)."

Title: Treatise on the accurate marking of quadrants
Physical Description: 1 v. ([8] p.) : ill. ; 21 cm.

Books and Other Printed Material

Described and managed at the item level:

Title: The works of Lord Byron : in four volumes
Physical Description: 4 volumes, [4] leaves of plates : illustrations, portrait ; 15 cm.

Explication: The holding institution has created an item-level description for this multipart monograph. It would count as one title in the “Books and Other Printed Material (Described and Managed at the Item Level)” category. The physical space occupied by the four volumes would be included in the holding institution's report, in linear feet, of physical space occupied by “Books and Other Printed Material.”

Title: The diabolical evolution of the chicken
Physical Description: [20] unnumbered pages : color illustrations ; 15 x 15 cm.

Title: The Philadelphia directory and register
Physical Description: xii, 234 p., [1] leaf of plates : ill. ; 22 cm. (8vo)

Explication: The holding institution has created an item-level description for this directory, which it would categorize as “Books and other Printed Material (Described and Managed at the item Level).” The catalog record includes copy-specific notes describing the variances among the five copies of this title that are held. Because this particular holding institution considers each copy held unique, or important for some reason, it would -- if it can easily do so -- count this as five titles rather than one title. A different holding institution might, based on preference or convenience (or both), consider this one title and report it as such. In both cases, the physical space occupied by the five volumes would be included in the holding institution's report, in linear feet, of physical space occupied by “Books and Other Printed Material.”

Title: Necessary disclosures
Physical Description: 1 ball-shaped bookwork ; 6.5 cm in diameter to 9 cm in diameter.
1 plastic box ; 10 x 10 x 10 cm
1 sheet ; 10 x 10 cm

Explication: The holding institution has created an item-level description for this artists’ book, which is in the form of a round fiber ball within a plastic box, with several stacked “pages” within the ball. Despite its non-codex form, the holding institution would count this as one title in the “Books and Other Printed Material (Described and Managed at the Item Level)” category, as it does all artists’ books regardless of form. The physical space occupied by the box would be included in the holding institution's report, in linear feet, of physical space occupied by “Books and Other Printed Material.”

Described and managed at the collection level:

Title: Menus : Michigan : Box M120
Physical Description: 28 items

Explication: The holding institution has created a collection-level description for these menus. Although the catalog record includes a significant amount of item-level information, the fact that these 28 items are represented by a single record compels this particular holding institution to consider the material “described and managed at the collection level” and to count it as one title in the “Books and Other Printed Material (Described and Managed at the Collection Level)” category. The physical space occupied by the box of menus would be included in the holding institution's report, in linear feet, of physical space occupied by “Books and Other Printed Material.”

Title: YMCA pamphlet collection
Physical Description: 14 cubic feet (approximately 2100 pamphlets)

Title: Hoover Institution Library Pamphlet Collection
Physical Description: 54,787 pamphlets

Cartographic Material

Described and managed at the item level:

Title: Duche de Bretaigne / dessigné par le Sieur Hardy
Physical Description: 1 map ; 36 x 49 cm.

Title: Hoover Dam and vicinity
Physical Description: 1 map ; 54 x 43 cm folded to 22 x 10 cm

Explication: The holding institution has created an item-level description for this map. It would count as one title in the "Cartographic Material (Described and Managed at the Item Level)" category. The physical space occupied by the map would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Cartographic Material."

Described and managed at the collection level:

Title: [A collection of 16 maps regarding seal hunting rights in the Bering Sea]
Physical Description: 16 maps on 11 sheets : some color ; sheets 76 x 99 cm or smaller.

Title: 15 minute series (topographic) Nevada
Physical Description: 475 maps : col. ; 45 x 35 cm

Explication: The holding institution has created a collection-level description for this set of maps and would count it as one title in the "Cartographic Material (Described and Managed at the Collection Level) category.The physical space occupied by the maps would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Cartographic Material."

Graphic/Visual Material

Described and managed at the item level:

Title: The Colorado and Southern Railway Company genesis : as of June 30, 1918
Physical Description: 1 technical drawing : ink. on paper ; 1 sheet 61 x 143 cm.

Title: Adenauer : photographic portfolio
Physical Description: 1 volume (1 album box) (0.4 linear feet)

Explication: The holding institution has created an item-level description for this portfolio. Because it consists entirely of photographs, the holding institution considers it "Graphic/Visual Material (Described and Managed at the Item Level)" and would count it as one title in that category. The physical space occupied by the album box would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Graphic/Visual Material."

Described and managed at the collection level:

Title: Francis E. Stafford Photographs
Physical Description: 3 oversize boxes (1.2 linear feet)

Title: [Postcards of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad]
Physical Description: 9 postcards : col. ; 14 x 9 cm.

Title: YMCA lantern slide collection
Physical Description: 1727 slides and 9 volumes (31 boxes)

Explication: The holding institution has created a collection-level description for these lantern slides, which are accompanied by some textual material. For this particular holding institution, it would count as one title in the "Graphic/Visual Material (Described and Managed at the Collection Level)" category, and the physical space occupied by the boxes in which the material is stored would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Graphic/Visual Material." A different holding institution might consider this "mixed material" and count it as "Archives and Manuscripts (Managed as Collections").

Title: Jamey Stillings Photographs
Physical Description: 285 digital files

Explication: The holding institution has created a collection-level description for these digital photographs. Although the photographs are described individually in the finding aid, the 285 files are managed as a collection and would count as one title in the "Graphic/Visual Material (Described and Managed at the Collection Level)" category. The digital space occupied by the files would be included in the holding institution's report, in gigabytes, of digital space occupied by "Graphic/Visual Material."

Title: Warren D. Segraves Architectural Drawings, 1953-1976
Description: 265 project drawings

Explication: The holding institution has created a collection-level description for these architectural drawings. It would count as one title in the "Graphic/Visual Material (Described and Managed at the Collection Level)" category. The physical space occupied by the drawings would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Graphic/Visual Material."

Moving Image Material

Described and managed at the item level:

Title: Silver spike ceremony on the Union Pacific Railroad branch line from Las Vegas to the Boulder City townsite [videorecording] : September 17, 1930
Physical Description: 1 videocassette (ca. 8 min., 50 sec.) : si., b&w ; 1/2 in.

Title: A is for atom B is for bomb
Physical Description: 1 videotape cassette

Explication: The holding institution has created an item-level description for this recording of moving image material. It would count as one title in the "Moving Image Material (Described and Managed at the Item Level)" category. The physical space occupied by the videocassette would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Moving Image Material."

Described and managed at the collection level:

Title: Special events videotapes of the Boston Medical Library, 2000-2014 (inclusive)
Physical Description: 8 VHS videotape cassette recordings and two DVD recordings in 2 letter size document boxes and 1 VHS videotape cassette recording in 1 letter size document box. 2 DVD recordings in 1 half letter size document box.

Explication: The holding institution has created a collection-level description for these moving image materials. It would count as one title in the "Moving Image Material (Described and Managed at the Collection Level)" category. The physical space occupied by the boxes in which the materials are stored would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Moving Image Material."

Title: Herman Axelbank motion picture film collection
Physical Description: 271 motion picture film reels, 1 oversize box (27 linear feet)

Objects/Artifacts

Described and managed at the item level:

Title: Pocket watch purported to belong to John Collins Warren (1778-1856)
Physical Description: Pocket watch, chain, key, and leather pouch purported to belong to John Collins Warren (1778-1856) and gifted via the family line of his daughter, Mary C. Warren (1816-).

Explication: The holding institution has created an item-level description for this artifact. It would count as one title in the "Objects/Artifacts (Described and Managed at the Item Level)" category. The holding institution would include the physical space occupied by the box in which pocket watch and other items are stored in its report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Objects/Artifacts."

Title: Penn's Desk
Physical Description: [secretary desk made in London circa 1710]

Explication: The holding institution's description of a secretary desk formerly owned by William Penn is discoverable by way of a webpage and would count it as one title in the "Objects/Artifacts (Described and Managed at the Item Level)" category. The holding institution would include the physical space occupied by the desk in its report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Objects/Artifacts."

Described and managed at the collection level:

Title: Brotherhood of America Medals
Physical Description: [ten medals]

Title: YMCA Archives memorabilia collection
Physical Description: Approximately 1600 items in 164 boxes

Explication: The holding institution has created a collection-level description for these artifacts. It would count as one title in the "Objects/Artifacts (Described and Managed at the Collection Level)" category. The holding institution would include the physical space occupied by the boxes in which the memorabilia are stored in its report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by "Objects/Artifacts."

Sound Recordings

Described and managed at the item level:

Title: Interview with Elizabeth D. Hay, M.D., 02 April 1991
Physical Description: 1 audio cassette and 1 folder in 1 half letter size document box.

The holding institution has created an item-level description for this sound recording, which is accompanied by a transcript. For this particular holding institution, it would count as one title in the “Sound Recordings (Described and Managed at the Item Level)” category, and the physical space occupied by the document box would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by “Sound Recordings.” A different holding institution might consider this “mixed material” and count it as “Archives and Manuscripts (Managed as Collections”).

Title: Home means Nevada [sound recording] : folklife in the Silver State
Physical Description: 1 sound cassette (76 min.) : analog, mono. + program (4 p. : ill. ; 23 cm.)

Described and managed at the collection level:

Title: Said Hyder Akbar Sound Recordings
Physical Description: 1 manuscript box (0.4 linear feet) (17 cassettes and 25 MiniDiscs)

Title: George T. Chandler Sound Recordings
Physical Description: 1 manuscript box (0.4 linear feet)

Explication: The holding institution has created a collection-level description for these sound recordings. It would count as one title in the “Sound Recordings (Described and Managed at the Collection Level)” category. The physical space occupied by the manuscript box would be included in the holding institution's report, in cubic feet, of physical space occupied by “Sound Recordings.”

a. Born digital and digitized content-related (19 comments)
b. Categories/types of collection material (7 comments)
c. Containers (1 comment)
d. Determining physical and digital space occupied/conducting count and units of measure (21 comments)
e. Discoverability requirement (5 comments)
f. Other (15 comments)

We reviewed feedback (which was helpful in questions that arose during 3-5 meeting):
Categories:
- books or format? Address this
- Mixed materials: Archives and manuscripts managed as collection will have less represented formats

§ Not our mandate to advise institutions on how to deal with this; and it's not practical to separate out less-represented formats

- Artifacts definition – some dissatisfaction here has been addressed

§ Software category created

§ Architectural records – we decided on graphic materials
- Cartographic as real or imagined
- Tubes and rolls – that would be level 2, with boxes

Digital images of objects not getting counted
- Many comments from People wanting to count surrogates; we do not, however
- Digital objects – 3D laser scans can be counted

Assessment in Action: Using Results to Improve the Archival Experience

Midwest Archives Conference
Lexington, Kentucky Annual Meeting
Thursday, May 7, 2015

Evaluating Public Services in Special Collections by Tanya Zanish-Belcher

Good afternoon. I am Tanya Zanish-Belcher, Director of Special Collections & Archives at Wake Forest University and I will be speaking about the assessment of public services in Special Collections & Archives. While preparing this presentation, it struck me how little statistics and numbers can truly capture our day-to-day experiences. Working with donors, teaching a class, meeting with a faculty member—while they may represent a tick of 1 on the numerical scale, what transpires can be so much more deep and meaningful for us as individuals, for our patrons, for our programs.

However, numbers, statistics and surveys are tools, tools which can help us tell our story and share our value with others who may not understand the complexity and significance of what archivists do. This is why assessment should be so important to us. For me, public services are why archives exist—they are why we collect, why we process, why we create finding aids. Assessment and evaluation of our activities in this area fulfill several goals for special collections, for me, the following are primary:

Is Special Collections & Archives worth the investment of resources by the parent institution?

Are we teaching and sharing information and skills which impact our patrons and visitors? Are we improving their learning experience? Are we helping them find the value in our collections for their education?

Flat out, Are we making a difference?

Just to be clear, Wake Forest is not necessarily a leader in assessment; nor am I, but I simply wanted to share some of what we are doing. I hope each of you will take some time and think about how you can introduce or expand your own assessment work and make the numbers, statistics, and surveys work for you.

Z. Smith Reynolds Library

What started this obsession with Assessment? In our case, it really did come from the top. Our Dean decided we needed an Assessment Committee, with the chair being an Associate Dean and the members including the Directors from Access, Reference and Instruction, Resource Services, Special Collections and IT. Our goal was to create a "culture of assessment" through role modeling, communication, education, and setting attainable assessment goals. As an added impetus, Wake Forest also had recently purchased a subscription to Qualtrics, a survey system to which every faculty and staff member has access. We were determined to make assessment happen and met on a regular basis. Some of our goals:

1. Each committee member would set one assessment goal within their annual team goals and execute the assessment. The key word being "execute."

A recent assessment of Personal Research Sessions, coordinated by Reference and Instruction appears here:
http://cloud.lib.wfu.edu/blog/gazette/2015/05/07/what-our-users-are-saying-about-personal-research-sessions/

2. The committee would sponsor educational programs about assessment for the ZSR faculty and staff

3. We deployed LibQUAL+, a suite of services that libraries use to solicit, track, understand, and collect users' opinions of service quality. One of the struggles with LibQual for us as archivists, is ensuring we are included. Fortunately, I was able to include one specific question in regards to Access to rare and historical materials—we are still analyzing the results.

4. In addition to LibQual, our Director of Access Services also submitted a successful proposal to ACRL for their Assessment in Action program. The

initial results have uncovered interesting ways that the building helps or hinders student study.

While the focus of these surveys are on the entire library, it is still possible for me to utilize elements of the findings, and relate them to Special Collections as we plan a major renovation of the Special Collection public spaces. Assessment has also offered me the opportunity to work more closely with my colleagues in the Library, always a good thing!

Resources

User-based assessment is a rapidly growing area of research in archives. Researchers doing work in this area include Anne Bahde, Joan Cherry, Wendy Duff, Christian DuPont, Magia Krause, Doris Malkmus, Aprille McKay, Heather Smedberg, Helen Tibbo, and Beth Yakel. I want to make special note of Archival Metrics (http://archivalmetrics.org/), which is a collaborative project between the University of Michigan, the University of NC and University of Toronto, which provides a number of downloadable toolkits and a bibliography.

Three publications I would recommend for anyone interested in assessing instruction:

Past or Portal? Enhancing Undergraduate Learning through Special Collections and Archives. Edited by Eleanor Mitchell, Peggy Seiden, and Suzy Taraba. Published by the Association of College and Research Libraries, 2012.

*Using Primary Sources: Hands-on Instructional Exercises***.** Edited by Anne Bahde, Heather Smedberg and Mattie Taormina. Santa Barbara, California : Libraries Unlimited, an imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2014. http://www.abc-clio.com/ABC-CLIOCorporate/product.aspx?pc=A4130P

Bahde and Smedberg have also published 2012's "Measuring the Magic: Assessment in the Special Collections and Archives Classroom" in *RBM: Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage*. *September 21, 2012 RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage.* Vol. 13 no. 2 152-174. http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/43935/152.full.pdf?sequence=1

The most exciting development is the recent appointment of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries. The Task Force is "responsible for development of a new standard defining appropriate statistical measures and performance metrics" and is currently working on definitions related to users, visits, reference transactions, collection use, reproductions (includes ILL), events or activities, and website, with a report forthcoming in the next year.
http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-public-services-metrics

When assessment became a priority, my first thought was evaluating the users' experience in instruction, reference services and our online presence. Our short-term goal was to determine whether immediate changes were needed in any of our programming. For the future, my goal is to develop a complete and thorough assessment plan for all of the Department's public services.

And I don't want to discount basic counting! Certainly, we count (especially in a Department which had honestly, never counted anything before). For instruction, we keep track of the number of presentations/type of presentation (in-depth or introduction or topical), section numbers, and number of students. We count all of our visitors, whether they use our collections or not. Again, these are numbers, which when included in our quarterly report can help convince the Dean we are an active and involved Department. But how do we go deeper?

Assessing Instruction

i. Lib100

We have made a real effort to focus our efforts on ZSR's Lib100, which is a for-credit class taught by Library Instruction Faculty. Their initial visit includes a very basic introduction to Special Collections & Archives: who we are, where we are, our collections. We began surveying the groups in 2014 when one of our instructors agreed to request (and **require**) online reflections (in addition to their traditional student evaluations):

- What did you think was the most interesting aspect of our visit to the Special Collections and Archives Reading Room?

- What about special collections/archives do you find confusing or are unsure of?
- How might someone doing research benefit from the use of materials in special collections and/or archives?

The comments were all thoughtful, but what surprised us the most was the amount of confusion over very basic information. And we thought we had done so well! We revised our presentation numerous times, specifically focusing on the areas where the surveys indicated confusion and also expanded our discussion in other areas. The latest round seem to show a better understanding of the information we are trying to share. However, the main challenge has been reminding the instructor to send the evaluation and we have found sending a reminder before the class visit is helpful. We will continue to collect this information to ensure our presentations remain consistent and easy to understand. For the future, we will develop new exercises to better connect the students with the possibilities in archives, and use the evaluations to assess how effective we are.

ii. Faculty

It is also important, from a pedagogical standpoint, to ask our faculty about their experiences. Our Special Collections Librarian conducted her first set of brief surveys with faculty she has worked with over this past semester. She utilized e-mail messages—again, the main challenge is obtaining a response.

Among the questions she asked:

Briefly describe your use of archives and manuscripts in your teaching this semester. (Please describe any assignments).

What were your teaching goals in using archives and manuscripts this term?

What help did you request from us? Please check all that apply.

____Lecturing the class on the use of primary sources (analog or digital)
____Class visit to see particular materials
____Class orientation in preparation for an archival research assignment
____Coordinating a primary source research project in the archives for your students

Please rate how well the following met your teaching needs this past term, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is poor, and 5 is excellent. Indicate N/A if you have no opinion or did not access the service.

_____Reference staff expertise
_____Reference staff availability
_____Instructional space
_____Reading room
_____Finding aids
_____Website
_____Hours of operation
_____Online catalog

We also ask questions relating to how we can assist them better, how long they have utilized archives and manuscripts /rare books in their teaching, and additional information about their status and length of time at the university.

Based on the responses we have received thus far the faculty are pleased with our service and our collections (except our hours), but this remains an area where we need to do more on a consistent basis. We also need to do a better job of evaluating special projects where we have collaborated with faculty, especially focused writing projects and oral histories.

iii. Lib200 classes

Also on our list for evaluation are the Library's 200 classes which focus on research in the Humanities, Social Sciences and the Sciences. I will be co-teaching one of these classes this fall which will include presentations and discussion on locating primary sources, digital humanities, and the use of rare books in research. This will be an excellent opportunity to develop more structured evaluations of both individual presentations, activities, and the long-term impact of a class such as this on student learning. Magia Krause's article "Undergraduates in the Archives: Using an Assessment Rubric to Measure Learning" (*The American Archivist*, Vol. 73, No. 2 (Fall/Winter 2010), pp. 507-534): http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/23290757?uid=3739776&uid=2134&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21106776463373

will be a resource I rely on as we decide what we want to assess—an increase in student understanding? Archival literacy? Do we need pre and post tests to determine these answers? There are many decisions to be made.

At this point, instruction assessment is just in the beginning stages and we plan to implement a more systematic method of collecting data and narratives and illustrating our impact more completely. However, the information we are collecting now, even if it is somewhat limited, has still been extremely helpful as we gauge how well we are doing and where we could do better.

Assessing Reference Services

For many of us, assessing our reference services is a top priority. Before describing how we handle our own, I thought I would briefly mention other programs being used by institutions in the U.S.

The most robust appears to be Aeon, which is being used by Harvard, the University of Kansas and Yale, among others. Its key features include complete reading room management, including online user registration and advance paging, online ordering for digital images and other reproductions, and software for e-mail reference request management. Most importantly, Aeon provides reporting and custom query tools to provide documentation for usage patterns and user communities. Another program is Desk Tracker by Compendium Library Services which is currently being used by over 100 subscribers. The system collects the type of question, contact, patron type, and users can also work with the company to develop specialized modules. Each of these systems has differing capabilities, and archivists must conduct research on what is available and make a choice of what works best, based on your organization's culture and needs.

At Wake Forest, we currently use the LibStats Knowledge Base to collect information about our in-house users. LibStats is an open source web-based Google app for collecting library statistics. Our online requests (using a form) are automatically added to the database. LibStats can produce any number of reports, ranging by patron type, the date of the question, who handled, or which collection was used. Moving from an Access database where everything was entered by hand, LibStats is a dream.

In addition, we collect hard copy out slips and also document our other services (reproduction and ILL). We currently discussing how we can use bar coding in the future to see what collections are being used most?

This summer, we will be upgrading and combine our reference service with Reference and Instruction as we all upgrade to LibAnswers (by Springshare). Special Collections will have its own queue within the system and we hope this will help track conversations, reduce user omissions, and be able to report statistics in more usable format. We have also been discussing the use of LibShare Analytics as we explore more directly evaluating the experiences of our users through individual evaluations and focus groups.

Assessing our Online Services

Lastly, I would like to discuss how we are currently assessing our online presence, including our web site, social media and digital collections. This is still at a very preliminary stage, although that is not stopping us from collecting information.

ZSR IT sends me monthly statistics relating to the Special Collections web site. Using Google Analytics, the information includes pages views for the main page, digital collections and blog posts, in addition to a percentage of the total and bounce rates. There is also a visual graphic showing daily results. While I have not determined long range plans for this statistical information, it does provide a visual snapshot of what web pages our users are visiting.

This kind of information will prove valuable as we continue with page revisions and a major reconfiguration of our digital collections page and institutional repository. These will require more in-depth evaluation of our users, and so we hope to implement a pop-up survey with very basic questions as a way for us to gather initial feedback. Our initial focus will be on our web site structure: Navigation Ease, How easy is content to understand? We also hope to develop in-depth surveys and focus groups focusing on the navigation of our finding aids and digital collections. Our online users are very important to us, and we need to do a much better job of tailoring our offerings in an intuitive and easy to use site.

Conclusions

So, in conclusion, why is assessment important? Special Collections is a significant expense of resources—collections and staff, and it is part of the archivist's responsibility to make sure upper level administrators do not forget your role in the success of the institution. Share your numbers and your stories through blog posts, reports, and other mechanisms. Constantly. Consistently. Annoyingly.

Allow the experiences of your users to drive your programming—what works, what doesn't? What inspires students? What bores them? What makes them curious?

While it important to plan and examine how to use products and resources, don't wait to collect important information NOW—while there are tools available, you don't necessarily need them to start.

It is important to integrate assessment thinking into all aspects of archival programming—whatever you do, some sort of evaluation should occur. This is a significant time commitment, but the information you collect can determine the ultimate success of your program and institution.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Katy Rawdon
Coordinator of Technical Services
Special Collections Research Center
krawdon@temple.edu
@lemurchild
#saa15 #s204

What is SAA-ACRL/RBMS JTF-HCM?

- **Stands for:** SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries.

- Task force put together jointly by the Society of American Archivists and the Rare Books & Manuscripts Section (RBMS) of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), which is a division of the American Library Association.

- A second task force was assembled at the same time: SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries.

- A third joint task force has more recently been convened: SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Primary Source Literacy.

Task Force Membership

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

What is the task force doing?

- Archivists and librarians are increasingly aware of the importance of assessment, but we lack standardized measures.

- Task Force's official charge is to "Develop a set of guidelines -- metrics, definitions, and best practices -- for quantifying holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries, paying particular attention to both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described." (see SAA microsite for full description).

- Task force is convened for two years through the 2016 SAA Annual Meeting, with an option for one additional year.

Work so far

- Meet primarily via conference call, and in person at SAA Annual Meeting, RBMS Conference, and ALA Midwinter (approx. 17 meetings to date).
- Reviewed how we count holdings in our own collections, as well as a "landscape review" of existing categories, vocabularies, and ways of counting – also, *reasons for counting*.
- Posted a call for survey instruments, worksheets, methodologies – and discussed results.
- Discussed (at great length) categories of materials and their definitions – particularly born-digital materials.

Final product

- Guidelines on how to count and measure various types of materials.
- Definitions of and guidance for assigning materials to different categories.
- Tiered approach: Minimum, Optimum, Added Value.
- Possibly (and possibly later…) provide tools for assisting with counting.

Further resources

- ***You're invited to our meeting!*** The Holdings Counts and Measures AND the Public Services task forces meet on Friday at 1pm, Convention Center Room 14
- *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage*, Fall 2012; 13 (2). Special issue on assessment
- SAA microsites for joint task forces (contain descriptions, announcements, members, minutes):

  Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures

  Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services

  Task Force on Primary Source Literacy

Katy Rawdon
Coordinator of Technical Services
Special Collections Research Center
krawdon@temple.edu
@lemurchild

Standards and Best Practices for Metrics: Reports from the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Forces

Emily R. Novak Gustainis, Deputy Director

Center for the History of Medicine, Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine

Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu

Co-chair, SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

2 April 2016

Officers

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

Membership

Adriana Cuervo (SAA), Rutgers University
Rachel D'Agostino (ACRL/RBMS), Library Company of Philadelphia
Elizabeth Haven Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida
Lara Friedman-Shedlov (ACRL/RBMS), University of Minnesota
Angela Fritz (SAA), University of Arkansas Libraries
Lisa Miller (SAA rep), Stanford University
Katy Rawdon (ACRL/RBMS), Temple University
Cyndi Shein (SAA), University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries

http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics#.Vv6ZaXqUIcs

What constitutes a collection?

TASKS	PRODUCT
Create a common understanding of what is being counted	Categories/types of collection material
Determine minimum requirements for reporting holdings	Tiered guidelines for reporting: • bibliographic units (e.g. titles) • physical units (e.g. volumes, sheets, audiocassettes, film reels) • space occupied (e.g. linear feet, cubic feet, gigabytes)
Account for library/archival control differences	Methodology that distinguishes material managed and described at the collection level from material managed and described at the item level
Communicate the accessibility of holdings reported	Methodology that distinguishes material that has been described and is available for use from material that has not been described/is not available for use

CATEGORIES/TYPES OF MATERIALS

Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections)
Manuscripts (managed as items)
Books and Other Printed Material
Cartographic Material
Graphic/Visual Material
Audio Material (music, sound, and spoken word recordings)
Moving Image Material (film, video)
Artifacts/Objects

CAN OCCUPY
physical space or digital space

ARE EITHER
discoverable or not discoverable

Tiered Approach

Level	What Reported
1	Intellectual Units and Physical Space Occupied
2	Intellectual Units , Physical Space Occupied, Physical Units (volumes, containers)
3	Intellectual Units , Physical Space Occupied, Physical Units (volumes, containers and added-value counts)

Implementation Needs

- Explanatory narrative
- Definitions of categories/types of collection material
- Definitions for terminology employed throughout guidelines
- Examples of categories/types from catalog records and other resources
- Container equivalencies chart
- Formats/reference chart
- A “how to…” for collecting data

Timeline

- **April 1-June 30, 2016**: Prepare supporting documentation to accompany Level 1 reporting; submit request to Council for one year extension

- **August 2016**: Distribute Level 1 reporting guidelines and accompanying guidelines at SAA for comment; hold open forum at SAA; begin recruiting repositories to test Level 1 guidelines

- **September 2016-August 2017**: Address community and test repository concerns; draft reporting levels 2 and 3

THANK YOU!

Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu

tions across repositories and raised the question of the role of archives in a greater social justice context.

Josue Sakata from the Boston Public Schools discussed the importance of teaching desegregation to students and the value of primary source analysis in grade school education. He also spoke about the continued need to collaborate with archivists and assist teachers in working with digitized resources. A website was created that pulls resources from several archives and offers lesson plans for teachers: <https://sites.google.com/a/bostonpublicschools.org/desegregation/home>.

Julia Collins Howington and Patricia Reeve from Suffolk University developed a project-based undergraduate course on desegregation. Course OERs and developmental sequence can be viewed at <http://moakleyarchive.omeka.net/hst200>. Students used Moakley Archive materials to learn about the topic while forming primary source analytical skills, and created final digital projects using Omeka. Howington spoke about the importance of staff and faculty participation in developing similar courses. Both she and Reeve emphasized the overall successful outcome of this collaboration.

Marilyn Morgan spoke about a similarly successful course she developed for graduate students in the University of Massachusetts Boston's Archives Track in the History MA program. Course goals included developing historical research skills, subject-area expertise, and digitization and metadata creation knowledge. Students digitized materials from several repositories, notably the City of Boston Archives, and used Omeka to create digital objects and exhibits: <http://bosdesca.omeka.net/>.

2.8 Transcription and Historical Documents as Means to Teach Primary Source Literacy

Speakers: Brantley Palmer, Rodney Obien, Mylynda Gill, and Hayley Lamberson, Keene State College

In this workshop, staff members from Keene State College of New Hampshire discussed their methods and uses of archival material to teach primary source literacy. The panelists provided archival materials, such as passports and love letters for the participants to engage with, allowing the participants themselves to evaluate their own thoughts on literacy and how students learn through these exercises. The archivists discussed their approaches to teaching primary source literacy, using examples from their collections to illustrate their points, including incredibly complex early nineteenth-century mathematics notes. The panelists discussed three main activities they complete with students and primary sources. The first two involve transcription; one method has students transcribe archival records of students' notebooks from the early nineteenth century (found at <http://commons.keene.edu/leavitt/13/>), the second, transcribing correspondence from a husband and wife. The third approach involves focusing these skills on old passports from Jews who escaped Nazi Germany, which allows students to discover context of primary source materials themselves. These different exercises required the students to utilize a variety of tools, for example, researching contexts (i.e., locations and names via the internet) or language usage (using applications such as Google translate). These encouraged participants to situate themselves within the archival materials, promoting primary source literacy. By having patrons engage with primary sources in these new ways, these archivists' work fits into the new ACRL Information Literacy Framework, which emphasizes the process of information creation, research as inquiry, and scholarship as a conversation. All major parts of this new framework are available online at <www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework#process>.

For examples of more of the artifacts and transcriptions, visit Keene State College's website, <http://commons.keene.edu/>.

2.9 Standards and Best Practices for Metrics: Reports from the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Forces

-Mehrdad Kermani

Speakers: Emilie Hardman, Houghton Library, Harvard University; Morgan Swan, Rauner Library, Dartmouth College; Emily Gustainis, Countway Medical Library, Harvard University

The SAA and ACRL/RBMS presented an update on their Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Re-

positories and Special Collections Libraries in one of the final NEA sessions. Emilie Hardman from Harvard University provided an update on the task force's outreach in discovering current practices in data collection at repositories nationwide. Archivists and special collections librarians completed a public services survey which determined that 90.6% collect some sort of data while tracking methods of their data varied considerably with little consistency about the methods and definitions of terms. Through the information collected from the survey, the task force plans to create and share standard definitions for terms (e.g., number of user visits, hours spent in a reading room), guidelines for collecting data, application and examples, recommended metrics, and advanced metrics. By creating a common standard of collecting information, the task force believes statistical analysis within and across repositories will be improved.

Morgan Swan reported that in order to understand primary source literacy among users of repositories, the task force is initially focusing on college/university students and will eventually develop guidelines that are more universal. Currently three subgroups are working to 1) create a standard definition of primary source literacy, 2) develop outcomes and goals through a comprehensive literature review, and 3) develop key concepts based on other subgroup reports for a more comprehensive approach. The primary source task force is currently working on a draft to present in December 2016 and is enthusiastically requesting input from the community for the draft.

Emily Gustainis, co-chair of the task force, explained their recommendation that repositories should take a tiered approach in adding various types of counts in their metrics, such as intellectual units, physical space occupied, physical units, and added-value counts. By implementing one tier at a time, repositories will be able to create a metric plan that is simple, meaningful, and sustainable. In the next couple of months, the task force will prepare supporting documentation for a draft of standards to be made available in August 2016. Then, they plan to engage the community at various forums throughout the year to work on the draft, address concerns, and seek input with the goal of receiving approval by SAA Council and the ACRL Board of Directors in 2017. The panel encourages input from the community by contacting the co-chairs of the task force (Emily Gustainis or Martha Conway) and attending forums and roundtables in 2016 and 2017.

For more information about the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force, including reports, meeting minutes, and other updates, visit:

- <www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-public-services-metrics#.VxIu8P-krK9K>
- <www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/saa-and-acrlrbms-launch-joint-effort-to-dev#.VxI-R_krK9I>

2016 NEA Award Winners

Archival Advocacy (presented by Immediate Past President Jill Snyder)—ProjectARCC presented to founder Casey Davis

A/V Professional Development (presented by Rep-at-Large Jessica Sedgwick)—Adam Schutzman to attend the 2016 Association of Moving Image Archivists Conference

Distinguished Service (presented by Immediate Past President Jill Snyder)—Kathryn Hammond Baker (awarded posthumously) accepted by her daughter Olivia Baker Hale

Professional Development (presented by Rep-at-Large Jessica Sedgwick)—Nicole Topich to attend the 2016 International Conference of Indigenous Archives, Libraries, and Museums

Inclusion and Diversity Session and Travel Award (presented by Inclusion and Diversity Coordinator Anna Clutterbuck-Cook)—Boston Public Schools Desegregation: From Digital Library to Classroom | presenters: Giordana Mecagni, Patricia Reeve, Marilyn Morgan, Josue Sakata, Andrew Elder, and Julia Collins Howington

NEA Member Meeting and Travel Scholarship (presented by Rep-at-Large Abby Cramer)—Rebecca Fullerton*, Allyson Glazier, and Kate Wells

Susan von Salis Student Meeting and Travel Scholarship (presented by Kim Brookes)—Desiree Alaniz and Hayley Lamberson

NEA Member Meeting and Travel Scholarship (presented by Rep-at-Large Abby Cramer)—Rebecca Fullerton, Allyson Glazier, and Kate Wells

Susan von Salis Student Meeting and Travel Scholarship (presented by Kim Brookes)—Desiree Alaniz and Hayley Lamberson

*Rebecca Fullerton also won first prize for the Friday night StorySLAM, Moths in the Archives: Stories from the Stacks, for her story "Donor Serendipity"

Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections

Friday August 21, 2015 1:00pm - 3:00pm

Room 14, Cleveland Convention Center, 300 Lakeside Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44114

User Story #1 (ARL Statistics)

As the head of the special collections unit in a large research library, I need a number for "titles held" and a number for "volumes in library" for the annual ARL Statistics Survey/Questionnaire.

Question 1: Titles Held

Report all instances of titles managed and maintained by the library including cataloged, locally digitized, and licensed resources.

- Report "all instances of titles managed and maintained by the library."
- Report "the total number of titles catalogued and made ready for use."
- Include "special collections materials, government documents, serials and monographs, microforms, computer files, manuscripts and archives, [and] audiovisual materials (cartographic, graphic, audio, film and video, etc.)."

ARL provides the definition of a title. A title is "the designation of a separate bibliographic whole, whether issued in one or several volumes …. 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… When vertical file materials are counted, a file folder is considered a title."

Suggested approaches to answering the question: Counting the 245 field when the library provides stewardship for those resources may be sufficient.

Question 2: Volumes in Library

ARL provides the definition of a volume: A volume is "a single physical unit of any printed, typewritten, handwritten, mimeographed, or processed work, distinguished from other units by a separate binding, encasement, portfolio, or other clear distinction, which has been cataloged, classified, and made ready for use, and which is typically the unit used to charge circulation transactions."

- Include duplicates and bound volumes of periodicals.
- Exclude microforms, maps, nonprint materials, and uncataloged items.

User Story #2 (Audio Digitization)

As the individual responsible for preparing an RFP for the digitization of a large, minimally-processed collection of field recordings (interviews and musical performances), I need to gather and provide information about the types (formats), quantities, and durations of the audio items in the collection. I also need to provide a count of the number of recordings that have transcriptions and that do not.

User Story #3 (Cross-Repository Institutional Survey)

I have been asked to gather information about the holdings of the repository I work for as part of a University-wide survey of special collections, with the idea of aggregating data about all special collections at my institution. The institution I work for is interested in knowing what percentage of its collections are discoverable and how much of

its collections are completely hidden, and well as how much special collections material is in off-site storage. The form I receive asks me to provide:

· The number of, and physical space occupied by, *processed and/or discoverable* manuscripts, collections of personal, professional, and/or family papers, collections of unique formats (such as photograph collections), and collections of records of corporate entities (excluding my own). I am asked to provide a number of gigabytes for born digital records associated with these collections. The collections do not have to be discoverable in the OPAC, but could have a finding aid or another web-discoverable system

· The number of, and physical space occupied by, *unprocessed, and completely hidden* manuscripts, collections of personal, professional, and/or family papers, collections of unique formats (such as photograph collections), and collections of records of corporate entities (excluding my own). I am asked to provide a number of gigabytes for born digital records associated with these collections

· The number of, and physical space occupied by, *processed and/or discoverable* archival series for records of the institution I work for. I am asked to provide a number of gigabytes for born digital records associated with these collections. Institutional records must be discoverable in the OPAC to count as discoverable

· The number of, and physical space occupied by, *unprocessed and/or completely hidden* archival series for records of the institution I work for. I am asked to provide a number of gigabytes for born digital records associated with these record series

· The number, and physical space occupied by, rare books and serials (titles) held by my repository that are *cataloged and in my OPAC* as being held by my repository

· The number of, and space occupied by, rare books and serials (titles) held by my repository that are *not cataloged and not discoverable in my OPAC*

· The amount of physical space occupied by any other holdings, *discoverable or undiscoverable*, that do not fit in the above categories

· The amount of physical space occupied by everything held, both *discoverable and undiscoverable,* that is on-site

· The amount of physical space occupied everything held, both *discoverable and undiscoverable,* in storage somewhere outside of my repository

User Story #3 (Relocation)

As the head of the special collections unit in a large research library, in preparation for relocating some of our collection material to a different building, I need to know the physical extent/space occupied by all of our collections, which include archival and manuscript collections, rare books, maps, posters, objects, framed works of art, and audiovisual material.

I am also asked to project how much physical space my repository is likely to need in this building to add to the collections over the next five-ten years.

User Story #4 (Digital Storage)

My special collections unit is thinking of launching a digital repository (no solution yet selected) for making both its born digital records and the scans of analog collection material public services staff have provided to patrons. Additionally, we have a couple of nineteenth century collections that have been scanned in their entirety as a result of donor funding. I have been asked to provide the:

- Number of gigabytes for entire collections that have been scanned
- The number of gigabytes for born digital records that could be opened to the public
- The number of gigabytes for born digital records that would need to be restricted to members of my repository/institution
- The number of gigabytes for born digital records that have restrictions on them and have to stay hidden in the system (and may also require special security and access options)
- The number of gigabytes for scans of analog collection material (digital surrogates)
- The total number of gigabytes of records on obsolete, external, networked, and cloud storage that could go in the system
- A projected storage (gigabyte) growth rate based on current acquisition patterns for the next two years

User Story #5 (Digitization Survey)

An SAA roundtable wants to send out an online survey to repositories to find out about special collections digitization efforts. Are they only scanning on-demand? Are they scanning whole collections? Who is funding the digitization? Are they doing it in-house or by vendors? What formats are they digitizing?

They also provide a general list of the types of record formats and ask users to estimate what percentage of everything digitized started off as one of these formats. They provide the following example:

- Manuscript material (10% of what has been digitized)
- Maps and atlases (5% of what has been digitized)
- Photographs and other visual works (40% of what has been digitized)
- Rare books (25% of what has been digitized)
- Objects (5% of what has been digitized)
- Sound recordings (10% of what has been digitized)
- Audio-visual material (5% of what has been digitized)

User Story #6 (Processing and Description)

An archivist is processing a big collection containing a lot of different kinds of record formats, including textual paper records, photographs, reprints, manuscript drafts for published and unpublished articles, audio interviews with the collection creator, and the born digital records of the collection creator forensically imaged and extracted

to network storage. There are also fifty CDs of images in the collection of supporting illustrations for publications (both original drawings and scans from other repositories), that have not yet been imaged, only described.

For the MARC record and finding aid, she would like to know what the best way to express the collection's digital extent. Her questions include:

- Should she include the total gigabytes for what is on network storage and the maximum capacity of what is on each CD since she doesn't want to open it until it is imaged?
- Should she differentiate processed and unprocessed digital extent?
- Should she include where the born digital records are kept, such as network vs. on media in the stacks?

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

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

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is responsible for the development of guidelines -- metrics, definitions, and best practices -- for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries, paying particular attention to both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described.

Roster

Martha O'Hara Conway (University of Michigan) (RBMS) (co-chair) moconway@umich.edu
Emily R. Novak Gustainis (Harvard University) (SAA) (co-chair) emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu
Alvan Mark Bregman (Queen's University) (RBMS) alvan.bregman@queensu.ca
Adriana P. Cuervo (Rutgers University) (SAA) adriana.cuervo@rutgers.edu
Rachel A. D'Agostino (Library Company of Philadelphia) (RBMS) rdagostino@librarycompany.org
Lara Friedman–Shedlov (University of Minnesota) (RBMS) ldfs@umn.edu
Angela Fritz (University of Arkansas) (SAA) fritz@uark.edu
Lisa K. Miller (Stanford University) (SAA) lisa.miller@stanford.edu
Katy E. Rawdon (Temple University) (RBMS) krawdon@temple.edu
Cyndi Shein (University of Nevada-Las Vegas) (SAA) cyndi.shein@unlv.edu

Tasks

1. Determine the categories/types of collection material for which we will develop guidelines regarding metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying holdings. Our proposed categories are:

    Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections)
    Books and Other Printed Material
    Cartographic Material
    [Born] Digital Material
    Graphic/Visual Material
    Manuscripts (managed as items)
    Microforms
    Moving Image Material (Film and Video)
    Objects and Artifacts
    Sound Recordings (Audio)

2. For each category/type of collection material

    a. Provide a definition; explain what it includes and what it excludes; address potential problem areas, issues arising from variations in practices; etc.

    b. Propose metrics, best practices, and/or guidelines for getting at the following three counts/measures:
        i. bibliographic units (e.g. titles)
        ii. physical units (e.g. volumes, sheets, audiocassettes, film reels)
        iii. space occupied (e.g. linear feet, cubic feet, gigabytes)

    c. Account for and address the need to distinguish
        i. material managed and described at the collection level from material managed and described at the item level
        ii. material that has been described and is available for use from material that has not been described/is not available for use

3. For all of the above, keep in mind the following:

    a. How we are counting/measuring – many ways to count/measure/get numbers:
        i. generate a report (from a catalog, archival collection management system, etc.)
        ii. do an actual/physical count/inventory (of containers, volumes, items, etc.)
        iii. get an actual/physical measurement (of [floor, shelf, online, etc.] space occupied)
        iv. track and tally (accretions, additions, deaccessions, withdrawals, etc.)
        v. sample and extrapolate (volumes per shelf, items per container. etc.)

    b. Why we are counting/measuring – many reasons for counting/measuring/getting numbers:
        i. for collection management purposes (inventory/security, insurance/risk management)
        ii. for space planning purposes (including transfer to offsite storage facilities, facility renovations, and repository mergers)
        iii. for formal (e.g. ARL Statistics) and informal (e.g. the OCLC survey) reporting needs, including aggregated reporting across multiple repositories at an institution or to ensure institutional compliance (such as IPEDS)
        iv. to inform broad/general-purpose statements about holdings, collection strengths, etc.
        v. to inform cataloging, digitization, processing, rehousing, and other activities/initiatives, including those that are collaborative and/or grant-funded

Proposed Categories/Types of Collection Material and Working Definitions

Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections)

Definition Materials created, assembled, or received by a person, family, or organization (including the holding institution itself), published or unpublished, in any format or formats, described and managed at the collection level as opposed to at the item level.

Books and Other Printed Material

Definition: Materials produced for distribution, reproduced mechanically, and intended to be read.
Scope: Materials included in this category are frequently printed on paper but may be printed on other substances, such as vellum or cloth. Most materials in this category are textual, but the category also includes works that present non-textual content in book form.
Examples: Monographs, serials, music, pamphlets, broadsides, ephemera, graphic novels, artists' books, color-plate books, atlases, and materials embossed for the use of the visually impaired.

Cartographic Material

Definition: Two- and three-dimensional representations of the whole or part of the Earth or another celestial body.
Scope: Cartographic materials include maps (graphic or photogrammetric representations on a flat medium, such as paper) and globes (representations in the form of a [ball or sphere]).

Digital Material

Definition: Items created, managed, or stored in binary format requiring a computer or other electronic device to render it intelligible by a person.
Scope: Digital material can be counted in bytes. This category includes born-digital materials, digital derivatives, and digital surrogates.
Examples: Born-digital material includes documents, images, sound and video, data sets, web sites, and email created in electronic form and saved as digital data, having had no initial or interstitial state as an analog or physical product. Digital derivatives include reformatted, enhanced, or access copies of physical or digital material. Digital surrogates include digitized documents and/or transcripts of such documents created via OCR, whether the digital forms were produced by the record creator or for access by the holding institution.

Graphic/Visual Material

Definition: Materials that communicate primarily visually, rather than textually.
Scope: Includes originals or reproductions. Includes opaque and transparent material. Separate categories exist for counting moving images and objects.
Examples: Architectural materials, charts, drawings, ephemera, paintings, postcards, posters, prints, photographs/still images (positives or negatives), slides, transparencies, and filmstrips.

Manuscripts (managed as items)

Definition: 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

Definition: Any medium, transparent or opaque, that holds highly reduced photographic reproductions (microreproductions).
Scope: Microforms include microfilm, microfiche, ultrafiche, aperture cards, and microcards.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Any sequence of visual images recorded or registered, by whatever means and on whatever medium, that create the illusion of movement when projected, broadcast, or played back, whether or not accompanied by sound.
Scope: It encompasses both live action and animation meant to be viewed as two or three dimensional works and includes all analog and digital formats.
Examples: Includes moving images of all types, e.g., features, shorts, news footage, trailers, outtakes, screen tests, experimental or independent productions, study films or video, home movies, unedited materials, television broadcasts, commercials, spot announcements, ephemeral film (films produced for educational, industrial, training, or promotional purposes), cartographic images intended to be perceived as moving in two dimensions (such as satellite images of the Earth or other celestial bodies in motion), recorded performances of concerts, ballets, plays, etc., and cartridge/disk ("video") and interactive online games that are predominantly comprised of moving images.

Objects and Artifacts

Definition: Material things that can be seen and touched.
Scope: Natural objects, artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose), and three-dimensional works of art.

Sound Recordings

Definition: Materials onto which sound has been recorded via analog or digital methods.
Scope: Sound recordings encompass a wide range of formats, including phonograph records, magnetic tape, compact discs, and digital audio files.These contain spoken words, sound, and/or performed music.
Examples: Cylinders, 78 rpm discs, wire recordings, reel-to-reel tape recordings, cassette tapes, vinyl records, compact discs, mini discs, 8-tracks, Digital Audio Tapes, etc.

Proposed Categories/Types of Collection Material and Working Definitions

Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections)

Definition Materials created, assembled, or received by a person, family, or organization (including the holding institution itself), published or unpublished, in any format or formats, described and managed at the collection level as opposed to at the item level.

Books and Other Printed Material

Definition: Materials produced for distribution, reproduced mechanically, and intended to be read.
Scope: Materials included in this category are frequently printed on paper but may be printed on other substances, such as vellum or cloth. Most materials in this category are textual, but the category also includes works that present non-textual content in book form.
Examples: Monographs, serials, music, pamphlets, broadsides, ephemera, graphic novels, artists' books, color-plate books, atlases, and materials embossed for the use of the visually impaired.

Cartographic Material

Definition: Two- and three-dimensional representations of the whole or part of the Earth or another celestial body.
Scope: Cartographic materials include maps (graphic or photogrammetric representations on a flat medium, such as paper) and globes (representations in the form of a [ball or sphere]).

Digital Material

Definition: Items created, managed, or stored in binary format requiring a computer or other electronic device to render it intelligible by a person.
Scope: Digital material can be counted in bytes. This category includes born-digital materials, digital derivatives, and digital surrogates.
Examples: Born-digital material includes documents, images, sound and video, data sets, web sites, and email created in electronic form and saved as digital data, having had no initial or interstitial state as an analog or physical product. Digital derivatives include reformatted, enhanced, or access copies of physical or digital material. Digital surrogates include digitized documents and/or transcripts of such documents created via OCR, whether the digital forms were produced by the record creator or for access by the holding institution.

Graphic/Visual Material

Definition: Materials that communicate primarily visually, rather than textually.
Scope: Includes originals or reproductions. Includes opaque and transparent material. Separate categories exist for counting moving images and objects.
Examples: Architectural materials, charts, drawings, ephemera, paintings, postcards, posters, prints, photographs/still images (positives or negatives), slides, transparencies, and filmstrips.

Manuscripts (managed as items)

Definition: 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

Definition: Any medium, transparent or opaque, that holds highly reduced photographic reproductions (microreproductions).
Scope: Microforms include microfilm, microfiche, ultrafiche, aperture cards, and microcards.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Any sequence of visual images recorded or registered, by whatever means and on whatever medium, that create the illusion of movement when projected, broadcast, or played back, whether or not accompanied by sound.
Scope: It encompasses both live action and animation meant to be viewed as two or three dimensional works and includes all analog and digital formats.
Examples: Includes moving images of all types, e.g., features, shorts, news footage, trailers, outtakes, screen tests, experimental or independent productions, study films or video, home movies, unedited materials, television broadcasts, commercials, spot announcements, ephemeral film (films produced for educational, industrial, training, or promotional purposes), cartographic images intended to be perceived as moving in two dimensions (such as satellite images of the Earth or other celestial bodies in motion), recorded performances of concerts, ballets, plays, etc., and cartridge/disk ("video") and interactive online games that are predominantly comprised of moving images.

Objects and Artifacts

Definition: Material things that can be seen and touched.
Scope: Natural objects, artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose), and three-dimensional works of art.

Sound Recordings

Definition: Materials onto which sound has been recorded via analog or digital methods.
Scope: Sound recordings encompass a wide range of formats, including phonograph records, magnetic tape, compact discs, and digital audio files.These contain spoken words, sound, and/or performed music.
Examples: Cylinders, 78 rpm discs, wire recordings, reel-to-reel tape recordings, cassette tapes, vinyl records, compact discs, mini discs, 8-tracks, Digital Audio Tapes, etc.

Reporting Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures
for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Introduction
The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is responsible for the development of guidelines that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum (Level 1) counts and measures and advanced/optimum counts and measures (Level 2) and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

With this charge in mind, we:

- Identified eight categories or types of collection material to guide reporting, regardless of whether those materials are physical or electronic (see attached)

- Articulated three types of counts or measures that are appropriate for and relevant to the quantification of holdings information

    - Intellectual Units Held (titles or title-equivalents)
    - Physical Units Held (volumes, sheets, audiocassettes, film reels, etc.)
    - Space Occupied (linear feet, cubic feet, or gigabytes)

- Considered the need to distinguish between the following:

    - Material described and managed at the collection level from material described and managed at the item level
    - Material that is described online and therefore discoverable from material that is not [yet] described online or discoverable

Our focus has been on developing and promoting *a common language to communicate holdings* so that we can talk about and share information about what we hold, *not on prescribing a methodology for obtaining that data.*

About the Level 1 Count
The myriad of systems, standards, and local practices governing how archival repositories and special collections libraries perform their work has created a unique information environment that prohibits any one practice for individual entities to compile the data necessary to satisfying Level I reporting criteria (described below). Our institutions vary, not just by collection management system or ILS (if one is even available), but by purpose of the repository, size and types of collect held, staffing levels, financial resources, and communities served. Most important, the data we collect--including data compiled about our holdings--reflects specific local needs and utilities. As a Task Force, we recognize that repositories will seek to utilize pre-existing data for the purpose of meeting Level I reporting criteria.

The following principles govern the use of the guidelines:

- Online descriptions of holdings need not be limited to catalog records or finding aids to be discoverable. To achieve the broadest participation possible, a description can be web content (such as a blog post or list of collections on a website), a PDF, a spreadsheet, or another declaration of holdings, as long as it is publicly available online

- Do not count bibliographic units or space occupied for any holding more than once

- Do not count surrogates of collection materials held by the repository and counted elsewhere, or derivatives in general, including access copies and/or preservation masters of digital objects, microfilmed collections, microfiche, or photocopies of holdings created post-acquisition

- Specific format categories of materials apply only if a holding is comprised of a single format

- Cubic feet should be used to report all holdings except for books and other printed material, which should be reported in linear feet

- A container count (number of manuscript cases, records center cartons, shelving units, other) is not part of reporting physical space occupied; however, container counts are useful for the purposes of calculating cubic feet occupied and using existing conversion tools. Containers are not holdings

Level 1 Count
The Task Force is proposing a Level 1 Count that consists of the following counts and measures (only):

- Titles/title equivalents representing collection material described and managed at the collection level that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material

- Titles/title equivalents representing collection material described and managed at the item level that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material

- Physical space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material, in cubic or linear feet as appropriate

- Digital space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by type/category of material, in gigabytes

Level I count summary:

- Provide/report counts and measures only for collection material that is described online and therefore discoverable

- Distinguish collection material that is described and managed at the item level from collection material that is described and managed at the collection level

- Provide/report counts of intellectual units held

- Provide/report measures of space occupied

- Do not provide/report counts of physical units held

Level 2 Count (Proposed)

- Counts and measures for collection material that is not yet described online or discoverable will be reported in a Level 2 Count

- Counts of physical units held are to be provided/reported in a Level 2 Count

- Level 2 counts can be considered analogous to parallel and/or multiple extent statements

Categories/Types of Collection Material: Working Definitions

Archives and Manuscripts (Managed as Collections)

Definition: Materials created, assembled, or received by a person, family, or organization (including the holding institution itself) that are described and managed at the collection level.

Scope: Includes organizational records, personal and family papers, and collections of mixed material in which unpublished materials predominate.

Manuscripts (Managed as Items)

Definition: Unpublished, primarily textual, usually handwritten or typed material that is described and managed at the item level.

Scope: Manuscripts may take the form of fragments, scrolls, codices, or single or multiple sheets, and are usually produced on papyrus, parchment, or paper.

Books and Other Printed Material

Definition: Materials produced for distribution and intended to be read.

Scope: Materials included in this category are frequently printed on paper but may be printed on other substances, such as parchment or cloth. Most materials in this category are textual, but the category also includes works that present non-textual content in book form.

Cartographic Material

Definition: Representations of the whole or part of the Earth or another celestial body.

Scope: Cartographic material includes maps, globes, and geographic information systems (GIS) data.

Graphic/Visual Material

Definition: Materials that communicate primarily visually, rather than textually.

Scope: Includes opaque and transparent formats including those intended to be projected.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Materials onto which a sequence of images has been recorded that creates the illusion of continuous movement when projected, broadcast, or played back.

Scope: Moving image materials exist in a variety of formats and include film, video, and interactive games that are predominantly comprised of moving images.

Objects/Artifacts

Definition: Material things that can be seen and touched.

Scope: Natural objects, artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose), and three-dimensional works of art.

Sound Recordings

Definition: Materials onto which sound has been recorded.

Scope: Sound recordings exist in a variety of formats and contain spoken words, performed music, and other sounds.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries : Level 1 Guidelines

	Intellectual Units	Space Occupied	
		Physical Space Occupied	Digital Space Occupied
Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections)			
described online/discoverable	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Manuscripts (managed as items)			
described online/discoverable	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Books and Other Printed Material			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	linear feet	gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level	titles/title equivalents	linear feet	gigabytes
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Cartographic Material			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Graphic/Visual Material			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Moving Image Material			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	gigabytes
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	[optional]
Objects/Artifacts			
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	n/a
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level	titles/title equivalents	cubic feet	n/a
not [yet] described online/discoverable	[optional]	[optional]	n/a
Sound Recordings			

		Intellectual Units		Space Occupied		
				Physical Space Occupied		Digital Space Occupied
described online/discoverable and managed at the item level		titles/title equivalents		cubic feet		gigabytes
described online/discoverable and managed at the collection level		titles/title equivalents		cubic feet		gigabytes
not [yet] described online/discoverable		[optional]		[optional]		[optional]

JTF-HCM – SAA 2017

Closed session, 1:00-3:00

In attendance: Katy, Adriana, Haven, Lisa, Emily

Agenda:

1. Review report for Standards Committee (today, 5:00-7:00)
2. Objective for talking to SAA members
3. Review feedback and be prepared to discuss what kinds of questions/comments came in

    a. Born digital and digitized content-related (19 comments)
    b. Categories/types of collection material (7 comments)
    c. Containers (1 comment)
    d. Determining physical and digital space occupied/conducting count and units of measure (21 comments)
    e. Discoverability requirement (5 comments)
    f. Other (15 comments)

4. Review timeline
5. Look at report outline

Counting In A Common Language

Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Martha O'Hara Conway * University of Michigan

THREE COUNTS/MEASURES

- Intellectual Units Held
- Physical Space Occupied
- Digital Space Occupied

FOUR CONSIDERATIONS

- Category/Type of Collection Material **(Type)**
- Described Online or Not Yet Described Online **(Discoverability)**
- How Described and Managed **(How Managed)**
- Born Digital or Digitized **(Origination)**

TEN CATEGORIES/TYPES OF COLLECTION MATERIAL

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

INTELLECTUAL UNITS HELD

Recommended Counts

- Count online descriptions of collection material.
- Categorize by (1) type of collection material and (2) how managed.

Optional Counts

- Count not-yet-online descriptions of collection material.
- Categorize by type of collection material.

PHYSICAL SPACE OCCUPIED

Recommended Measures

- Measure physical space occupied by all collection material.
- Categorize, whenever possible, by type of collection material.

Optional Measures

- Distinguish, whenever possible, physical space occupied by collection material that is discoverable from physical space occupied by collection material that is not yet discoverable.

DIGITAL SPACE OCCUPIED

Recommended Counts

- Categorize all files to be counted as Born Digital, Digitized, or Mixed/Unknown Origin.
- Categorize all files to be counted as Discoverable, Not Yet Discoverable, or Mixed/Unknown Discoverability.

Optional Counts

- Categorize all files to be counted, whenever possible, by type of collection material.

RBMS
Rare Books and Manuscripts Section

https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-HCMGuidelines2018_Draft2_2.pdf

SAA SOCIETY OF American Archivists

SAA and ACRL/RBMS Launch Joint Effort to Develop Standardized Statistical Measures for Holdings Counts and Public Services

As archivists and special collections librarians, we are becoming increasingly mindful of the need to gather, analyze, and share evidence concerning the effectiveness of the operations we manage and the impact of the services we provide. Yet the absence of commonly accepted statistical measures greatly impedes our ability to conduct meaningful assessment initiatives and the evaluation and establishment of best practices. Recognition of this two-pronged challenge has manifested itself in a number of ways including an assessment-themed issue of *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage*; assessment-related sessions at the meetings of our professional associations including ALA and SAA; presentations centered on special collections at the biennial ARL-sponsored Library Assessment Conference; and grant-supported initiatives led by ACRL, ARL, and other organizations to help our allied professions to build and foster a culture of assessment and to demonstrate the value that libraries and archives bring to their communities and society at large.

Within this context, SAA and the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) of ACRL have appointed two joint task forces charged with developing standards that will define statistical measures for describing the extent of collection holdings and common public services operations in archival repositories and special collections libraries. Each task force consists of ten members, five appointed by SAA and five appointed by ACRL/RBMS, including co-chairs representing each organization.

Emily Novak Gustainis (Harvard University) and Martha O'Hara Conway (University of Michigan) are co-chairing the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries, which is charged with developing guidelines that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying collection holdings. The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries, co-chaired by Amy Schindler (University of Nebraska Omaha) and Christian Dupont (Boston College), is charged with developing statistical measures and related metrics for evaluating and comparing public services within and across institutions, including visitor and paging counts, reference transactions, reproduction orders, and events.

The task forces will hold open meetings at SAA Annual and ALA Midwinter and Annual meetings. The task forces will maintain their agenda, minutes, and working documents on their respective Holdings Counts and Public Services microsites hosted on the SAA website. They will aim to complete their draft standards by August 2016 for review by the SAA and ACRL standards committees and eventual approval by SAA Council and the ACRL Board of Directors. Because the standards development processes will involve consultation with SAA and RBMS members and experts from other organizations, there will be many opportunities for your participation. Please feel free to contact any of the co-chairs with your comments or questions.

Group News Item

- Announcing the Revised Draft Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (2018)
- Call for Survey Instruments -- Holdings Counts and Measures

Group Page

- Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Appendix C
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Appendix B
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Appendix A
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Conducting the Counts and Measures
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Physical Space Occupied
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Digital Space Occupied
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Intellectual Units Held
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Overarching Approach
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Audience and Purpose

1 2 next › last »

Group News Item (4) | Group Page (15)

Login to post comments

UPDATED: 2014-10-08

What Are Archives?
Standards
Archival Organizations
Archival Consultants
Resources

Who We Are
Benefits of Membership
Awards & Scholarships
Governance
SAA Foundation
Contact Us

SAA Career Center
Professional Development
Explore a Career in Archives

Annual Meeting
Continuing Education
Certificate Programs
Graduate Archival Education

Privacy & Confidentiality • Contact Us
Copyright © 1997-2019 by SAA. All rights reserved.

Publications

Bookstore
American Archivist
Archival Outlook
In the Loop
Book Publishing
Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology
Case Studies
More Resources

Advocacy

Public Policy
Public Awareness
Within Your Institution
Archives Change Lives
MayDay!
Suggest SAA Advocacy Action

Membership

Join / Renew
Resources
Groups
SAA Connect
Students

From:	Emily R. Novak Gustainis <Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu> via
To:	SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Metrics
Subject:	[jtf-holdings] FW: Questions for tomorrow
Date:	Monday, December 8, 2014 1:30:41 PM
Attachments:	RBMS_SAA TF on holdings metrics data requested 20141208.xlsx

---

Emily R. Novak Gustainis
Head, Collections Services
Center for the History of Medicine
Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine
Harvard Medical School
emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu / 617.432.7702
Website / Blog / Omeka / A partner in the Medical Heritage Library

---

From: Dooley,Jackie [mailto:dooleyj@oclc.org]
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2014 1:15 PM
To: Gustainis, Emily
Cc: Martha Conway
Subject: Re: Questions for tomorrow

Thanks, Emily. Attached is a spreadsheet with the data in response to your first question. The survey included a question at the end of each online page that asked "Any additional comments about this page?"--which is something I recommend to any survey designer! :)

Looking forward to the rest of the questions.

--Jackie

--
Jackie Dooley
Program Officer, OCLC Research

From: <Gustainis>, Emily Gustainis <emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu>
Date: Monday, 8December, 2014 5:44 AM
To: dooleyj <dooleyj@oclc.org>
Cc: Martha Conway <moconway@umich.edu>
Subject: Questions for tomorrow

Hi Jackie,

Hope this finds you well.

The JFT is having a conference call this afternoon to finalize questions, however, wanted to send along what we had so far:

1. What kinds of comments, questions, concerns, etc. did you get from survey participants about Question 11 and Question 12 and Questions 41-48? These are the questions that require survey participants to think about -- and quantify -- holdings

2. How do you think responses and/or recommendations might have differed if the survey had included a larger number of non-academic repositories (museums, historical societies, corporate archives)?

3. Do you think that the small number of digital collections holdings reported (pp. 10-11) is because of an actual lack of digital holdings, or because of a lack of comfort in recording digital materials - and maybe the lack of a standard way to count it?

4. Pros and cons on counting digital materials as a lump whole, versus formats of material (photos, video, documents) that are digital - or an option for both?

5. Unrelated to the OCLC paper: Having been involved in the creation the EAD standard, do you have any advice, recommendations, warnings in our creation of the counts and holdings standard?

Thanks so much, and looking forward to tomorrow,

Emily

Emily R. Novak Gustainis
Head, Collections Services
Center for the History of Medicine
Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine
Harvard Medical School
emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu / 617.432.7702
Website / Blog / Omeka / A partner in the Medical Heritage Library

---

You are currently subscribed to the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Metrics as: emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu

To unsubscribe or to change your list settings, please visit:
http://saa.archivists.org/scripts/4disapi.dll/4DCGI/person/ListServ.html

From: SAA Headquarters
To: Gustainis, Emily
Subject: In the Loop for Wednesday, September 24, 2014
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2014 10:04:21 AM

How Are You Celebrating Archives Month?

September 24, 2014
View this email in your browser

In the Loop - SAA's Biweekly Newsletter

Deadlines • Jobs

Annual Meeting • Archives in the News • Around SAA • Around the Profession
Continuing Education • Publications

How Are You Celebrating Archives Month?

The California State Archives is hosting three Archives Month events in October at the California Secretary of State's building. The State Archives will host an open house as part of the fourth annual Sacramento Archives Crawl. The full-day event with the theme "Having Fun in the Sacramento Region" will showcase local

historical treasures. The archives is also hosting a Digital Archives Day for the Family Historian and a Preservation Workshop. For more information, see the latest issue of *California Originals*, the California State Archives' quarterly newsletter.

The Austin Archives Bazaar will feature booths with twenty-two Central Texas archives showing off their collections as well as an archival film screening, an oral history booth, a preservation station, and more.

October 10 Is Electronic Records Day

Join the Council of State Archivists in celebrating Electronic Records Day on 10/10! E-records Day is an opportunity to share information about what you're doing to manage your state's digital resources and enlist help in preserving electronic records. CoSA has put together informational flyers for affiliated stakeholders and external stakeholders, as well as Survival Strategies for Personal Digital Records, Tips for Government Agencies Working with Electronic Records, and Ten Reasons Why Electronic Records Need Special Attention.

top ▲

AROUND THE PROFESSION

ARL/SAA Mosaic Program Fellows Selected for 2014-2016
SAA and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) selected five master of library and information science students specializing in archives to participate in the 2014-2016 ARL/SAA Mosaic Program. Funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services, this program reflects the joint commitment of SAA and ARL to promote much-needed diversification of the archives and special collections professional workforce.

From NARA: Additional Guidance on Managing Email Released
A September 15 communication from the Office of Management and Budget and NARA reinforces the importance of each agency managing its email properly and includes NARA Bulletin 2014-06, which reminds agency heads of existing NARA guidance and resources to assist in managing email.

Newberry Library Fellowship Program Accepting Applications
The Newberry Library Fellowship Program supports researchers using Newberry's collection. Long-term fellowships of four to twelve months assist individual scholarly research and participation in Newberry's scholarly activities. Short-term fellowships of one to two months primarily assist researchers who need to examine specific items in the collection. *Deadline for long-term fellowship applications: December 1, 2014. Deadline for short-term fellowship applications: January 15, 2015.*

Call for Applications: 2015 UCLA Short-term Research Fellowships
The UCLA Library Special Collections Short-term Research Fellowships Program supports the use of special collections materials by visiting scholars and UCLA graduate students. Materials in the humanities and social sciences, medicine, life and physical sciences, visual and performing arts, and UCLA history are available for research. Several opportunities are available; for deadlines and further information, visit the UCLA Library website.

Consumer Movement Archives Offering Research Award
The Consumer Movement Archives (CMA) at Kansas State University is offering a $3,000 research award to study the consumer movement. The recipient is expected to complete a scholarly product that would include a visit to the CMA next year to use its multidisciplinary holdings. *Deadline for applications: January 30.*

Call for Applicants: 2015 ALI
With support from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the Archives Leadership Institute (ALI) at Luther College provides advanced leadership training and mentorship for twenty-five innovative archival leaders, giving them the knowledge and tools to transform the profession in practice, theory, and attitude. The 2015 application is now open. *Deadline for applications: November 30.*

top ▲

ANNUAL MEETING

October 8 Is the Deadline for 2015 Annual Meeting Session Proposals
Read the full Call for Proposals for *ARCHIVES 2015* in Cleveland and remember: *The deadline for proposals is 11:59 p.m. on Wednesday, October 8.*

2014 Conference Recordings Available on MP3
SAA members now can have access to all recorded sessions at the 2014 Joint Annual Meeting via MP3 files that can be played on your MP3 player, smartphone, or tablet. (Based on speaker preference, not all presentations were recorded.) You'll receive an email with a link and passcode upon completing your order. Purchase the conference recordings for just $29.99 via the SAA Bookstore.

top ▲

AROUND SAA

August Foundation Board Meeting Minutes Adopted
Browse the August 15 SAA Foundation Board meeting minutes.

August Council Meeting Minutes Adopted
Browse the August 11-12 and 16 Council meeting minutes.

SAA and ACRL/RBMS Launch Joint Effort to Develop Standards
SAA and the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) of ACRL launched two joint task forces charged with developing standards that will define statistical measures for describing the extent of collection holdings and common public services operations in archival repositories and special collections libraries.

Women Archivists Roundtable Hosting Live Tweet
The "Lean In Too Live Tweet" this Friday, September 26, 12:00 to 3:00 p.m. (Eastern), will focus on Sheryl Sandberg's bestselling book *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead* and the criticisms that the book's message lacks diverse perspectives. Use #SAAWAR to participate.

Have You Used the SAA Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning?
If so, the Technical Subcommittee on Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning (TS-GRD) wants to hear from you. Whether you've used the guidelines in a small way or on a grand scale, your experiences will assist TS-GRD in promoting and reviewing the guidelines. If you have experience, contact TS-GRD Chair Laura Uglean Jackson, or visit the group's microsite for more information.

top ▲

ARCHIVES IN THE NEWS

"Bulk of Sendak Collection Leaving Rosenbach"
Philadelphia's Rosenbach Museum and Library began building a relationship with Maurice Sendak—the famed author and illustrator best known for *Where the Wild Things Are*—early in his career and today houses about 10,000 items of Sendakiana. But Sendak, who died in 2012, never gifted most of these items to the Rosenbach, and Sendak trustees have asked that the collection be returned to them.

"Risque Business: KC Library Collects Relics from Theater's Burlesque Past"
The *Kansas City Star* reports that the city's Folly Theater—which opened in 1900 as a vaudeville house that also showcased burlesque—has donated thousands of business records, posters, autographed glamour publicity photos, contracts, and other items from its 114-year history to the Kansas City Public Library.

"GPO Items Findable in DPLA"
More than 148,000 items from the Government Printing Office's Catalog of U.S. Government Publications are now also available through the Digital Public Library of America, including the Federal Budget; laws such as the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Federal regulations; and Congressional hearings, reports, and documents, according to this DPLA blog post.

top ▲

PUBLICATIONS

Reviewers Wanted for *The American Archivist* Reviews Portal
The Reviews Portal changes frequently, hosting new content in Archival Technologies and Resources (a list of websites useful for archivists working with digital archival materials) and Reviews (reviews of digital and digitized archival content, technologies, and related resources). You're invited to contribute a review. Contact Reviews Portal Coordinator Alexandra Orchard.

top ▲

JOBS

Attention, Job Seekers!
Here are the latest career opportunities posted to SAA's *Online Career Center.* Click here to view all postings.

Director, Special Collections
University of Arizona (Tucson)

Metadata and Technical Services Archivist
Smith College (Northampton, MA)

Assistant Archivist
University of Wyoming, American Heritage Center (Laramie)

Digital Media Archivist
Tulane University (New Orleans)

Special Collections Librarian
United States Golf Association (Far Hills, New Jersey)

Archivist (Specialist II) (Temporary)
The New York Public Library (New York City)

Project Archivist
Archives of the Catholic Archdiocese of Seattle

Temporary Project Archivist
Baltimore Museum of Art

Curator of Special Collections and University Archivist
Pittsburg State University (Pittsburg, KS)

Assistant University Archivist for Public Services
Princeton University Library (Princeton, NJ)

Head, Collection Access
Canadian Centre for Architecture (Montréal, Quebec)

Head of Special Collections
University of Houston Libraries

Archivist
Sealaska Heritage Institute (Juneau, AK)

Executive Director
Presbyterian Historical Society (Philadelphia)

College Archivist
Florida Southern College (Lakeland)

Archivist for Special Collections
University of California, Irvine Libraries

Director of Special Collections and the John Hay Library
Brown University (Providence, RI)

View all jobs

top ▲

DEADLINES

Oct. 1 Letter of Inquiry for the 2015 GRAMMY Foundation Grant Program

Oct. 8 ARCHIVES 2015 Session Proposals

Nov. 30 Archives Leadership Institute Applications

Dec. 1 Newberry Long-Term Fellowship Applications

Dec. 3 Sustaining Cultural Heritage Grant Applications

Jan. 15 Newberry Short-Term Fellowship Applications

Jan. 30 Consumer Movement Archives Research Award Applications

Early-Bird Deadlines

Sept. 24 Digital Curation: Creating an Environment for Success [DAS]
Santa Fe, NM, Oct. 20

Sept. 24 Digital Curation Planning and Sustainable Futures [DAS]
Santa Fe, NM, Oct 21

Sept. 24 Developing Specifications and RFPs for Recordkeeping Systems [DAS]
Santa Fe, NM, Oct. 22

Sept. 24 Arrangement and Description of Electronic Records, Parts I and II [DAS]
Santa Fe, NM, Oct. 23–24

Sept. Appraisal of Electronic Records [DAS]

24	Riverside, CA, Oct. 24
Sept. 24	Digital Curation Planning and Sustainable Futures [DAS] Emporia, KS, Oct. 24
Sept. 27	Oral History: From Planning to Preservation Dallas, TX, Oct. 27
Sept. 30	Reappraising and Deaccessioning Archival Materials from Start to Finish East Lansing, MI, Oct. 30
Oct. 5	Accessioning and Ingest of Electronic Records [DAS] Athens, GA, Nov. 5
Oct. 7	Managing Architectural, Design, and Construction Records Chicago, IL Nov. 6–7
Oct. 7	Copyright Issues for Digital Archives [DAS] Pittsburgh, PA, Nov. 7
Oct. 7	Digital Archives and Libraries [DAS] Fairfax, VA, Nov. 7

top ▲

CONTINUING EDUCATION

SAA Course and Workshop Scholarships!
The Missouri State Archives is providing full registration scholarships to archivists, records managers, librarians, or information professionals via the 2014–2015 Missouri Historical Records Advisory Board SNAP grant. Preference will be given to persons (living or working in Missouri) whose positions relate directly to the workshop topic and whose institutions have restrictions on out-of-state travel.

Register now for this exciting offering:

- Nov. 5: Preserving Digital Archives [DAS]

Be sure to check the Education Calendar as additional offerings become available:

- Mid-April 2015: Privacy and Confidentiality Issues [DAS]
- Mid-June 2015: Preservation and Identification of 20th-Century Visual Materials
- October 2015: Real-World Reference: Moving Beyond Theory

DAS Comprehensive Exam
The next round of DAS Comprehensive Examinations is scheduled for November 10 in the following locations:

- Metropolitan New York Library Council (METRO) (New York City)
- George Mason University (Fairfax, VA)
- Andersen Libraries (Minneapolis, MN)
- SAA Office (Chicago, IL)
- Texas State Archives (Austin, TX)
- Atlanta, GA (location TBD)

Salt Lake City, UT (location TBD)
- University of California, Los Angeles, Library

Registration for the November 10 exam has opened. If your deadline to complete the DAS coursework and Comprehensive Exam comes up prior to the November 10 exam date, or if you have any questions regarding registration, please contact us at education@archivists.org.

Mark Your Calendars: Upcoming Web Seminars

- Oct. 7: Records Management for Archivists [Register Now!]
- Oct. 23: EAD3: What's New?
- Nov. 4: Archival Content Management Systems [DAS]

DAS Courses and Continuing Education Workshops
For an up-to-date schedule of courses and workshops in 2014–2015, see the SAA Education Calendar.

Sept. 29 Managing Electronic Records in Archives and Special Collections [DAS]
Tucson, AZ

Oct. 3 Fundamentals of Acquisition and Appraisal
Austin, TX

Oct. 6 Digital Curation: Creating an Environment for Success [DAS]
Cambridge, MA

Oct. 6 Preserving Digital Archives [DAS]
Honolulu, HI

Oct. 7 Records Management for Archivists
Web Seminar

Oct. 10 Managing Electronic Records in Archives and Special Collections [DAS]
Honolulu, HI

Oct. 10 Implementing "More Product, Less Process"
Denton, TX

Oct. 17 Digital Repositories [DAS]
Boone, NC

Oct. 20 Digital Curation: Creating an Environment for Success [DAS]
Santa Fe, NM

Oct. 21 Digital Curation Planning and Sustainable Futures [DAS]
Santa Fe, NM

Oct. 22 Developing Specifications and RFPs for Recordkeeping Systems [DAS]
Santa Fe, NM

Oct. 23–24 Arrangement and Description of Electronic Records, Parts I and II [DAS]
Santa Fe, NM

Oct. 24 Appraisal of Electronic Records [DAS]
Riverside, CA

Oct. 24 Digital Curation Planning and Sustainable Futures [DAS]
Emporia, KS

Oct. 27 Oral History: From Planning to Preservation
Dallas, TX

Oct. 30 Reappraising and Deaccessioning Archival Materials from Start to Finish
E. Lansing, MI

SAA also offers online, on-demand web seminars and CDs of web seminars.

Plan a DAS Course or Continuing Education Workshop at Your Institution!
Become an SAA education host! Visit the education catalog and choose from sixty-plus available courses and workshops. Be sure to allot enough time to ensure your course/workshop instructor is available and to publicize your offering for maximum exposure (SAA recommends at least three months to spread the word). Many education hosts are surprised by how easy the process is. Contact SAA to get started now.

Facebook Twitter LinkedIn Website

SAA Logo

17 N. State Street, Suite 1425
Chicago, IL 60602-3315
312-606-0722; toll-free 866-722-7858
http://www.archivists.org

View previous issues of *In the Loop*

Join SAA

In the Loop is a bi-weekly electronic newsletter of the Society of American Archivists.

unsubscribe from this list update subscription preferences

Copyright © 2014 Society of American Archivists, All rights reserved.

top ▲

OCLC Research 2010 survey of special collections and archives

Q50: Open-ended responses to questions 41-48 on metadata)

Percentages of uncataloged materials exclude working backlogs that can be cleared within a year. Some materials are represented by finding aids, linked to collection-level MARC records.

Cataloguing of printed items in Special Collections is carried out by the Libraries' Bibliographic Services Department, which ensures timely entry of new acquisitions into the Libraries' online catalogue. Description of archival holdings is undertaken at the fonds or collection level, and is not broken down by media as suggested by questions 44 to 47. The absence of finding aids noted in questions 42 and 48 is due to a processing backlog resulting from an increase of acquisitions by approximately 300 percent during the last five years.

materials in some categories; for some items digitized through [xxx] Center, metadata are available. MARC collection-level records available for most manuscript and many archival collections. #46: include audio as well as video? #48: the figures vary considerably across units: no finding aid 10-50%, finding aid not Internet-accessible 50-85%, Internet accessible finding aid probably 5%. #49: hard to say, given growth of collections, attention to "hidden collections" of printed ephemera, etc.

On #46. About 1/2 of the cataloged collections have individual MARK records and the other half have web-accessible lists and other finding aids.

Our backlog of uncataloged printed volumes has increased, but that's related mainly to increased funds (and thus increased purchases). We were able to add a .4 FTE rare book cataloger to our staff in the fall of 2008, so that is helping to keep the backlog from growing too much -- and, eventually, it should begin to shrink. For archives and mss. collections, about 15% have full catalog records, and about 50% have very minimal records.

#43 = scrapbooks #49 we have completed several backlog processing projects but just kept pace with new acquisitions (which are intentionally limited) so there has been change, but backlog quantities balance out

MSS are not cataloged indiviually; collection-level records for indiviudal collections are in OCLC and local OPAC. Use LUNA for online catalog of digital visual image collection.

Most units found questions 44-47 non-applicable. Some units have 75% of their finding aids internet accessible, others have 0 - 10%.

Percentages for questions 41-48 are averaged across responding repositories (not all repositories have each format); probably not accurate if we totalled # of items from each repository.

It will be too difficult and time-consuming to gather this information for #41-48.

and available for public searching. We do have internal finding aids that "catalog" most of our archival collections.

Print catalog responses include internal databases that are not available online. There is very little born-digital material currently in the repository. More is expecting in the near future.

We have cataloged many of our collections, however we have acquired numerous large institutional collections which do not yet have finding aids

In section 44, Cartographic materials, the online catalog records exist in Filemaker databases only, not in our library online catalog, and also for almost all the online records in section 45, Visual materials.

Re #49, all nonarchival Special Collections materials receive a record in the library's online catalog when they enter the library. Each item later receives full cataloging at which time the item will appear in OCLC. Increase in uncataloged/unprocessed backlogs is reflected due to archival collections which did not exist prior to 2001.

Was not clear in this section whether to estimate based on percentage of individual collections/items, or based on the percentage of overall volume of collections/items. I based my estimates on overall volume.

Most of our architectural collections are both cataloged in an OPAC on a project level or appear in digital, sheet form in the [xxx] Architects project [URL].
These percentages are based on processed collections, not counting unprocessed backlog.
Two responses are provided for each item in question 48; the first is for Special Collections and the second is for the [xxx]. The responses to question 49 apply to Special Collections. [xxx] has no printed volumes; they report an increase in uncataloged/unprocessed backlogs of materials in other formats.
Received past presidential administration files in 2008 - had grant funds to begin arranging and processing, but those ran out before the project was completed.
Questions 41 through 48 are difficult to answer because of the varying types of materials housed in the constituent units, the organization of the data not always matching the categories of the questions, and the difficulty of estimating percentages of differing volumes of materials in the units.
We have since made all finding aids available online.
Because our archives program is so new, we have a significant backlog of unprocessed material and thus, we don't have a complete record of what collections we have.
Local databases are reported as non-Internet accessible finding aids in #48. Re: item 49, gains in backlog processing have been offset by new accessions / acquisitions.
Rules for Archival Description (RAD) records in Canada would be the equivalent of catalogue records at the collection or fonds level. I am not answering questions 41 to 47 about finding aids, which I answer in 48.
98% of manuscript collections are described at the collection-level in MARC records. We do have some items that are individually cataloged, but too difficult to count so we lumped them into collections. Although 98% have collection-level records, many are rudimentary records that describe unprocessed collections. In other words, the collection-level cataloging is not reflective of the processing backlog.
Included in 45 "Online catalog record" are metadata in our online image management database system, InsightLuna; we are unclear whether born-digital photographs should be included under "47" or "45-46"--we have accounted for them in the latter.
Amount of cataloging varies widely by collection
has worked hard to provide collection-level records for us and to catalog our most important collections and to enhance earlier item records.
neither publicly online or in print. Re #45 & #46, #47: 100 % have collection level records in an internal collections management database.
be redone.
We have an internal database that covers the other 80% in #48 above; we are not planning to make finding aids for these as they are not fully open collections.
Re #48. "Legacy" finding aids and container lists are included in our 32% of "Internet-accessible finding aids."
Due to staff retirement and subsequent re-organization we do not have an in-department catalogeur. We rely on the Library's Cataloguing unit, also depleted.
Most books and all manuscripts/archival collections have purchase order or accession records for control before full cataloging
As the Archives has been formalized for less than a year, we are working on many of these things right now.
I don;t understand the managed as collections vs managed as items distinction
Struggled with definition of cataloging - answered everything above in terms of MARC or EAD although we have several internal and public databases for local control and reference support.

Special Collections books are in the OPAC; a few 'un-catalogued' book collections are accessible via a card-catalogue in the Archives Reading Room; RECON of Special Collections un-catalogued books is in progress. We do not 'catalogue' archival/MS collections, but prepare inventories. We have had over 100 inventories accessible on our department's web page for some time; as we progress with transferring data to GenCat, we will have far more inventories accessible, including graphic materials. An exception to my first statement is this: One of our very largest MS collections has been made searchable via the OPAC... the [xxx] Canadian Correspondence was catalogued at the file level by means of an externally-funded grant. Regarding the definition of 'unprocessed': we are in far better shape than I thought if the Greene and Meissner article is taken into consideration. We have very few archival/ms collections which are not at least box-listed or roughly

Only thing counted in av is oral history, the rest is included in the archives number; if the finding aid v. catalog numbers seem odd, it's because we do not make a finding aid for small collections, they only get a catalog record. Therefore, the percentage that has a finding is not a true representation of how much is "processed." No finding aid also includes unprocessed materials.

Archives and Special Collections includes its fonds level descriptions to two online databases: the "Archives Network of [state] (provincial) and "Archives Canada" (national). These descriptions have been included under #48 "finding aids". While only a small percentage of our extant file level finding aids are available online, researchers are able to access information about the vast majority of our holdings through the online databases.

If we have a collection level descriptive record for archives/manuscripts in our online Archon database, but not in our library's online catalog (MARC record), we are counting it as having an online catalog record. If a born digital photograph appears in our institutional repository, we are counting it as having an online catalog record (metadata), even if it does not appear in our library's online catalog (MARC record).

#43 - mostly sound recordings

The seven repositories were surveyed in this section with the majority response represented. Question 41 was not surveyed. A good faith estimate would indicate that more than 80% of special collections have online catalog records for their print volumes. Question 44-47 Since methods vary greatly across the seven special collections, this was difficult to assess. Between 4-8 repositories replied to each question. The remainder either have no materials in a format or process all or a portion of materials as part of archival and manuscript collections. Question 48 This question presented a problem to several repositories. They note that if asked the percentage of linear feet not processed (not the number of collections),the response would be a significantly lower proportion of processed material with finding aids of any sort. Questions 49 One repository noted a The estimates here are based on reported estimates.

#42: The material without a catalog record of any kind consists mostly of record series for University Archives

Conversation with Jackie Dooley re: Taking Our Pulse

1. **What kinds of comments, questions, concerns, etc. did you get from survey participants about Question 11 and Question 12 and Questions 41-48? These are the questions that require survey participants to think about -- and quantify -- holdings! (Martha)**

[Sent list of comments via email]

2. **How did you arrive at the categories of things to count?**

Used 1998 ARL survey categories as the model. She did not receive too many comments/questions on which categories to use, which indicated that people were not confused by the categories.

The ARL survey was the "parent" of the Pulse one.

3. **How do you think responses and/or recommendations might have differed if the survey had included a larger number of non-academic repositories (museums, historical societies, corporate archives)? (Katy)**

Responses to this were a bit drawn out, and not particularly helpful, I suspect because she didn't really think about the question from our group's perspective, but from the public services perspective. Response focussed on the different types of non-academic repositories there might be, rather than on how she thought the survey responses would have differed had the survey had a broader participant base.

One useful point: that some of these non-academic institutions will likely have one catalog for library, special collections, and museum collections [possibly with people cataloging all of them], so should be sensitive to this audience.

4. **Unrelated to the OCLC paper: Having been involved in the creation the EAD standard, do you have any advice, recommendations, warnings in our creation of the counts and holdings standard? (Katy)**

EAD3 has much more flexible approach to communicating extent. Works with RDA expressions. Can be macro level or very granular.

5. **Do you think that the small number of digital collections holdings reported (pp. 10-11) is because of an actual lack of digital holdings, or because of a lack of comfort in recording digital materials - and maybe the lack of a standard way to count it? (Katy)**

6. **Pros and cons on counting digital materials as a lump whole, versus formats of material (photos, video, documents) that are digital - or an option for both? (Katy)**

Born digital was purely born digital - no surrogates considered, but was interested in the idea of counting a digitized collection when its use completely replaced an original.

GB the least ambiguous thing to count. She felt that this was the first time anyone had asked the question, and that this was the obvious way to keep it simple. Thought trying to break out GB by format/category too much (e.g., digital photographs, CAD, mss.).

Counting files (vs. GBs) could be distorting, because files doesn't necessarily relate to intellectual items. Another challenge with digital files is that repositories often don't store them all in one place, and the archives/special collections unit may not have all the information about them. [LM]

7. **Why no title counts?**

Felt they couldn't ask both, and count of volumes trumped title counts for space planning purposes. Martha pointed out that ARL always asks for titles and volumes (but only for cataloged/accessible works).

[It seems to me that if you are asking for count of collection and volume (both physical and digital), you need to make a parallel ask for rare books and serials - Emily]

OTHER:

- Liked the tiered counting approach
- Make sure data collection process is consistent [and repeatable]
- Contextualize the counts (why/what purpose)
- Put ephemera is Visual Materials category because [it seemed to her?] that ephemera most often fell under the purview of visual curators, for example per AAH [Association of Art Historians?]. Felt more frequently managed as visual collections. [Emily disagrees somewhat, in that they are generally photomechanical in nature, and not "prints" in the sense that they are original woodcuts, etchings, etc.]
- Emily didn't see maps on the list, only atlases and globes…
- Wondered about whether or not state of access would be part of the recommendations [believe we decided this was something that the group could advocate for after the practices are finalized]
- Recommended we look at the UK Survey
- Changed mind about counting maximum capacity of data on external and/or obsolete media for planning purposes

Take-aways:

- Cyndi: Jackie's survey categories had to be consistent with the 1998 ALA survey, the JTF Holdings survey does not. Many of Jackie's decisions were based on reducing the complexity of the survey to encourage participation. (Counting volumes rather than titles was an example of selecting the more easily "countable" unit.) Some decisions were made to make the survey "manageable" for participants while still collecting meaningful, useful, consistent data. We (JTF on Holdings) would be wise to remember this when we design our survey...the desire to reduce barriers to participation. We also need to remember that the strategies we adopt in our survey do not dictate the outcome or level of detail of our final recommendations /standard. For example, while our survey may list a limited number of broad categories or simply require counting born-digital by the byte, our recommendations will certainly be more nuanced than that.

- Martha: Jackie confirmed that the focus/purpose of the OCLC survey was in part to get at the "hidden collections" problem -- it was not to gather information about holdings. This in contrast to

the ARL Annual Statistics, for example. I made a note at some point during the conversation that “counting, estimating, reporting, inventorying, and surveying” -- all mentioned! -- are different activities, perhaps calling for different guidelines, tools, etc.

From: Emily R Novak Gustainis <Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu> via
To: Archives & Archivists (A&A) List
Subject: [archives] Call for Survey Instruments -- Holdings Counts and Measures
Date: Wednesday, February 11, 2015 11:10:35 AM

In its efforts to learn more about how archives and special collections repositories are currently quantifying their holdings, the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is seeking **examples of survey instruments, worksheets, methodologies, etc.** that have been used to:

* Provide a number for collections [of archival and/or manuscript material], titles [bibliographic units], and/or physical units held. Please include definitions and explanations if these are not apparent in the instrument.

* Figure out how much physical space collections occupy

* Count any non-textual formats held, such as audio-visual materials

* Determine extent for born-digital material

Please be assured that survey instruments submitted will be shared with Task Force members only. If you have surveyed your holdings within the last ten years, and have an instrument you are willing to share, please send it to Emily Novak Gustainis (Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu), Co-chair, ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries, by **Friday, February 20, 2015**. We are also interested in learning more about repositories that have had difficulties conducting holdings surveys and/or have opted not to participate in a survey.

Thank you!

Emily R. Novak Gustainis
Learn more about JTF-HCM: http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics

Emily R. Novak Gustainis
Head, Collections Services
Center for the History of Medicine
Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine
Harvard Medical School
emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu / 617.432.7702
Website / Blog / Omeka / A partner in the Medical Heritage Library

o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o

The ARCHIVES & ARCHIVISTS (A&A) LIST is sponsored by the Society of American Archivists. The opinions expressed on the A&A List do not necessarily represent those of SAA and are not endorsed by the Society.

To post to the list, send messages to archives@forums.archivists.org.

To unsubscribe or to modify your subscription settings, log in at:
http://www.archivists.org/listservs/change.asp

To read the list archives:
September 2006 to Present: http://forums.archivists.org/read/?forum=archives
April 1993 to September 2006: http://listserv.muohio.edu/archives/archives.html

To view the A&A List Terms of Participation, visit:
http://www2.archivists.org/listservs/archives

A&A List Coordinator:
Melanie Mueller
mmueller@archivists.org

From:	Emily R Novak Gustainis <Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu> via
To:	Archives & Archivists (A&A) List
Subject:	[archives] Second call for survey instruments -- Holdings Counts and Measures
Date:	Tuesday, March 10, 2015 12:00:00 AM

Please note that we continue to seek survey instruments! Please consider contributing by Friday, March 20th.

Thank you!

In its efforts to learn more about how archives and special collections repositories are currently quantifying their holdings, the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is seeking **examples of survey instruments, worksheets, methodologies, etc.** that have been used to:

* Provide a number for collections [of archival and/or manuscript material], titles [bibliographic units], and/or physical units held. Please include definitions and explanations if these are not apparent in the instrument.

* Figure out how much physical space collections occupy

* Count any non-textual formats held, such as audio-visual materials

* Determine extent for born-digital material

Please be assured that survey instruments submitted will be shared with Task Force members only. If you have surveyed your holdings within the last ten years, and have an instrument you are willing to share, please send it to Emily Novak Gustainis (Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu), Co-chair, ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries, by **Friday, March 20, 2015**. We are also interested in learning more about repositories that have had difficulties conducting holdings surveys and/or have opted not to participate in a survey.

Thank you!

Emily R. Novak Gustainis
Learn more about JTF-HCM: http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics

Emily R. Novak Gustainis
Head, Collections Services
Center for the History of Medicine
Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine
Harvard Medical School
emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu / 617.432.7702
Website / Blog / Omeka / A partner in the Medical Heritage Library

o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o

The ARCHIVES & ARCHIVISTS (A&A) LIST is sponsored by the Society of American Archivists. The opinions expressed on the A&A List do not necessarily represent those of SAA and are not endorsed by the Society.

To post to the list, send messages to archives@forums.archivists.org.

To unsubscribe or to modify your subscription settings, log in at:
http://www.archivists.org/listservs/change.asp

To read the list archives:
September 2006 to Present: http://forums.archivists.org/read/?forum=archives
April 1993 to September 2006: http://listserv.muohio.edu/archives/archives.html

To view the A&A List Terms of Participation, visit:
http://www2.archivists.org/listservs/archives

A&A List Coordinator:
Melanie Mueller
mmueller@archivists.org

From: Gustainis, Emily
To: saaleaders@forums.archivists.org
Subject: Now open to comments: Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures
Date: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 1:41:13 PM

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is pleased to invite comments on its proposed "Level 1 Count" for quantifying and sharing information about the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. Comments are due on or before **Friday, 3 March 2017**.

The document is available both online and as a pdf on this SAA website: http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/proposed-level-1-guidelines-for-standardize

Comments should be directed to either or both of the Task Force co-chairs:

Martha O'Hara Conway moconway@umich.edu (for RBMS)
Emily R. Novak Gustainis emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu (for SAA)

You do not need to be a member of RBMS or SAA to comment on the proposed "Level 1 Count."

Thank you in advance for your interest and input!

Emily R. Novak Gustainis, on behalf of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Martha O'Hara Conway (RBMS) University of Michigan
Adriana P. Cuervo (SAA) Rutgers University
Rachel A. D'Agostino (RBMS) Library Company of Philadelphia
Lara Friedman–Shedlov (RBMS) University of Minnesota
Angela Fritz (SAA) University of Arkansas
Emily R. Novak Gustainis (SAA) Harvard Medical School
E. Haven Hawley (RBMS) University of Florida
Lisa K. Miller (SAA) Stanford University
Katy E. Rawdon (RBMS) Temple University
Cyndi Shein (SAA) University of Nevada

EMILY R. NOVAK GUSTAINIS | Deputy Director | Center for the History of Medicine
Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine | 10 Shattuck Street | Boston, MA 02115
617.432.7702 | emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu
website | blog | onview | twitter

From: SAA Headquarters
To: Gustainis, Emily
Subject: In the Loop for Wednesday, February 15, 2017
Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 8:04:51 AM

Love books? We've got the perfect Valentine's week sale for you!

February 15, 2017

View this email in your browser

In the Loop - SAA's Biweekly Newsletter

Deadlines • Jobs • Advocacy

Annual Meeting • Around the Profession • Around SAA

Education • From the Archives • Publications

Nominate a Colleague—or Yourself—for an SAA Award

Do you know of an individual or organization that has made an outstanding contribution to the archives profession? Or promoted greater public awareness of archives? Have you

published a groundbreaking book, written an outstanding article, or developed an innovative finding aid? Do you need financial assistance to attend graduate school or a professional conference? SAA and the SAA Foundation offer a variety of opportunities for professional recognition and financial assistance through the naming of Fellows, an awards competition, and scholarships. To learn more about these recognitions, click here. ***But hurry—the deadline to nominate is February 28!***

Call for Proposals and Presenters: "The Liberated Archive" Forum

The Liberated Archive: A Forum for Envisioning and Implementing a Community-Based Approach to Archives will bring together archivists from around the country and members of communities in the Portland metro area (and beyond!) to envision how archivists might partner with the public to repurpose the archive as a site of social transformation and radical inclusion. The full-day forum will be held on Saturday, July 29, in conjunction with the Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting in Portland, Oregon. ***Read the Call for Proposals and Presenters here. Deadline: March 13.***

top ▲

PUBLICATIONS

Valentine's Week Book Sale!
Celebrate your love of books, archives, and archives books all week long! Enjoy 20% to 80% off select print titles in the SAA Bookstore, including the always timely *Many Happy Returns: Advocacy and the Development of Archives* + *Controlling the Past: Documenting Society and Institutions* + *Archives in Libraries* + *Encoded Archival Description Tag Library Version EAD3* and more! Treat yourself here.

SAA Sampler Series Now Open Access
The SAA Sampler Series offers a sample of select chapters from authoritative books on archives. Each sampler features one chapter from three different books that provide an overview of a relevant theme. Check out the *Archival Advocacy Sampler* and *Law and Ethics Sampler*—and stay tuned for the forthcoming *Social Justice Sampler*—here.

Spanish Translation of Brochure Now Available

Thanks to SAA's LACCHA Section for the Spanish translation of the brochure "Donating Your Personal or Family Records to a Repository."

Agradecemos a la sección de Archivos de Herencia Cultural Latinoamericana y del Caribe por la traducción de este folleto.

Read it, use it, and share it for free here!

top ▲

AROUND SAA

Transparency in SAA Advocacy Governance and How to Build for the Future
Wondering how the SAA Council makes statements and how SAA members might become more involved in initiating them? SAA Council member Michelle Light and Vice President Tanya Zanish-Belcher share more about the process in a blog post on *Off the Record*.

A Constantly Evolving Profession
Abbi Nye, archivist at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee and SAA's archivist, shares a blog post on *Off the Record* the people and stories she has encountered in the SAA Archives.

Dealing With Controversial Collections
The Issues and Advocacy Section considers how to deal with controversial collections and the remnants of racist artifacts and objects in a new blog post by Hope Dunbar, archivist at SUNY Buffalo State.

Remembering Brenda Banks
The Archives and Archivists of Color Section shares a moving remembrance of SAA Past President Brenda Banks on the Archiving in Color blog.

SAA Seeks Editor of *The American Archivist*
Are you an avid reader of the professional literature? Are you a published author? Do you have experience as an editor? Do you get excited about nurturing new and veteran voices? Are you brimming with ideas for expanding the journal's readership? If so, then you could be the next editor of *The American Archivist*! For more information and to apply, click here. ***Deadline to apply: April 14.***

Meet the Candidates!
Fourteen candidates are slated for SAA's 2017 ballot, for Vice President/President Elect, three seats on the Council, and three positions on the 2018 Nominating Committee. Read the candidates' statements and learn more about the election here.

top ▲

ADVOCACY

SAA Signs on to Letter Regarding Public Notice Before Removing Online Government Information
SAA joined with more than 60 organizations to send a letter to the Office of Management and Budget requesting that OMB "issue guidance to federal agencies, reminding them that they are required under the Paperwork Reduction Act to give public notice before removing online government information." Read the full letter, coordinated by OpenTheGovernment.org, here.

Council Approves Issue Brief on Confidentiality of Private Information
On its February 6 conference call, the SAA Council approved an issue brief, drafted by the Committee on Public Policy, on the Confidentiality of Private Information Held in Records of the Federal Government's Executive Agencies. Read the issue brief here.

top ▲

AROUND THE PROFESSION

Babies at Work
The State Historical Society of North Dakota has successfully implemented an infant-at-work program, where both coworkers and new moms and dads benefited from having these tiniest staff members around.

Read ICA's February Newsletter!
Find out what your colleagues around the world have been doing in the International Council on Archives' Section of Professional Associations February newsletter, available here.

Provide Feedback on Quantifying and Sharing Archival Information
The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries invites comments on its proposed "Level 1 Count" for quantifying and sharing information about the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. Review the document here. Comments can be sent to Martha O'Hara Conway (RBMS) at moconway@umich.edu and Emily R. Novak Gustainis (SAA) at emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu. Comments are due on or before **Friday, March 3.**

50th Georgia Archives Institute
The Georgia Archives Institute will be held June 12–23 in Morrow, Georgia. Kathleen Roe will serve as principal instructor. The Institute includes classroom instruction, repository tours, and a three-day internship. Click here for more information. ***Deadline for applications: April 1.***

Are You an Archon User or Interested Party?
Join us May 22 at Denison University in Granville, Ohio, for Archon Day 2017, an unconference-like event where we will facilitate community conversations, co-working time, and hands-on demonstrations. The cost is $30 and registration includes lunch and coffee/treats for break. A block of rooms has been reserved at the Granville Inn and registration for the event is capped at 60 people. Click here for more info or to register. ***Deadline for registrations: April 7.***

New Grant Opportunity Encourages Community Development Approaches
The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) has a new grant opportunity and invites proposals to test and develop museum and library collaborative approaches for bringing about positive community change. Eligible entities are libraries, museums, institutions of higher education, and non-profit community organizations with experience in library, archive, or museum projects and in managing grants for community development work. Award amounts range from $25,000 to $150,000, and a one-to-one cost share is

required. See the application guidelines on the IMLS website for details. ***Application deadline: April 3.***

top ▲

ANNUAL MEETING

Plan Now to Exhibit at *ARCHIVES 2017*
In July 2017, Portland will become the ARCHIVES capital of the world! You'll have access to the year's largest audience of archives, records, and information professionals who are eager to learn about your products and services, ask questions, and provide their perspectives. The *ARCHIVES 2017* Expo brings together—in one place and at one time—the purchasing decision makers at the national, state, and local levels. Take advantage of their great ideas—and share a few of your own! Purchase your booth today!

Better Than Lonely Planet . . .
Wondering what you'll eat, do, and see in Portland during *ARCHIVES 2017*? No need to purchase a travel guide—just follow the newly launched Host Committee blog for advice and tips for exploring Portland!

top ▲

FROM THE ARCHIVES

A Rose By Any Other Name . . .
The first SAA Annual Meeting in 1937 prompted a discussion on the pronunciation of the terms *archivist*, *archives*, and *archival*. This topic proved so controversial that a committee for "proper pronunciation" was appointed in 1938. The committee's recommendation was recorded in the following meeting minutes from 1939:

(Minutes of Business Meeting, October 13, 1939, Box 2, Folder 36, Society of American Archivists Records, UWM Mss 172, SAA 200.3.1, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Archives Department.)

top ▲

DEADLINES

Feb. 28 Deadline for SAA awards, scholarship applications, and Fellow nominations

Mar. 3 Feedback on Quantifying and Sharing Archival Information

Mar. 13 Proposals and Presenters for "The Liberated Archive" Forum

Apr. 1 Applications for Georgia Archives Institute

Apr. 3 Applications for IMLS Grant

Apr. 7 Registrations for Archon Day 2017

Apr. 14 Applications for *The American Archivist* Editor position

top ▲

JOBS

Attention, Job Seekers!
Here are the latest career opportunities posted to SAA's *Career Center.* View all postings.

- Digitization Project Manager (Athens, Georgia)
  University of Georgia Libraries
- Curator of Special Collections and Assistant Professor (Wichita, Kansas)
  Wichita State University Libraries
- Archivist (Nerinx, Kentucky)
  Loretto Heritage Center
- Archivist (Washington, DC)
  No Greater Love
- Film Archivist (Helena, Montana)
  Montana Historical Society
- Archivist and Special Collections Librarian (Tacoma, Washington)
  University of Puget Sound
- Executive Director (Chicago, Illinois)
  Black Metropolis Research Consortium
- Molina Curator for the History of Medicine and Early Science (San Marino, California)
  The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens
- Project Archivist (Gainesville, Florida)
  George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida
- Library Instruction Coordinator (Sacramento, California)
  California State University, Sacramento
- Processing and Digital Archivist (Athens, Georgia)
  University of Georgia Libraries
- Assistant/Associate Professor of Data Stewardship (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania)
  University of Pittsburgh

top ▲

EDUCATION

Featured Workshop
The popular Business Archives … Establishing and Managing an Archives workshop is back! Last held in 2015, this three-day workshop presents an overview of establishing and managing archives in a business environment—that is, what it takes to garner support from management to establish an archival program and how to start, manage, and oversee a business archives. Taught by retired Coca-Cola archivist Phil Mooney and Bruce Bruemmer, who directs the corporate archives at Cargill, **attendees will have the opportunity to** tour the Harley Davidson archives as well as two other corporate archives in the Milwaukee area. Transportation for these tours is included with your registration. This popular workshop will sell out faster than you can say "Harley Davidson Motorcycles,"

so register today!

Learn Online
Did you know that SAA offers live and on-demand webcasts for education that fits your schedule? Visit the catalog here. Stay tuned for the next session of our Advocacy Café webcast series on April 4!

Arrangement & Description (A&D) Certificate Program

- Early-bird price extended! This is your last chance to register at the early-bird rate for **Arrangement & Description: Fundamentals** in Dallas, TX, on March 6 & 7. Save your seat and register today!

- Questions about the A&D Certificate Program and where to begin? Check out our FAQs!

Digital Archives Specialist (DAS) Certificate Program

- Preparing for the upcoming DAS Comprehensive Exam on February 24? Check out the updated Suggested Readings List, which now includes all pre-readings in an easier-to-view format.

- The DAS certificate program has two *new* courses: Tool Selection and Management: Finding the Right Tool for the Job and Tool Integration: From Pre-SIP to DIP. Contact us to schedule a course near you!

Upcoming A&D and DAS Courses and Workshops

View our full course calendar here.

MIDWEST

Feb. 24 Comprehensive Exam [DAS]
Chicago, IL

Apr. 5 Cultural Diversity Competency
Omaha, NE, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 5

Apr. 24 Reappraising and Deaccessioning Archival Materials from Start to Finish
Bowling Green, OH, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 24

Apr. 24 — Apr. 25
Arrangement and Description: Fundamentals [A&D]
Evanston, IL EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 25

May 23
Reappraising and Deaccessioning Archival Materials from Start to Finish
Chicago, IL, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE APR 24

Jun. 12 — 14
Business Archives: Establishing and Managing an Archives
Milwaukee, WI, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAY 12

Jun. 29 — 30
Copyright Law for Archivists: A Risk-Assessment Approach
Ames, IA, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAY 29

NORTHEAST

Feb. 24
Comprehensive Exam [DAS]
Boston, MA

Feb. 24
Comprehensive Exam [DAS]
College Park, MD

Mar. 6 — Mar. 7
Planning New and Remodeled Archival Facilities
Pittsburgh, PA

Mar. 21
Digital Repositories [DAS]
College Park, MD, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE FEB 21

Mar. 23
Fundamentals of Project Management for Archivists [A&D]
Hyannis, MA, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE FEB 23

Apr. 27 — Apr. 28
Arrangement and Description of Electronic Records [DAS]
New York City, NY EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 28

Apr. 28
Accessioning and Ingest of Electronic Records [DAS]
Washington, DC EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 28

SOUTHEAST

Feb. 22
Describing Archives: A Content Standard [DASC]
Orlando, FL

Apr. 10
Photographs: Archival Principles and Practices [A&D]
Fayetteville, AR, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 10

May 24
Privacy and Confidentiality Issues in Digital Archives [A&D, DAS]
Fayetteville, AR, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE APR 24

WESTERN REGION

Feb. 24 Comprehensive Exam [DAS]
Los Angeles, CA

Apr. 5 Digital Forensics for Archivists: Fundamentals [DAS]
Eugene, OR, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 6

Apr. 6 — Apr. 7 Digital Forensics for Archivists: Advanced [DAS]
Eugene, OR, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 7

Apr. 27 Copyright Issues for Digital Archives [A&D, DAS]
Pasadena, CA, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 27

SOUTHWEST

Feb. 24 Comprehensive Exam [DAS]
Austin, TX

Mar. 6 — Mar. 7 Arrangement and Description: Fundamentals [A&D]
Dallas, TX

May 16 Photographs: Archival Principles and Practices [DAS]
Tucson, AZ, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE APR 16

ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION

Feb. 24 Comprehensive Exam [DAS]
Denver, CO

Apr. 14 Building Advocacy and Support for Digital Archives
Arvada, CO, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE MAR 14

May 16 Preserving Digital Archives [DAS]
Arvada, CO, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE APR 17

May 17 Arrangement and Description of Audiovisual Materials [A&D]
Boise, ID, EARLY-BIRD DEADLINE APR 17

SAA also offers on-demand webinars and CDs of webinars.

Plan A&D and DAS Courses or Continuing Education Workshops at Your Institution! Become an SAA education cosponsor! Visit the Catalog and choose from 60+ available courses and workshops. Stay tuned for the Call for Cosponsors opening March 1. Can't wait to start planning? Contact SAA's Education team today!

Facebook Twitter LinkedIn Instagram Website

SAA Logo

17 N. State Street, Suite 1425
Chicago, IL 60602-3315
312-606-0722; toll-free 866-722-7858
http://www.archivists.org

View previous issues of *In the Loop*

Join SAA

In the Loop is a bi-weekly electronic newsletter of the Society of American Archivists.

unsubscribe from this list update subscription preferences

Copyright © 2017 Society of American Archivists, All rights reserved.

top ▲

From:	Emily R Novak Gustainis <Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu> via
To:	Archives & Archivists (A&A) List
Subject:	[archives] Reminder! Comments on Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures due Friday 3/3
Date:	Tuesday, February 28, 2017 11:24:55 PM

The **SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries** is pleased to invite comments on its proposed "Level 1 Count" for quantifying and sharing information about the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. Comments are due on or before **Friday, 3 March 2017**.

The document is available both online and as a pdf on this SAA website:
http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/proposed-level-1-guidelines-for-standardize

Comments should be directed to either or both of the Task Force co-chairs:

Martha O'Hara Conway moconway@umich.edu (for RBMS)
Emily R. Novak Gustainis emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu (for SAA)

You do not need to be a member of RBMS or SAA to comment on the proposed "Level 1 Count."

Thank you in advance for your interest and input!

Emily R. Novak Gustainis, on behalf of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Martha O'Hara Conway (RBMS) University of Michigan
Adriana P. Cuervo (SAA) Rutgers University
Rachel A. D'Agostino (RBMS) Library Company of Philadelphia
Lara Friedman–Shedlov (RBMS) University of Minnesota
Angela Fritz (SAA) University of Arkansas
Emily R. Novak Gustainis (SAA) Harvard Medical School
E. Haven Hawley (RBMS) University of Florida
Lisa K. Miller (SAA) Stanford University
Katy E. Rawdon (RBMS) Temple University
Cyndi Shein (SAA) University of Nevada

EMILY R. NOVAK GUSTAINIS | Deputy Director | Center for the History of Medicine
Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine | 10 Shattuck Street | Boston, MA 02115
617.432.7702 | emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu
website | blog | onview | twitter

o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o

The ARCHIVES & ARCHIVISTS (A&A) LIST is sponsored by the Society of American Archivists. The opinions expressed on the A&A List do not necessarily represent those of SAA and are not endorsed by the Society.

Unsubscribe or Change Settings: http://www.archivists.org/listservs/change.asp

A&A List Terms of Participation and archives: http://www2.archivists.org/listservs/archives

A&A List Coordinator: Melanie Mueller, mmueller@archivists.org

o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o

The ARCHIVES & ARCHIVISTS (A&A) LIST is sponsored by the Society of American Archivists. The opinions expressed on the A&A List do not necessarily represent those of SAA and are not endorsed by the Society.

Unsubscribe or Change Settings: http://www.archivists.org/listservs/change.asp

A&A List Terms of Participation and archives: http://www2.archivists.org/listservs/archives

A&A List Coordinator: Melanie Mueller, mmueller@archivists.org

Announcing the Revised Draft Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (2018)

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is pleased to announce the release of its revised draft ***Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries***.The *Guidelines* are the product of the Task Force's efforts to analyze, incorporate, and address community feedback received in response to its draft release between January 11 and March 3, 2017, and as summarized in the Task Force's **July 20, 2017 Annual Report to the Standards Committee**.

- Read the *Guidelines* online
- Download the *Guidelines* as a PDF
- Download the tables/worksheets in the *Guidelines* here

Comments on the *Guidelines* are welcome before Tuesday, July 31, 2018. Please direct comments to the Task Force co-chairs:

Martha O'Hara Conway, moconway@umich.edu (for RBMS)
Emily R. Novak Gustainis, emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu (for SAA).

You do not need to be a member of RBMS or SAA to comment on the Guidelines.

Attachment	Size
Revised Draft Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures 2018 (PDF)	676.43 KB

Group News Item

- Announcing the Revised Draft Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (2018)
- Call for Survey Instruments -- Holdings Counts and Measures

Group Page

- Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Appendix C
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Appendix B
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Appendix A
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Conducting the Counts and Measures
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Physical Space Occupied
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Digital Space Occupied
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Intellectual Units Held
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Overarching Approach
- JTF-HCM Guidelines 2018: Audience and Purpose

1 2 next › last »

Group News Item (4) | Group Page (15)

Login to post comments

UPDATED: 2018-05-24

Privacy & Confidentiality • Disclaimer • Contact Us

Copyright © 1997-2019 by SAA. All rights reserved.

About Archives

What Are Archives?
Standards
Archival Organizations
Archival Consultants
Resources

About SAA

Who We Are
Benefits of Membership
Awards & Scholarships
Governance
SAA Foundation
Contact Us

Careers

SAA Career Center
Professional Development
Explore a Career in Archives

Education

Annual Meeting
Continuing Education
Certificate Programs
Graduate Archival Education

Publications

Bookstore
American Archivist
Archival Outlook
In the Loop
Book Publishing
Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology
Case Studies
More Resources

Advocacy

Public Policy
Public Awareness
Within Your Institution
Archives Change Lives
MayDay!
Suggest SAA Advocacy Action

Membership

Join / Renew
Resources
Groups
SAA Connect
Students

Comments/Table of Contents

1. Aliza Leventhal (Librarian/Archivist, Sasaki Associates, Inc.)
2. Gordon Fretwell (retired, University of Massachusetts)
3. Fletcher Durant (Preservation Librarian, University of Florida Libraries)
4. Bob Shuster (Billy Graham Center Archives, Wheaton College)
5. Mary Catharine Johnsen (Special Collections Librarian, Carnegie Mellon University Libraries)
6. Nick Krabbenhoeft (Head of Digital Preservation, New York Public Library)
7. James Eason (Archivist for Pictorial Collections, The Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley)
8. Shelley Sweeney (Head of Archives & Special Collections, University of Manitoba Libraries)
9. Elizabeth Nielsen (University Archivist, Oregon State University Libraries)
10. Lisa Carter (Associate Director for Special Collections and Area Studies, Ohio State University Libraries)
11. Glenn Griffin (Media Specialist, Hubbard Broadcasting, Inc. Archives)
12. Michael Rush (Assistant Head, Manuscript Unit, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University)
13. Kat Timms (Information Standards Specialist, Published Heritage Branch, Library and Archives Canada)
14. Meg Phillips (External Affairs Liaison, National Archives and Records Administration)
15. Mary Lacy (Manuscript Division, Library of Congress)
16. Mary Samouelian (Manager, Archival Processing, Baker Library Special Collections Harvard Business School)
17. Stephanie Bennett (Collections Archivist, Special Collections & Archive, Wake Forest University)
18. Special Collections & Archives Council, Harvard Library, Harvard University
19. Elizabeth Surles (Archivist, Institute of Jazz Studies, Rutgers University)

Comment Number: 1

Comment Number: 2

Comment Number: 3

Comment Number: 4

Comment Number: 5

Comment Number: 6

Comment Number: 7

Comment Number: 8

Comment Number: 9

Comment Number: 10

Comment Number: 11

Comment Number: 12

Comment Number: 13

Comment Number: 14

Comment Number: 15

Comment Number: 16

Comment Number: 17

Comment Number: 18

Comment Number: 19

Comment Number: 1
from: Aliza Leventhal <aleventhal@sasaki.com>
to: emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu, moconway@umich.edu
date: Thu, Jan 12, 2017 at 8:39 AM
subject: Re: [saaleaders] Now open to comments: Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures

Thank you for taking on this undertaking.

I have a few comments about the document you've developed. My focus is on architectural and design materials, so my comments are a bit skewed to ensure that niche community is effectively represented in this document.

Holdings Counts and Measures:

1. Does not include any mention of tubes or rolls, which are standard containers and objects within design collections.
2. Your recommendation for all digital space to be reported in gigabytes is not reasonable for those of us with digital collections in the multiples of terabytes or possibly petabytes. Is this flexible for larger digital holdings?

Categories/Types of Collection Material

1. Does not consistently include examples of the materials in the scope, and is lacking digital examples especially for the Graphic/Visual and Moving Image Material. Records produced by design professionals are largely within these two categories, but without additional text in the definition and scope for these sections, I would imagine it may be difficult for folks to feel confident in that classification.

Again, I realize my feedback is specific to addressing concerns in my field, but I hope it is somewhat useful.

Comment Number: 2
from: Gordon Fretwell <gordon.fretwell@library.umass.edu>
to: moconway@umich.edu
date: Thu, Jan 12, 2017 at 10:01 AM
subject: Guidelines for statnardized holdings counts ...

I read proposed "Level 1" count document with some interest. Having worked in research libraries for 61 years, I find the "Optional" status for those items "not [yet] described online/discoverable" to be unfortunate, as it seems to eliminate huge portions of known materials/collections from the count. (As if 1/16 I will be an octogenarian.) I certainly agree that the two status groups need to be counted separately, but without equivalent data for both, how will "we" know the nature of completing access to all these rich holdings, or how much progress we're making over some period of time?

Comment Number: 3
from: Fletcher Durant <fletcher.durant@gmail.com>
to: emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu
cc: moconway@umich.edu
date: Thu, Jan 12, 2017 at 2:20 PM
subject: Comments re: Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures

Thank you very much for your efforts in drafting these guidelines. I look forward to seeing the data and gaining an understanding of collections that the amassed holdings count and measures will provide.

I do have some comments on proposed guidelines as posted on 1/12/17, which I feel are similar to issues that were discussed at the roundtable at ALA 2016.

My overarching comment is that one of the most important and most challenging parts of a large, multi-institutional data collection project like this is achieving the "standardized" aspect of the holdings counts and measures. The more detailed and structured the guidelines can be (particularly in defining the 8 categories of collection material) the higher quality the counts and measures will be. In my experience with collection surveys at multiple institutions, surveys fail (or produce very fuzzy data) when the surveyors run into gray areas in surveys. Without clear guidance, surveyors get frustrated and may give up or simply skip over items/collections that they can't easily fit into the categories provided. I recognize that by being too prescriptive the holdings count can also cause headaches for organizations that have pre-exisiting holdings counts which may not align with the standardized format being developed here.

In my reading of the Proposed Guidelines, the category of "Books and Other Printed Materials" is problematic for 2 reasons and will likely cause many questions from surveyors.

1. Is "Book..." a form or a format? Does "Book" mean bound form? (In which case, why is "codices" listed under the "Manuscripts" listing of forms?) Or does "book" only refer to printed, bound materials? (In which case where do other bound formats that aren't printed but may be managed at the item level and shelved as books? Like scrapbooks, letterbooks, bound correspondence, autograph albums, photo albums, atlases, document binders, fabric sample books, etc.)

2. As the only material type that is measured in linear feet, institutions will want to measure all of their bound materials together regardless of the material type category,

"Physical Units Held" - what level of detail will the format types be broken down into? Particularly for visual, film, and A/V formats, knowing that an institution has 100 videotapes is much different than knowing that they have 50 Umatic tapes, 20 2-inch video tapes, and 30 VHS tapes. Similarly being able to differentiate between graphic posters, photographs, and film negatives.

"Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both)" Seems unnecessary. Holding count would benefit from including both the physical shelf space that an external hard drive or set of floppy discs takes up as well as the GB count.

Similarly "surrogates and derivatives....are not counted" would misrepresent collection holdings and storage needs. Again, counting the physical shelf space or GB of digital content for collection items should be the goal, whether the material is an alternate format or not. Surrogates and derivatives that are not accessioned (or described) collection items should not be counted (exhibition copies, promotional materials, etc.)

Finally, the categorizing of mixed material collections under the "Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections) heading seems like it would irresponsibly undercount vulnerable and/or minority formats that are included in larger paper-based collections. Presumably the ultimate goal of this count is to leverage the data to gain more funding. Hiding problematic formats in larger collections will lead to undercounting and underfunding.

Thank you again for all your work on this. I hope that my comments are coherent.

Comment Number: 4

from: Bob Shuster <robert.shuster@wheaton.edu>
to: "moconway@umich.edu", "emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu"
date: Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 10:25 AM
subject: Quantification units

The Guidelines for Standardized Holdings seem quite good to me. I did have one thought. Under the measures for quantification, a fourth type of count would seem to me to be time, in terms of hours and minutes. This is often very relevant to our researchers and for our statistical reports, such as in the sample below, which describe audio or moving image materials:

TRANSCRIPTS

In 2016, the Archives staff transcribed 27 hours of oral history interviews into 461 pages of text which are now online, along with the audio file of each interview. The tape which were transcribed were:

Collection 115 - T1, T2. Raymond Leroy Elliott, Wycliffe a Bible translator working among the Ixil Indian tribe in Guatemala from 1953-1982.
http://www2.wheaton.edu/bgc/archives/GUIDES/115.htm#8

Collection 171 - T3. Albert Edward Bobby was a missionary in Portugal with the Evangelical Alliance Mission (TEAM) from 1953-1961
http://www2.wheaton.edu/bgc/archives/GUIDES/171.htm#8

or

#	R/C	speed	length in minutes	Sides	Contents	Dates
I. Crusades and Other Events						
T5701	R	3-3/4	32	--	Christ for Greater Los Angeles Campaign. NOTES: First meeting of campaign. 3 pm service. Comments by Cliff Barrows and Clifford Smith, duet by Cliff and Billy Barrows, comments by the treasurer of the campaign. Continued on T5702. Copied from wire recording original.	9/25/49
T5702	R	3-3/4	53		--Christ for Greater Los Angeles Campaign. SPEAKER: Billy Graham. NOTES: Conclusion of T5701. 3pm service. Sermon - "Why a Revival?" Copied from wire recording original.	9/25/49
T5703	R	3-3/4	46		Christ for Greater Los Angeles Campaign. SPEAKER: Billy Graham. NOTES: George Beverly Shea sings "Balm of Gilead"; sermon Amos 4:12, "Prepare to Meet God." Copied from wire recording original.	9/25/49

Comment Number: 5

from: Mary Catharine Johnsen <mj0g@andrew.cmu.edu>
to: "moconway@umich.edu" <moconway@umich.edu>
cc: Mary Catharine Johnsen <mj0g@andrew.cmu.edu>
date: Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 10:20 AM
subject: Collection count questions

1. I'm starting to review the Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures. I am very math-challenged and would appreciate a mini-tutorial on how to convert 100 map cases at 40" x"50" x 4" into cubic feet. Do I multiply everything?

2. For objects, do I draw an imaginary box around the item to get height, depth and width to make the cubic feet? African masks, for example.

3. Why don't digital images of objects get counted? They are "derivatives?"

4. If I missed directions in the document, please point me to them.

Comment Number: 6

from: Nick Krabbenhoeft <nickkrabbenhoeft@nypl.org>
to: moconway@umich.edu, emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu
date: Thu, Jan 19, 2017 at 11:38 AM
subject: Space Occupied Reporting Feedback

Thank you for putting together the reporting document. Level 1 looks like a good first step for creating sh ared definitions of metrics. I have the following feedback on the Level 1 requirements for space reporting. I'm approaching this document from primarily a digital perspective.

1. Objects/Artifacts should be able to be measured digitally. For example, we recently completed a laser scan of our building. The multi-GB point-cloud file and 3-D model would not fall under any of the existing categories, but it does fit closest into the object category.
    1. Change the definition of Objects/Artifacts from "Material things that can be seen and touched" to something that bases it on the dimensionality of the material instead of the method of interaction. "Material that have length, width, and depth" is an attempt, but I don't think it adequately excludes the other categories.
    2. Add GB to Level 1 Count for Object
2. Software doesn't seem to fit into the existing categories. Examples of software in physical and digital spaces include video game collections and archives of developers or software companies. The performance and interactivity components of this material makes it distinct from the motion picture and object categories.
    1. Add a Software category
    2. Proposed Software definition "Materials that can be played back through computing equipment and allow for user interaction"
    3. Add Cubic feet and GB to Level 1 Count for Software
3. There's still lingering confusion in the community over the definition of a gigabyte, either 1024^3 bytes or 1000^3 bytes. Using the 1024-definition gives a 7% smaller result than using the 1000-definition. Officially according to SI, GB = 1000^3 B and GiB = 1024^3.
    1. Add an explicit definition that a gigabyte is 1000^3 bytes and is abbreviated GB

4. How does the reporting account for multiple copies of digital material and derivatives of materials that are created for access purposes?
    1. Add explicit guidance whether to count copies of digital material
    2. Add explicit guidance whether derivative copies count, and if so, what types of derivatives (i.e. digital archives with files format-migrated for access purposes vs. digitized material with files resized for access purposes)

Please let me know if you have any questions about my comments.

Comment Number: 7

From: James A. EASON [mailto:jeason@library.berkeley.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 7:28 PM
To: Gustainis, Emily
Subject: Comments: Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures

I have just a few questions or observations on the draft of "Level 1 Guidelines". I have have more after a small group of Technical Services managers discuss the draft next week.

First, I'm curious whether the ARL statistical categories and measurable units were considered. I assume that must have been a starting point, and there are probably lots of good reasons to move away from those count categories or instructions -- but making the departure a bit more explicit in the report explicit (briefly) in the report might put such questions to rest.

In the context of what ARL libraries have been counting for decades, I see the following significant departures:
1) volume counts (for print) are no longer of interest, but VOLUME (cubic feet) now would be of interest.
2) Item estimates/counts for Visual Materials would be replaced by cubic footage, which is of limited usefulness (but might be refined in Level 2 -- no quibble here -- just an observation.)
3) MU's (1.25 linear feet) are not adopted, but cubic footage.

(No doubt there are more -- these are the three areas I with which I am familiar.)

It might be good to acknowledge that changing how we count will introduce difficulties in comparing retrospective data to future data, for those institutions that have kept data under different systems (like ARL reporting). The implication for institutions adopting a new standard is, that if they want to have numbers relevant to their former system (say, ARL stats), they need to capture these proposed data elements *in addition* to those they've historically recorded.

In the list of examples, I think the example of the Visual Materials "single item" that is a portfolio of photographic prints needs another line of explanation. (This is "Adenauer: photographic portfolio".) It is not clear to me why the institution would choose to count this as an item rather than a collection. In the full record linked, I see no indication it was "published" as a portfolio, issued in identical multiples, or given a title by the creator as an intended collective unit. The "portfolio" may be simply a housing -- like a box -- that has no more significance than any container might. Now, all this comes down to institutional choice, and that may be the point of this example, but noting in the explication that the institution chose to count it as a "single item", for whatever reason, would draw attention to that interesting point.

(By the way, we consider unpublished photo albums to be "collections" of photographs. That they're mounted in an album is not relevant to our counts. On the other hand, a portfolio or album intentionally "issued" in multiples with, say, a publication statement and/or title page and/or limited edition statement would be a factor that would lead us to consider it a monograph or single item.)

Interesting work. Thank you for tackling it.

Comment Number: 8

from: Shelley Sweeney <Shelley.Sweeney@umanitoba.ca>
to: "moconway@umich.edu", "emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu"
date: Fri, Jan 20, 2017 at 11:10 AM
subject: quick observation

Just a quick observation re: Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures in case I don't get a chance to respond in full before the deadline. Lots of archives have architectural records. It's a major category in various descriptive standards and might be quite different I would imagine in calculating amounts.

Comment Number: 9

from: Carter, Lisa R. <carter.1088@osu.edu>
to: "moconway@umich.edu" "Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu"
date: Sun, Jan 22, 2017 at 12:00 PM
subject: Invitation to Comment: Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures

I just read through the Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures. While I'm sure you and your team are getting lots of good feedback, questions, and suggestions on your draft, I just wanted to send a note to say thank you for taking this on, especially as a joint effort between associations. I don't have any concrete, specific suggestions, I just really wanted to take a moment to recognize your hard work and show appreciation for your efforts to provide this tool to our field. We will all benefit significantly from having these standards. Keep up the good work!

Comment Number: 10

from: Nielsen, Elizabeth <elizabeth.nielsen@oregonstate.edu>
to: "moconway@umich.edu" "emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu"
date: Mon, Jan 23, 2017 at 7:16 PM
subject: Feedback on Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures --

Thank you for the excellent work of your task force in developing the proposed standard for holdings counts and measures.

Two thumbs up for these fundamental concepts:

1. For level 1, including only materials that are described on-line (i.e. discoverable).
2. Distinguishing between materials managed as collections and those managed as items. The examples you provided are helpful in clarifying this.

I have only one concern: I think "described at the collection level" may be confusing, so I encourage use of "managed as a collection" as being more accurate. As I understand the proposed standard, materials "described at the collection level" could be represented online by a very detailed finding aid that might include item-level description of some components. The materials are managed as a collection, but described at more detail than just "collection-level description."

I hope this is helpful.

Thanks again for your good work … I look forward to the adoption of this standard and its implementation.

Comment Number: 11

from: Griffin, Glenn <GGriffin@hbi.com>
to: "moconway@umich.edu" <moconway@umich.edu>
cc: "emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu" <emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu>
date: Wed, Jan 25, 2017 at 4:58 PM
subject: Comments: Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures

I must be missing something in reading through your proposed guidelines where on Page 2 of 3; "The Level 1 Count" states, in the last set of bullets, the first bullet: "Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both)". Huh? Wait, what's that again?

That makes no sense to me.

I have a film reel (Physical) and a computer (Digital) file of that same film reel, both take occupied space - that much I 'm sure of - but the bullet point doesn't seem to meet or match that reality. Both seem critical. A hard drive takes space, the rack that hard drive is housed in takes up space. It's already known the film reel takes up its own.

So I remain confused by what's attempting to be conveyed. Additionally the remaining, bullets, in that same section, also appear to completely contradict what the first bullet is conveying.

But I have to be missing something in reading this because it simply makes no sense on the surface of things. Both manifestations of this 'object' matter.

I must be completely off the mark here but I can't figure out where that mark is then.

Comment Number: 12

from: Rush, Michael <michael.rush@yale.edu>
to: <moconway@umich.edu>, " <Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu>
date: Thu, Feb 9, 2017 at 12:08 PM
subject: Comments on standardized holdings counts and measures

I've taken advantage of the snow day here in New Haven to catch up on reviewing the Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures. I think it looks great - congrats!

I have three comments/questions:

1) What informed the decision to emphasize counting collections for which description is available online for the Level 1 count? It's not clear to me why that distinction is important to make when formulating holdings counts. It's probably a safe assumption that some measures of holdings and extent are available for anything described online, but I don't think it follows that such data would necessarily not be available for collections not described online. Is the recommendation intended to reinforce the "if it isn't online, it doesn't exist" mindset. In other words, is it intended to motivate repositories to get description online? I'm not opposed to the distinction, per se, I just don't quite understand why it was made. It seems an odd choice to tie counts so closely to descriptive systems.

2) What informed the decision to prioritize cubic feet for measuring the space occupied by materials measured as collections rather than items? Did your research show that cubic feet is used by more shops? Were there

criteria you used to decide cubic feet was a more useful metric in this regard? Or did you think it was simply important to settle on one or the other. For the record I would be fine with cubic feet, but it would mean a significant change in practice for my repository and many others and having a justification laid out will be helpful.

3) Would you consider taking a unit-neutral approach to measuring space occupied? As American institutions, cubic or linear feet make sense, but the proposed standard may be used in metric countries as well. I'd recommend not tying space measurements specifically to American measurements.

I'm looking forward to the final draft. Again, this is excellent work.

Comment Number: 13

from: Timms, Katherine (BAC/LAC) <katherine.timms@canada.ca>
to: "moconway@umich.edu" "emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu"
date: Wed, Feb 22, 2017 at 10:08 AM
subject: Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures

I read with interest your draft of the above (from the SAA and ACRL/RBMS task group).

I have a few comments and questions:

1. I liked your approach of distinguishing intellectual units from physical units and space occupied.

    a. I was wondering if you could add a definition for “title/title equivalent”? I understood it to mean the title of the item (e.g. provided by a creator/publisher) or aggregate/collection (e.g. title assigned to a fonds by an archivist). Is this correct?

    b. In other words, is it essentially intended to be the title of the ‘unit of description’ (item or otherwise) as defined in ISAD(G)?

2. Non-online finding aids/descriptions are excluded. Will they be included in a “Level 2” count? While it may be a goal to have all holdings’ descriptions available online, is this yet the reality for all archives?

3. Regarding space occupied, the draft states that “Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both).” Related to this, “Surrogates and derivatives (digitized or microfilmed content, photocopies, access copies, etc.) of intellectual units are not counted.”

    a.. I’m wondering why digitized materials are altogether excluded? Because they are access tools or surrogates, not original holdings? My sense is that they should be counted (separately) as it seems relevant to know how much of the born-analogue materials have been digitized (the ratio between the two). When considering total digital holdings, it could be useful to know the percentage that is born-digital vs. born-analogue. Digital storage requirements could be affected by digitized holdings too.

    b.You mention that a repository may decide to record information about multiple copies – could the same logic apply to born-analogue holdings and their digitized equivalents?

4. You mention that you “are not recommending any methods or even best practices regarding the ‘hows’ of counting or measuring.” I’m wondering why this is so? Could this be a Phase 2 for these guidelines? The work you’ve done to date is important and well-done, but it seems like the other piece is missing (how to count or measure the holdings). Having common counts and measures would allow for comparisons to be drawn across repositories, if statistics were shared.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment and best of luck with this project, as it moves forward.

Comment Number: 14

from: Meg Phillips <meg.phillips@nara.gov>
to: moconway@umich.edu, emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu
cc: "Patterson, Carla" <carla.patterson@nara.gov>
date: Fri, Mar 3, 2017 at 4:41 PM
subject: a few comments from NARA on Proposed Level 1 Guidelines

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SAA / RBMS Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures.

A number of National Archives staff took a look at the proposal, and a consolidated summary of the considerations they raised follows below. If you want to follow up on any of these thoughts, I can put you in touch with the originator(s) of the comments if you like. Just let me know.

I've put these roughly in order of how many people mentioned them, with the most commonly mentioned issue at the top.

Summary of Considerations:

1. Several people suggested that the Level 1 and Level 2 counts seem backwards. The entire universe of holdings is the more important management measure for holdings (since the entirety of the physical or digital collection must be stored and managed). The portion of the total holdings discoverable / described online is more meaningful once you can see the relationship of that fraction to the whole universe than it is on its own as the freestanding Level 1 count.
2. A couple of people questioned the proposal that digital surrogates should not be counted. Again, surrogates take up space which must be managed, so knowing the total volume of holdings is an important management and comparison tool.
3. Some types of materials unique to the born-digital world are not explicitly included in this framework of categories (data files/ databases or social media, for example). Could explicit guidance be included about where to count those? Do they need their own category where there is no paper equivalent, which would be the way NARA actually understands these records?
4. The very broad definition of “described online” would make it nearly impossible for us to count accurately. We need to be specific - described in the catalog - or it would grind us to a halt to figure out what is mentioned in a blog post but not described in the catalog. (That shouldn't happen often, but checking would be difficult.) If NARA were to use this metric, we would have to just ignore that part of the definition and only include things described in the catalog, so our preference would be for a narrower definition.
5. The presidential libraries manage very large collections of artifacts. Experts there explained that museum professionals rely almost entirely on item counts to manage their collections. However, other staff members acknowledged that for specific purposes (planning a move, etc) a cubic foot measure could also be useful. (In combination, this is not really a recommendation to change the proposal since both are there. MP)
6. There were a couple of places where the language in the draft created confusion for some readers.
    a. The paragraph containing, “Physical units held...are not counted, nor are the containers…” which is immediately followed by “A container count may be useful...for the purposes of calculating cubic or linear feet.” At least one person thought this seemed contradictory, so it might be possible to further clarify.

b. Could an explicit discussion of mixed collections be included? For examples, how to handle books that are shelved along with a collection that would otherwise be measured in cubic feet. One person mentioned wondering about this.

There are also a few of these that NARA would currently have trouble generating, but we are not commenting on those because they still seem like a reasonable recommendation for the profession. I just want to be clear that we couldn't immediately generate a report that looked like this.

Comment Number: 15

from: Lacy, Mary <mlac@loc.gov>
to: <moconway@umich.edu> <emily_gustainis@hms.harvard.edu>
date: Fri, Mar 3, 2017 at 4:56 PM
subject: FW: [RBMS] REMINDER: Comments Invited on Proposed Level 1 Guidelines

LC staff from divisions responsible for or supporting archival content reviewed this document with great interest. We applaud the concept of finding basic common vocabulary for holdings counts and measures, which are essential both within an institution for managing collections and repositories, and for conveying to researchers and other institutions the extent and accessibility of our collections.

General questions:

We are curious as to how the guidelines may be used for collections assessment, and how the holdings counts and measures might be used: primarily for sharing across institutions for a broad survey? Would these Level 1 counts then form the base of intra-institutional statistics and measures? What the reporting mechanism be?

Specific comments for Level 1:

1. LC commonly uses linear feet, not cubic feet as a measure of extent. Use by custodial units vary: for instance, the Geography and Maps Division would be measuring the content of map drawers. The Manuscript Division measures linear feet for normally shelved containers (usually legal size but sometimes letter sized) but doesn't estimate for oversize material on flat shelves or map drawers. We noticed that some examples give linear feet rather than cubic feet.

2. Like so many institutions, we are wrestling with how best to record the extent of born-digital content. We are starting to record number of files as well as byte size (conversion to GB should be easy enough; for GIS systems, terabytes may be required). Would datasets serving as metadata received from the creators of the collection creators be considered part of the digital content to be recorded?

3. We note that surrogates (microform or digital) are not included in the level 1 count. Would they be included in the level 2? This ties in with determining needs for shared or repository storage: both would need to be tracked for institutional needs.

4. Sometimes the boundaries between surrogates and copies is blurred. Are preservation copies are recorded as surrogates or as copies (as opposed to access copies or copies received as part of the collection). Copies received as part of the collection might also include files received both in digital and analog form, and both copies might be retained.

5. We noted with interest the division between archives and manuscripts (managed as collections) and manuscripts (managed as items). We determined that some collections might contain just one item but

could still be managed as collections (cataloged with DACS and under archival rather than bibliographic control).

6. For cartographic material, the definition needs to be expanded to include imaginary/fictional places (maps of Middle Earth, Narnia, etc.)

Level 2 questions:

1. We will be particularly interested in how Level 2 is formulated, as it may prove most useful in determining total holdings extents as needed for storage and digital repository needs, and for arrearage measurement, tracking, and reporting.

2. Of especial interest will be how digital arrearages are counted and reported.

3. Counting of surrogates (digitized and microfilmed content) as well as born-digital material (whether processed or in arrearage status) continues to be of the greatest importance in evaluating needs for storage and service.

Comment Number: 16
From: Samouelian, Mary [mailto:msamouelian@hbs.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 01, 2017 10:51 AM
To: Gustainis, Emily
Subject: Comments on proposed "Level 1 Count"

Baker Library Special Collections at Harvard Business School has reviewed the Proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures. Thank you for the efforts of the Joint Task Force for developing these standards and the opportunity for our repository to review and respond to them. We respectfully submit the following comments:

- We would argue that space occupied for all categories of material should include both cubic feet and linear feet. This would afford repositories the flexibility of using the extent that best accurately reflect their holdings and which could be more meaningful to its researchers.
- We would further argue that digital space occupied should be measured in megabytes, gigabytes, and terabytes again affording repositories the flexibility of using extents that best reflect their holdings and which could be more meaningful to researchers. Limiting extent to just one type could make reporting of collections with a small amount of digital content confusing. As an example, in our repository we have multiple collections containing a small number of files with small storage (i.e., 100kb). Converting this to gigabytes would equate it to .0001 gigabytes. Conversely something very large like 8 TB would convert to 8,000 GB. We believe that it would be more meaningful to researchers to record .1 megabytes and 8 TB respectively.
- We are confused about the statement "Collection materials occupies physical space or digital space (not both)." Why not? Many of our collections have and will have both and we feel it's important to count both if they both exist in a collection.

Again thank for the opportunity to review and respond to this document. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any clarification.

Comment Number: 17

From: Bennett, Stephanie [mailto:bennetse@wfu.edu]
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2017 3:27 PM
To: Gustainis, Emily
Subject: Level 1, Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures

Just wanted to say that I found the Level 1 proposal very clear and (relatively) implementable, especially given that they are particularly aimed at online/discoverable resources. It might help to clarify that when you mention online description, in its many forms, that it should be created by the repository. Some of our collections are sort of described online, in that they are mentioned on others' genealogy blogs, but those sources sometimes get information wrong. They help make our collections discoverable, yes, but also muddy the waters a bit.

Thanks for creating such a useful document! We are moving in the next few years and I have a feeling these counts will be helpful for that process.

Comment Number: 18

From: Special Collections & Archives Council, Harvard Library, Harvard University

1. Would like to see the category "Manuscripts (described and managed as items)" changed to "Archives and Manuscripts (described and managed as items) so that it is parallel to "Archives and Manuscripts (described and managed as collections"

   Why: There are many single item "archival" records, such as an institutional charter or a single letter issued by a corporate entity. The inclusion of archives is important to indicate that something that is an archival record (that is, in the purest sense, the record of a business or corporate entity) exist for things managed as collections and as items. For corporate and government archives, the clarification may prove important

2. The use of accessioning is a fair test of whether to count or not, however, there was one strong comment from a member regarding digitized collections (surrogates) that are being provided as a separate website, searchable via a separate database, etc., be counted. The question raised was, does the presentation of the digitized content present new or novel user interaction with the digital copies? In other words, does it constitute a NEW resource in that traditional surrogates are being presented in a transformative way, such as with: narrative accompaniment; transcription; translation; user feedback; highlighting; zoom functionality; OCR, etc. If so, one of the SPARC members wanted to be able to count it, as these kinds of things are both managed and high-investment

3. Group was interested in Level 2, presented as a likely stacks management/collection management count, as this information seemed more useful than the Level 1 count. They wanted more clarification on the levels and who the data was being collected for. (This brings up the issue of audience.)

4. Many archives are required to keep the fact that certain records (such specific institutional/archival records) because legal counsel has asked them to suppress records. Since these are not discoverable, but may represent a lot of records (such as government records series) that can't be reported. How would you respond to this?

5. Many places are seeking much more prescriptive guidance. SPARC members felt that the guideline should be more assertive in telling people what to count or not to count.

Comment Number: 19

From: Elizabeth Surles [mailto:elizabeth.surles@rutgers.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 3:27 PM
To: Gustainis, Emily
Subject: Comment for SAA-ACRL-RBMS task force

The Music Library Association Working Group for Archival Description of Music Materials recommends that the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries include “Notated Music Material” as a separate item in the categories and types of collection materials, listed in the third document of the Task Force’s proposed Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries.

The Working Group's assumption and rationale for its comment is that the categories identified for level 1 counts will be the same for level 2 counts. Given that level 2 counts will likely include "physical units held," the idiosyncrasies of various notated music types and formats should be accounted for in a separate category. Specifically, notated music representing the same title/work can exist in manuscript form written by a copyist and/or the composer; published form as sheet music, in a bound anthology, or some other form; in various iterations such as a conductor's score and parts, a piano reduction, an arrangement for middle school band, etc. Additionally, notated music is both cataloged at the item level using various library-based practices as well as described at less granular levels following archival practice. Addressing these idiosyncrasies by including notated music materials as a separate category could help clarify the guidelines and facilitate their application.

Comment #	Category	Comment	Key Issue		Response				
3	Books and Other Printed Materials	Is "Book..." a form or a format? Does "Book" mean bound form? (In which case, why is "codices" listed under the "Manuscripts" listing of forms?) Or does "book" only refer to printed, bound materials? (In which case where do other bound formats that aren't printed but may be managed at the item level and shelved as books? Like scrapbooks, letterbooks, bound correspondence, autograph albums, photo albums, atlases, document binders, fabric sample books, etc.)							
3	Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections)	The categorizing of mixed material collections under the "Archives and Manuscripts (managed as collections) heading seems like it would irresponsibly undercount vulnerable and/or minority formats that are included in larger paper-based collections. Presumably the ultimate goal of this count is to leverage the data to gain more funding. Hiding problematic formats in larger collections will lead to undercounting and underfunding.			ldfs response: That may be true, but I don't think it's our role or mandate to advise repositories that by categorizing things as mixed materials for this reason. There are lots of good reasons for having mixed materials collections. It's just not practical in many cases to separate out minority formats and I don't think we can or should tell people they have to. Perhaps we could allude to it as a concern in our introduction.				
6	Objects/Artifacts	Change the definition of Objects/Artifacts from "Material things that can be seen and touched" to something that bases it on the dimensionality of the material instead of the method of interaction. "Material that have length, width, and depth" is an attempt, but I don't think it adequately excludes the other categories.	Category needs to include digital		The model would be object/artifact (due to the physical nature) but the cloud drawing would be visual/graphic - 5/19/2017				
6	Proposed/Missing Category	Proposed Software definition "Materials that can be played back through computing equipment and allow for user interaction"	Additional category needed		ldfs response: We added this category				
8	Proposed/Missing Category	Lots of archives have architectural records. It';s a major category in various descriptive standards and might be quite different I would imagine in calculating amounts.	Additional category needed						
15	Cartographic	For cartographic material, the definition needs to be expanded to include imaginary/fictional places (maps of Middle Earth, Narnia, etc.)	Category revision (suggested)		ldfs response: done				
18	Manuscripts (described and managed as items)	Would like to see the category “Manuscripts (described and managed as items)” changed to “Archives and Manuscripts (described and managed as items) so that it is parallel to “Archives and Manuscripts (described and managed as collections.” There are many single item “archival” records, such as an institutional charter or a single letter issued by a corporate entity. The inclusion of archives is important to indicate that something that is an archival record (that is, in the purest sense, the record of a business or corporate entity) exist for things managed as collections and as items. For corporate and government archives, the clarification may prove important	Category revision (suggested)		ldfs response: I think this is moot now with our reconfigured categories				
See also:	**Digital tab**								

Comment #	Comment	Key Issue	Response	
1	Does not include any mention of tubes or rolls, which are standard containers and objects within design collections.		counting physical units is at the discretion of the repository	

Comment #	Comment	Key Issue	Response
1	Categories/Types of Collection Material does not consistently include examples of the materials in the scope, and is lacking digital examples especially for the Graphic/Visual and Moving Image Material.	Categories/Types of Collection Materials scope notes need more examples for materials found in that category, especially digital examples for graphic/visual and moving image categories	add digital examples to definitions/scope notes and to "Examples"
3	[Re:] "Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both)" - [This] Seems unnecessary. Holding count would benefit from including both the physical shelf space that an external hard drive or set of floppy discs takes up as well as the GB count.	Counting physical space occupied by external media on which records you have migrated to another form of storage and are reporting as part of digital space occupied	will strike this: Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both)"
3	[Re:] "surrogates and derivatives....are not counted" - [this] would misrepresent collection holdings and storage needs. Again, counting the physical shelf space or GB of digital content for collection items should be the goal, whether the material is an alternate format or not. Surrogates and derivatives that are not accessioned (or described) collection items should not be counted (exhibition copies, promotional materials, etc.)	Digital surrogates and derivatives, explicit guidance needed	need definitions and guideance re: surrogate, derivative
5	Why don't digital images of objects get counted? [Is it because] They are “derivatives?”	Digital surrogates and derivatives, explicit guidance needed	need definitions and guideance re: surrogate, derivative
6	There is still lingering confusion in the community over the definition of a gigabyte, either 1024^3 bytes or 1000^3 bytes. Using the 1024-definition gives a 7% smaller result than using the 1000-definition. Officially according to SI, GB = 1000^3 B and GiB = 1024^3.	Definition of a gigabyte	decimal or binary definition of/for "multiples of bytes" Could leave this to the discretion of the repository. Should maybe say that there are these two "definitions" and how you know which you have/are using.
6	How does the reporting account for multiple copies of digital material and derivatives of materials that are created for access purposes? [Can you] Add explicit guidance whether to count copies of digital material [and] Add explicit guidance whether derivative copies count, and if so, what types of derivatives (i.e. digital archives with files format-migrated for access purposes vs. digitized material with files resized for access purposes)	Digital surrogates and derivatives, explicit guidance needed	need definitions and guidance re: surrogate, derivative
6	Software doesn't seem to fit into the existing categories. Examples of software in physical and digital spaces include video game collections and archives of developers or software companies. The performance and interactivity components of this material makes it distinct from the motion picture and object categories.	No category for some types of born digital material (it does not fit in existing categories)	ComputerPrograms category added
6	Objects/Artifacts should be able to be measured digitally. For example, we recently completed a laser scan of our building. The multi-GB point-cloud file and 3-D model would not fall under any of the existing categories, but it does fit closest into the object category.	No category for some types of born digital material (it does not fit in existing categories); No place to report digital objects and artifacts	Objects/Artififacts can be digital (in/for an "Advanced" measure of Digial Speace Occupied).
11	[This does not make sense:] The Level 1 Count” states, in the last set of bullets, the first bullet: “Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both). [Example:]I have a film reel (Physical) and a computer (Digital) file of that same film reel, both take occupied space - that much I ‘m sure of - but the bullet point doesn’t seem to meet or match that reality. Both seem critical. A hard drive takes space, the rack that hard drive is housed in takes up space. It’s already known the film reel takes up its own.	Counting physical space occupied by external media on which records you have migrated to another form of storage and are reporting as part of digital space occupied	will strike this: Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both)"
13	Regarding space occupied, the draft states that "Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both)."	Counting physical space occupied by external media on which records you have migrated to another form of storage and are reporting as part of digital space occupied	will strike this: Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both)"
13	"Surrogates and derivatives (digitized or microfilmed content, photocopies, access copies, etc.) of intellectual units are not counted." [Why are] digitized materials altogether excluded? Because they are access tools or surrogates, not original holdings? My sense is that they should be counted (separately) as it seems relevant to know how much of the born-analogue materials have been digitized (the ratio between the two). When considering total digital holdings, it could be useful to know the percentage that is born-digital vs. born-analogue. Digital storage requirements could be affected by digitized holdings too. You mention that a repository may decide to record information about multiple copies – could the same logic apply to born-analogue holdings and their digitized equivalents?	Digital surrogates and derivatives, explicit guidance needed	Will provide definitions and guidance on this particular isue.
14	[Why do we advise that] digital surrogates should not be counted...surrogates take up space which must be managed, so knowing the total volume of holdings is an important management and comparison tool.	Digital surrogates and derivatives, explicit guidance needed	Will provide definitions and guidance on this particular isue.
14	Some types of materials unique to the born-digital world are not explicitly included in this framework of categories (data files/ databases or social media, for example). Could explicit guidance be included about where to count those? Do they need their own category where there is no paper equivalent?	No category for some types of born digital material (it does not fit in existing categories)	Will add digital examples to definitions/scope notes and to "Examples"

Comment #	Comment	Key Issue	Response
15	Would datasets serving as metadata received from the creators of the collection creators be considered part of the digital content to be recorded?	No category for some types of born digital material (it does not fit in existing categories); No place to report digital objects and artifacts	[Yes]
15	We note that surrogates (microform or digital) are not included in the level 1 count. Would they be included in the level 2? This ties in with determining needs for shared or repository storage: both would need to be tracked for institutional needs.	Digital surrogates and derivatives, explicit guidance needed	Differnt guidance for Intellectual Units Held (surrogates not counted) and Physical Space Occupied and Digital Space Occupied (surrogates counted).
15	Sometimes the boundaries between surrogates and copies is blurred. Are preservation copies are recorded as surrogates or as copies (as opposed to access copies or copies received as part of the collection). Copies received as part of the collection might also include files received both in digital and analog form, and both copies might be retained.	How are preservation copies counted?	Will address counting "copies" and "surrogates" in Guidance for Intellectual Units Held and Physical Space and Ditial Space occupied.
15	[For Level 2:] Counting of surrogates (digitized and microfilmed content) as well as born-digital material (whether processed or in arrearage status) continues to be of the greatest importance in evaluating needs for storage and service.	Comment	Will address counting "copies" and "surrogates" in Guidance for Intellectual Units Held and Physical Space and Ditial Space occupied.
16	We are confused about the statement "Collection materials occupies physical space or digital space (not both)." Why not? Many of our collections have and will have both and we feel it's important to count both if they both exist in a collection.	Physical vs. digital space occupied	will strike this: Collection material occupies physical space or digital space (not both)"
18	[I would] like to count web-based presentatons of digitized content (surrogates), as [I would] consider it a resource in which traditional surrogates are being presented in a transformative way, such as with: narrative accompaniment; transcription; translation; user feedback; highlighting; zoom functionality; OCR, etc. These kinds of resources require management and are an investment	Digital surrogates and derivatives, explicit guidance needed; No category for some types of born digital material (it does not fit)	Online Exhibits and Digital Collections: are these the same? how are they counted (Intellectual Units Held, Digital Space Occupied?

Comment #	Comment	Key Issue	Response	
2	I find the "Optional" status for those items "not [yet] described online/discoverable" to be unfortunate, as it seems to eliminate huge portions of known materials/collections from the count. ... I certainly agree that the two status groups need to be counted separately, but without equivalent data for both, how will "we" know the nature of completing access to all these rich holdings, or how much progress we're making over some period of time? tus for those items "not [yet] described online/discoverable" to be unfortunate	Undiscoverable not included in Level 1	This is now an advanced measure	
12	What informed the decision to emphasize counting collections for which description is available online for the Level 1 count?...Is the recommendation intended to reinforce the "if it isn't online, it doesn't exist" mindset. In other words, is it intended to motivate repositories to get description online? I'm not opposed to the distinction, per se, I just don't quite understand why it was made. It seems an odd choice to tie counts so closely to descriptive systems.	Undiscoverable not included in Level 1 -- rationale needed		
13	Non-online finding aids/descriptions are excluded. Will they be included in a "Level 2" count? While it may be a goal to have all holdings' descriptions available online, is this yet the reality for all archives?	Undiscoverable not included in Level 1	Include more in background on our thinking about why we would exclude non-online description	
14	The very broad definition of "described online" would make it nearly impossible for us to count accurately. We need to be specific - described in the catalog - or it would grind us to a halt to figure out what is mentioned in a blog post but not described in the catalog. (That shouldn't happen often, but checking would be difficult.) If NARA were to use this metric, we would have to just ignore that part of the definition and only include things described in the catalog, so our preference would be for a narrower definition.		We are being inclusive of a variety of repositories... can make a nod to the revised DACS principles...	Clarify that we are not saying that it *has* to be counted if it is only described in a blog post, but that it *can* count as online description
18	Many archives are required to keep the fact that certain records (such specific institutional/archival records) because legal counsel has asked them to suppress records. Since these are not discoverable, but may represent a lot of records (such as government records series) that can't be reported. How would you respond to this?		Online discoverable is not necessarily the same as processed. We need to emphasize the importance of discoverability as a value for our profession. We are not saying discoverable ='s processed	

Comment #	Comment	Key Issue	Response	
1	Linear	Reporting unit for digital space occupied	Addressed	
3	[Re: Books and Other Printed Material" category:] As the only material type that is measured in linear feet, institutions will want to measure all of their bound materials together regardless of the material type category,	Use of linear feet for all bound materials, regardless of category	Physical space occupied does not need to be separated by category	
3	"Physical Units Held" - what level of detail will the format types be broken down into? Particularly for visual, film, and A/V formats, knowing that an institution has 100 videotapes is much different than knowing that they have 50 Umatic tapes, 20 2-inch video tapes, and 30 VHS tapes. Similarly being able to differentiate between graphic posters, photographs, and film negatives.	How do you report on the number of types of things in a box	counting physical units is at the discretion of the repository	
5	I am very math-challenged and would appreciate a mini-tutorial on how to convert 100 map cases at 40x50x4 into cubic feet. Do I multiply everything?	Instructions for getting space occupied - map cases	Didn't we have an appendix listing a bunch of tools?	
5	For objects, do I draw an imaginary box around the item to get height, depth and width to make the cubic feet? African masks, for example.	Instructions for getting space occupied - objects	Didn't we have an appendix listing a bunch of tools?	
6	Add GB to Level 1 Count for Object	Reporting unit for category Objects/Artifacts		
6	Should be able to count software in GB and cubic feet		Addressed	
6	Add explicit guidance whether to count copies of digital material	Choice of cubic feet materials managed as collections	To be addressed in handling digital objects guidance	
6	Add explicit guidance whether derivative copies count	Instructions needed	To be addressed in handling digital objects guidance	
7	I think the example of the Visual Materials "single item" that is a portfolio of photographic prints needs another line of explanation. (This is "Adenauer: photographic portfolio".) It is not clear to me why the institution would choose to count this as an item rather than a collection.	Distinguishing items from collections	Don't really need to address the comment	

Comment #	Comment	Key Issue	Response	
12	What informed the decision to prioritize cubic feet for measuring the space occupied by materials measured as collections rather than items? Did your research show that cubic feet is used by more shops? Were there criteria you used to decide cubic feet was a more useful metric in this regard? Or did you think it was simply important to settle on one or the other. For the record I would be fine with cubic feet, but it would mean a significant change in practice for my repository and many others and having a justification laid out will be helpful.	Choice of cubic feet materials managed as collections	Addressed	
12	Would you consider taking a unit-neutral approach to measuring space occupied? As American institutions, cubic or linear feet make sense, but the proposed standard may be used in metric countries as well. I'd recommend not tying space measurements specifically to American measurements.	Use of American units of measure	will include metric conversion tool in Resources	
14	The presidential libraries manage very large collections of artifacts. Experts there explained that museum professionals rely almost entirely on item counts to manage their collections. However, other staff members acknowledged that for specific purposes (planning a move, etc) a cubic foot measure could also be useful. (In combination, this is not really a recommendation to change the proposal since both are there.	Greater weight on item counts for objects/atifacts	Physical unit counts are at the discretion of the repository and we will point to resources for these counts	
14	Could an explicit discussion of mixed collections be included? For examples, how to handle books that are shelved along with a collection that would otherwise be measured in cubic feet. One person mentioned wondering about this.	Instructions for physical space occupied for shelves holding different categories of material	Physical space occupied does not need to be separated by category	
15	We are starting to record number of files as well as byte size (conversion to GB should be easy enough; for GIS systems, terabytes may be required)	Reporting unit for digital space occupied	Addressed	
15	LC commonly uses linear feet, not cubic feet as a measure of extent. Use by custodial units vary: for instance, the Geography and Maps Division would be measuring the content of map drawers. The Manuscript Division measures linear feet for normally shelved containers (usually legal size but sometimes letter sized) but doesn't estimate for oversize material on flat shelves or map drawers. We noticed that some examples give linear feet rather than cubic feet.	When to use linear or cubic feet - more examples?	Addressed	

Comment #	Comment	Key Issue	Response	
15	We noted with interest the division between archives and manuscripts (managed as collections) and manuscripts (managed as items). We determined that some collections might contain just one item but could still be managed as collections (cataloged with DACS and under archival rather than bibliographic control).	Distinguishing items from collections - guidelines clarification?	Addressed	
15	Sometimes the boundaries between surrogates and copies is blurred. Are preservation copies are recorded as surrogates or as copies (as opposed to access copies or copies received as part of the collection). Copies received as part of the collection might also include files received both in digital and analog form, and both copies might be retained.	How are preservation copies counted? (Also mentioned in Digital)	The revised guidelines state/will state that if you cannot distinguish between preservation masters and derivative files (for access copies/reproduction master), count the digital space occupied for both. If you can distinguish between masters and derivates, only ccount the digital space occupied for masters.	
16	[We believe] digital space occupied should be measured in megabytes, gigabytes, and terabytes again affording repositories the flexibility of using extents that best reflect their holdings and which could be more meaningful to researchers.	Reporting unit for digital space occupied	Addressed	
16	We would argue that space occupied for all categories of material should include both cubic feet and linear feet. This would afford repositories the flexibility of using the extent that best accurately reflect their holdings and which could be more meaningful to its researchers.	Choice of cubic feet vs. linear feet should be left to the repository	Addressed	
16	We would further argue that digital space occupied should be measured in megabytes, gigabytes, and terabytes again affording repositories the flexibility of using extents that best reflect their holdings and which could be more meaningful to researchers.	Reporting unit for digital space occupied	Addressed	

Comment #	Comment	Key Issue	Response			
3	...Without clear guidance, surveyors get frustrated and may give up or simply skip over items/collections that they can't easily fit into the categories provided...	Would like to see guidelines be more prescriptive	The guidelines are designed to promote local flexibility and enable maximum participation.			
4	Under the measures for quantification, a fourth type of count would seem to me to be time, in terms of hours and minutes. This is often very relevant to our researchers and for our statistical reports, such as in the sample below, which describe audio or moving image materials:	Additional count wanted	time-based/duration -- count at the discretion of the repository (like physical units) -- can point to resources (media			
7	[Were] ARL statistical categories and measurable units were considered.. making the departure a bit more explicit in the report explicit (briefly) in the report might put such questions to rest. . In the context of what ARL libraries have been counting for decades, I see the following significant departures: 1) volume counts (for print) are no longer of interest, but VOLUME (cubic feet) now would be of interest. 2) Item estimates/counts for Visual Materials would be replaced by cubic footage, which is of limited usefulness (but might be refined in Level 2 -- no quibble here -- just an observation.) 3) MU's (1.25 linear feet) are not adopted, but cubic footage.	Content recommendation for guidelines text	Volume counts are physical units and to be counted per the needs/at the discretion of individual repositories.			
7	It might be good to acknowledge that changing how we count will introduce difficulties in comparing retrospective data to future data, for those institutions that have kept data under different systems (like ARL reporting).	Content recommendation for guidelines text				
10	I think "described at the collection level" may be confusing, so I encourage use of "managed as a collection" as being more accurate. As I understand the proposed standard, materials "described at the collection level" could be represented online by a very detailed finding aid that might include item-level description of some components. The materials are managed as a collection, but described at more detail than just "collection-level description."	Language choice for types of counts	Discussed 3/15/2017. The Task Force agreed that "managed" is a more appropriate way of communicating what we are requesting, and have adopted this change in language.			
13	I was wondering if you could add a definition for "title/title equivalent"? I understood it to mean the title of the item (e.g. provided by a creator/publisher) or aggregate/collection (e.g. title assigned to a fonds by an archivist). Is this correct? In other words, is it essentially intended to be the title of the 'unit of description' (item or otherwise) as defined in ISAD(G)?	Supplemental definition nee	we need to/will do this!			
13	You mention that you "are not recommending any methods or even best practices regarding the"how" of counting or measuring." I'm wondering why this is so? Could this be a Phase 2 for these guidelines? The work you';ve done to date is important and well-done, but it seems like the other piece is missing (how to count or measure the holdings).	Would like to see guidelines be more prescriptive	nope!			
14	Several people suggested that the Level 1 and Level 2 counts seem backwards. The entire universe of holdings is the more important management measure for holdings (since the entirety of the physical or digital collection must be stored and managed).	Level 1 and Level 2 scope	Discussed 3/15/17. How should we handle gross aggregates across categories? Does it preclude more granular counts or present an additional option to characterize holdings? Should a total for all physical space occupied, both for discoverable and undiscoverable, both physical and digital, be required? It was decided that yes, to get at a comprehensive view of space occupied, physical and digital space occupied should be required as part of the Level 1 count, but that a title count is not. The chart has been adjusted.			
14	The paragraph containing, "Physical units held...are not counted, nor are the containers…" which is immediately followed by "A container count may be useful...for the purposes of calculating cubic or linear feet." At least one person thought this seemed contradictory, so it might be possible to further clarify.	Clarification needed	sort of but not really! We might consider removing this verbiage if confusing			
15	We are curious as to how the guidelines may be used for collections assessment, and how the holdings counts and measures might be used: primarily for sharing across institutions for a broad survey? Would these Level 1 counts then form the base of intra-institutional statistics and measures? What the reporting mechanism be?	Intent and audience	survey and data repository beyond the scope of the TF; resources are available re: rchival collections assessment			
15	We will be particularly interested in how Level 2 is formulated, as it may prove most useful in determining total holdings extents as needed for storage and digital repository needs, and for arrearage measurement, tracking, and reporting.					

Comment #	Comment	Key Issue	Response			
15	[For Level 2:] Of especial interest will be how digital arrearages are counted and reported					
18	Many places are seeking much more prescriptive guidance. SPARC members felt that the guideline should be more assertive in telling people what to count or not to count.	Would like to see guidelines be more prescriptive				
18	Group was interested in Level 2, presented as a likely stacks management/collection management count, as this information seemed more useful than the Level 1 count. They wanted more clarification on the levels and who the data was being collected for.	Intent and audience				

Assessment Toolkit

Collection Assessment

Collection Surveys:

- Sample Strategy for Collection Survey, Graduate School of Design
- Holdings Counts and Measures: Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
  Report from a joint ACRL/RBMS-SAA Task Force offering metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries

Calculating Extent:

The following calculators will calculate physical extent for you based on the number of containers (standard container types with dimensions are provided).

- Rebel Archives Calculator (calculates BOTH cubic and linear feet)
- Yale linear feet calculator
- Schlesinger linear feet calculator

Processing Practice and Workflow Assessment

Processing Complexity:

- Processing Complexity Level Definitions [DOC], Center for the History of Medicine, Countway Library of Medicine
  A rubric used to assess the pre-processing complexity of a collection which can be tracked as part of a processing plan and/or processing metrics data.

Processing Metrics:

- Processing Metrics Collaborative Wiki: Database Development Initiative
  - A wiki containing information and resources on tracking processing metrics using MD (an Access database developed by the Center for the History of Medicine for tracking processing metrics data, which can be downloaded from the wiki).
- Archival Processing Metrics Worksheet [XLS], University of California Libraries
  - A worksheet for tracking and calculating collection-level processing metrics for collections processed at different levels (low to highly intensive).
- Processing Activities Worksheet [PDF], PACSCL/CLIR Hidden Collections Processing Project, 2009-2012
  - A form for daily logging of time spent on processing activities.

Processing Cost Estimates:

- Sample Processing Costing Estimate Template [XLS], Center for the History of Medicine, Countway Library of Medicine

Use and User Assessment

Public Services Metrics:

- Standardized Statistical Measures and Metrics for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries, SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force (final version submitted for approval as of 10/27/2017)

uc-borndigital-ckg / uc-guidelines

Dismiss

Join GitHub today

GitHub is home to over 36 million developers working together to host and review code, manage projects, and build software together.

Sign up

Branch: master ▾ uc-guidelines / DESCRIPTIVE_ELEMENTS / physical_description.md Find file Copy path

charliemacquarie Changed wording of 'website' to 'web site' to reflect controlled voca... a22fbdb on Jan 9, 2018

3 contributors

43 lines (25 sloc) 3.7 KB Raw Blame History

Physical Description

- DACS: Extent Element 2.5
- EAD3: Physical Description
- ArchivesSpace: Physical Description Note
- MARC: 300
- ISAD(G): 3.1.5
- RDA: Extent 3.4

See also Extent

REQUIRED

Physical Description **[8]** must include units of measure for born-digital material. This should *always* include both the size of the digital material in GB as well as the total number of files that have been preserved. Use 'GB' instead of "Gigabytes", "gigabyte", "Gb", "GBs", or any other variations thereof. Consult a digital data storage conversion tool if necessary, such as: http://www.thecalculatorsite.com/conversions/datastorage.php

When calculating size, round to three decimal points only when content is less than 1 GB. If content is smaller than 1 MB, default to ".001 GB". Otherwise, round to two decimal points (e.g. 9.25 GB).

For unprocessed material where capacity is unknown or difficult to estimate, include a count of the unprocessed media formats.

In certain cases, processors can also include other units of measure that may help a researcher better gauge or contextualize the amount of digital material present in the collection. This could include, for instance, total runtime or duration (for audiovisual files), total number of disk images, or total number of emails.

EXAMPLES:

- "Physical Description: 3 unprocessed hard drives (100 GB, 3000 GB, and 1000 GB) and 14 unprocessed CDs."
- "Physical Description: 4.5 linear feet (6 oversize boxes, 1 manuscript box), and 3400 GB (37,364 digital files)"
- "Physical Description: 13.4 linear feet (26 document boxes, 10 half document boxes, and 1 oversize flat box), and 385 GB (12,938 digital files)"
- "Physical Description: 19.5 linear feet (29 boxes) and 3750 GB (58,439 digital files, including 20,879 WAV files that total approximately 75 hours in duration)"
- "Physical Description: 109 linear feet (204 boxes) and 985 GB (11,905 digital files, including 17 disk images and 209 digital video files that total approximately 19 hours in duration)"
- "Physical Description: .5 linear feet (1 box) and 113 GB (1,097 WARC files representing periodic crawls of approximately 193 web sites)"
- "Physical Description: 17 linear feet (25 boxes) and .011 GB (31 digital files)"

[8] "Physical Description" is used here to mean a brief narrative summary noting the type and number of containers present, their physical attributes and/or dimensions, or other information related to their size, shape, or appearance. Please note that "Physical Description" and "Extent" actually map to two separate EAD3 elements: and . These two elements are independent of each other, and are differentiated in order to record different kinds of information about physical description. See https://www.loc.gov/ead/EAD3taglib/index.html#elem-physdesc and https://www.loc.gov/ead/EAD3taglib/index.html#elem-physdescstructured

[9] SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (Affiliated Group). "Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries." Society of American Archivists. (2014-2016). http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/guidelines-for-standardized-holdings-coun-1

[10] The total size and number of files recorded in the field should refer only to the collection material being described; it should not include any accompanying metadata files or related submission documentation.

ACRL Transmittal Sheet for Draft Standards and Guidelines

Title of Standard or Guideline:

Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Section or Committee Submitting:

Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS)

Submitting Section or Committee Chairperson:

Shannon Supple (RBMS Chair, 2018/2019)

Date of Previous Version:

N/A (these are new guidelines)

Means used to solicit comment on earlier drafts of the new/revised Standard or Guideline:

1. Published in *C&RL News*:

2. Disseminated on email distribution lists (with invitation to comment):

In **February 2015**, in an effort to learn more about how archives and special collections repositories are currently quantifying information about holdings, we issued a call for survey instruments, worksheets, methodologies, etc. to the following:

- ArchivesSpace Users Group
- Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC)
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS)
- Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA)
- Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Assessment Interest Group
- Big Ten Heads of Special Collections
- Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) Cataloging Hidden Collections Grant Recipients
- Midwest Archives Conference (MAC)
- New England Archivists (NEA)
- OCLC Research Libraries Partnership (RLP) Primary Sources Interest Group
- Society of American Archivists (SAA)
- Twin Cities Archives Round Table (TCART)
- Western Archivists (Society of California Archivists, Conference of Inter-Mountain Archivists, Northwest Archivists, Society of Rocky Mountain Archivists, Society of Southwest Archivists)

In **January 2017** we issued an invitation to comment on the first draft of our proposed guidelines for quantifying and sharing information about the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries, and in **May 2018** the same for a second, significantly revised draft, to the following:

- Archival Outlook (SAA p-newsletter)
- ArchivesSpace Users Group
- Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS) Preservation and Reformatting Section (PARS)
- Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC)
- Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA)
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS)
- Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA)
- Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Assessment Interest Group
- Big Ten Heads of Special Collections
- Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) Cataloging Hidden Collections Grant Recipients
- In the Loop (SAA e-newsletter)
- Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference (MARAC)
- Midwest Archives Conference (MAC)
- New England Archivists (NEA)
- OCLC Research Libraries Partnership (RLP) Primary Sources Interest Group
- Philadelphia Area Consortium of Special Collections Libraries (PACSCL)
- Society of American Archivists (SAA)
- Society of American Archivists (SAA) Archives Management Roundtable
- Society of American Archivists (SAA) Collection Management Tools Roundtable
- Society of American Archivists (SAA) Description Section
- Society of American Archivists (SAA) Manuscript Repositories Section
- Society of Florida Archivists
- Society of Georgia Archivists
- Society of Southwest Archivists
- Twin Cities Archives Round Table (TCART)
- Western Archivists (Society of California Archivists, Conference of Inter-Mountain Archivists, Northwest Archivists, Society of Rocky Mountain Archivists, Society of Southwest Archivists)

3. Published on Section website (with invitation to comment):

Announcement: Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures (20 June 2018)

4. Public hearing held:

21 August 2015 (at the SAA Annual Meeting): Open forum with the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries and the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy.

4 August 2016 (at the SAA Annual Meeting): Open forum with the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries.

5. Other public discussions held:

The Task Force held formally scheduled, announced-in-advance, open-to-all meetings at the following:

- ALA Midwinter 2015 (Chicago IL)
- ALA Annual 2015 (San Francisco CA)
- SAA Annual 2015 (Cleveland OH)
- ALA Midwinter 2016 (Boston MA)
- ALA Annual 2016 (Orlando FL)
- SAA Annual 2016 (Atlanta GA)
- ALA Midwinter 2017 (Atlanta GA)
- ALA Annual 2017 (Chicago IL)
- SAA Annual 2017 (Portland OR)
- ALA Midwinter 2018 (Denver CO)
- ALA Annual 2018 (New Orleans LA)
- SAA Annual 2018 (Washington DC)

6. Letters to "experts" requesting comments: (list names and dates):

On 9 December 2014 we met via conference call with Jackie Dooley, tthe primary author of Taking Our Pulse: The OCLC Research Survey of Special Collections and Archives. Jackie provided very helpful comments and advice both during and on several occasions after the call.

7. Other professional associations consulted (e.g., Society of American Archivists):

The *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* were developed as a joint/collaborative undertaking with the Society of American Archivists (SAA).

8. Other (please list):

Task Force members presented on the *Guidelines* at the following conferences:

- May 2015: Midwest Archives Conference (MAC) Annual Meeting (Lexington KY): “Assessment in Action: Using Results to Improve the Archival Experience”
- August 2015: Society of American Archivists (SAA) Annual Meeting (Cleveland OH): “Measure Up: Assessment Tools and Techniques from the Field” and “Collecting, Analyzing, and Acting with Assessment Data: A Community Conversation”
- April 2016: New England Archivists (NEA) Spring Meeting (Portland ME): “Standards and Best Practices for Metrics: Reports from the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Forces”
- June 2018: Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) Annual Conference (New Orleans LA): “Counting in a Common Language”

Date Approved by Section executive committee (if applicable):

Date Approved by ACRL Standards Committee:

Date Approved by ACRL Board:

Where and on whose responsibility should this (Standard or Guideline) be published or otherwise disseminated?

C&RL News:
Other (please list):

Announcement: Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures Approved by ACRL

Announcements News & Events May 3, 2019

I am pleased to let you know that the ACRL Board of Directors, at its 25 April 2019 virtual meeting, approved our *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries*. In anticipation of approval later this year by the SAA Standards Committee and SAA Council, the *Guidelines* have been made available on the Guidelines, Standards, and Frameworks page on the ACRL website. The result of a multi-year effort to develop definitions and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries, the *Guidelines* address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held and the different ways collection material is managed and described.

Here I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the members of the joint RBMS-SAA task force for the work that brought these *Guidelines* to fruition:

Representing ACRL/RBMS:

- Martha O'Hara Conway (University of Michigan) (co-chair) (2014 – 2018)
- Alvan Bregman (Queen's University) (2014 – 2016)
- Rachel D'Agostino (Library Company of Philadelphia) (2014 – 2018)
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (University of Minnesota) (2014 – 2018)
- Elizabeth Haven Hawley (University of Florida) (2016 – 2018)
- Katy Rawdon (Temple University) (2014 – 2017)

Representing SAA:

- Emily R. Novak Gustainis (Harvard University) (co-chair) (2014 – 2018)
- Adriana Cuervo (Rutgers University) (2014 – 2017)
- Angela Fritz (University of Notre Dame) (2014 – 2017)
- Lisa Miller (Stanford University) (2014 – 2018)
- Cyndi Shein (University of Nevada Las Vegas) (2014 – 2017)

Extra-special thanks go to Emily for her leadership and to Rachel, Lara, Haven, and Lisa for sticking with it all the way to the end. Our work was far more difficult and took considerably longer (and more of our time) than we anticipated.

Our hope is that those of us who are using the *Guidelines* to quantify and communicate holdings information will form a community of practice through which we interact regularly and document our

experience, for the purpose of developing and sharing best practices.

Thank you for your contributions to and interest in this work, and for your patience as we worked our way through it.

Please direct comments, questions, suggestions, etc. to me (moconway@umich.edu) or to Emily (Emily_Gustainis@hms.harvard.edu).

Martha O'Hara Conway
Director, Special Collections Research Center
University of Michigan Library

From:	Martha O"Hara Conway
To:	Gustainis, Emily
Subject:	Fwd: ACRL Board action: Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
Date:	Wednesday, May 1, 2019 1:46:42 PM

Hi Emily --

Very happy to let you know that our *Guidelines* were approved by the ACRL Board of Directors on 25 April.

It would great if I could say something about the anticipated/approximate timing for SAA review and approval in my announcement to the RBMS community. I can also just leave that unspecified, if you think best.

Please advise -- and yay!

All best to you -- Martha

Martha O'Hara Conway
Director * Special Collections Research Center
University of Michigan Library * Ann Arbor MI 48109-1190
(734) 647-8151 * moconway@umich.edu

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Shannon K. Supple** <ssupple@smith.edu>
Date: Fri, Apr 26, 2019 at 12:02 PM
Subject: Fwd: ACRL Board action: Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
To: <leadership@rbms.info>, Martha O'Hara Conway <moconway@umich.edu>, Pearson, Audrey <audrey.pearson@yale.edu>

Dear Team RBMS,

ACRL's Board has approved the RBMS joint task force's Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries. Huge thanks to Martha O'Hara Conway and the task force!

Martha, are you willing to send this out to the RBMS listserv so it is clear who did all the work?
Audrey, will you share this on the news blog?

Many thanks,
~Shannon

Shannon K. Supple
Curator of Rare Books
Smith College Libraries
http://www.pronoun.is/she
ssupple@smith.edu

413-585-2907

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Mary Ellen Davis** <mdavis@ala.org>
Date: Fri, Apr 26, 2019 at 11:57 AM
Subject: ACRL Board action: Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
To: eccles_kl@mercer.edu <eccles_kl@mercer.edu>
Cc: Lauren Pressley (pressley@uw.edu) <pressley@uw.edu>, Karen Munro (karen_munro@sfu.ca) <karen_munro@sfu.ca>, Cheryl A. Middleton <Cheryl.Middleton@oregonstate.edu>, April D. Cunningham <aprcunningham@gmail.com>, Kelly Gordon Jacobsma <jacobsma@hope.edu>, wmmiller@iupui.edu <wmmiller@iupui.edu>, Shannon Supple <ssupple@smith.edu>, David Free <dfree@ala.org>, Megan Griffin <mgriffin@ala.org>, Allison Payne <apayne@ala.org>

To: Kim Eccles, Chair, Standards Committee Chair

From: Mary Ellen Davis, ACRL Executive Director

Re: ACRL Board action: Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Cc: Lauren Pressley, ACRL President

Karen Munro, ACRL Vice-President

Cheryl Middleton, ACRL Past President

April D. Cunningham, ACRL Director-at-large

Kelly Gordon Jacobsma, ACRL Director-at-large

Willie Miller, Vice-Chair, Standards Committee

Shannon K. Supple, Chair, Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS)

David Free, Editor-in-Chief of *C&RL News*/Senior Communications Strategist

Megan Griffin, ACRL Senior Program Officer

Allison Payne, ACRL Program Manager for Strategic Initiatives

Thank you for submitting the revised Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries and the accompanying process documents for Board consideration. The ACRL Board of Directors, at its April 25, 2019, virtual meeting, was pleased to approve the Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries.

ACRL Editor-in-Chief of *C&RL News*/Senior Communications Strategist David Free will add the newly approved Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries to the ACRL website and promote on ACRL marketing channels.

On behalf the ACRL Board, I would like to thank you for leadership of the ACRL Standards Committee and for your careful stewardship of the standards process. Shannon, thank you for your work revising the document and consulting with the Society of American Archivists and other key stakeholders. Please pass along the Board's thanks and appreciation to the members of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section.

++++++++++++++
Mary Ellen K. Davis

Executive Director
Association of College and Research Libraries
ACRL/ALA, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611-2795
voice: 312.280.3248; fax: 312.280.2520; mdavis@ala.org; http://www.acrl.org

Pronouns: she, her, hers

ACRL Advancing learning Transforming scholarship
Association of College & Research Libraries
A division of the American Library Association