

**SAA/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures
Meeting Minutes
2015-08-21 Cleveland, Ohio 1:00-3:00PM**

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

Absent: Alvan Bregman; Rachel A. D'Agostino

Note taker: Cyndi Shein

Discussion

Informal productive brainstorming. Not following agenda too rigidly. Jumped right into user stories. Call for more user stories.

Someone voiced need to capture parallel physical extents—we assured her (we didn't do introductions, and I don't know everyone's names) that RDA and EAC3 validate parallel extents and systems like ArchivesSpace accommodate it.

User story #3

Defining hidden vs discoverable may hinge on whether there is some kind of description online that points to the material, because if it is only described on-site, then it is not discoverable by users elsewhere. This was debated, but we eventually agreed that there is a reasonable expectation of global discovery (at least at the collection level) in the 21st century.

Defining processed vs unprocessed is challenging in our environment of iterative processing. Defining "enhancement" is also challenging due to the nuances.

Cyndi: Does the JTF need to define these terms? Can we do that later? Missed last meeting and doesn't understand purpose of the user stories?

Purpose of user stories to test guidelines—see if the guidelines will address issues users face, particularly when asked to report specific info to external entities. Need to test it in real-world scenarios. Mention of tiered guidelines previously discussed:

- Base: physical space occupied/# of titles
- Mid: optimum
- Value added

User stories may help us align guidelines with most common methodologies used to measure/count holdings. For example, one might query the ILS for number of titles added; query database/collection management system for number of collections or linear feet added.

Katie: We are getting lost in the stories. Can we create a framework of our deliverable? Some place we can begin saving ideas.

Magically, Emily produced exactly that. Emily explained rubric and we spent a great deal of time productively discussing *potential* revisions:

- Add column for examples
- Add row for each material type under each major theme (bib unit; physical unit; space occupied...)
- Provide option to report/distinguish born-digital (no physical counterpart in holdings); digital surrogates; access copies (as desired by some institutions) but generic "digital files" for baseline. Once again the need for examples was mentioned.

Agreed upon value of meeting in person. Proposed all-day meeting in Boston on January 8, prior to ALA mid-winter (January 8-12, 2016). Attendance of West Coast members (Cyndi and Lisa) unlikely. Emily will investigate hosting it at her institution so we would have stable internet to Skype with remote members.

Action items

- Conceptualize deliverable in parallel with rubric
- Emily will revise rubric per today's discussion
- Each JTF member should proofread the rubric
- Do NOT alter the master rubric; create your own copy for edits/comments/notes for discussion
- Schedule next conference call

Joint meeting with Public Services (PS) Joint Task Force

Christian gave update on their progress:

- The structure of the PS deliverable supports the construction of survey
- What data to collect?
- How to collect it?
- What very basic counts to gather? (Tiered approach)

Structure of the PS deliverable:

- Introduction
- Definition of terms
- Lists of measures with applications and examples of each

Discussion of the difference between measures and metrics:

- Measure = simple count, such as # of visits (gate count: 1 per 24 hour period regardless of how many times a person exits and returns)
- Measure = # of boxes used; # of visits
- Metric = 2 dimensional ratio/correlation between variables, such as

- # of visits per week
 - # of boxes used per week
- Measures rely on a "discrete unit of delivery" such as a call slip

Emily explained rubric. Christian suggested dividing the document by:

- Space
 - Basic count
 - Mid level measure
 - Value added tier
- Title
 - Basic count
 - Mid level measure
 - Value added tier

Discussed need to publicize our progress and call for comments.

Mentioned publicizing progress in regional newsletters.