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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Review of posted documents:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

d. Objects and realia—**MARTHA**

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

f. Architectural drawings—**Angela**

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

i. Single-item Manuscripts—**Alvan**

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

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

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

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

Alvan Bregman