

**SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures Comments from the ALA Annual Meeting
June 25, 2016
Notetaker: Emilie Hardmann**

A request was made that the committee add language to the standard indicating, specifically to administrators, that these standards are not meant to produce numbers which can be used for comparative purposes across repositories, or even year-to-year within a repository, without context. Suggestions about what this language might be were discussed and committee members emphasized that the document provides options for advanced metrics that might help repositories do more contextualized storytelling work locally. Further, it was suggested that the committee do more work to flesh out the intended audience for this document and develop some pointers on how to make use of it as a tool locally.

Several visitors articulated some concern about the idea that this standard could serve to trap ourselves in a “numbers game.” General agreement that the rewards outweigh the risks with implementing a standard though and it was noted that RBMS has a tradition of disclaimers around such standards; the committee may just need to cultivate that language appropriately in the next draft release.

Strong suggestion and agreement that the SAA and RBMS build in a timeline for revisiting and reshaping the document. It made need to be refined after it is has been used “in the wild.” To this point, several guests and committee members volunteered to use and report on the process of using the standard to gather and report out findings for the next fiscal year. Given the diversity of institutional representation on the task force it was thought that if each member could participate in a year one assessment of the standard it may be useful to some final refinements before the official release.

Several specific requests for the committee to address were also made:

- Within the document there are some places where the rationale for collecting a measure or calculating a metric are made, but this is uneven and would be helpful across the board if the committee would return to the document to add these considerations throughout.
- Might a redirect service in the document be helpful. When being told not to count something in a particular way, if the question might naturally arise of where this information may be captured elsewhere, could the document point to that place?
- Could the committee add in a measure for citation counts?
- Likewise, digital scholarship contributions - how to count it?
- Questions about unprocessed collections--the use of these was seen as more complicated and there is a desire to capture the impact they have on the reading room (staff and patrons), as well as within classes? Do we need to raise this as an issue for counting--unprocessed, underprocessed, MPLP, etc. Need to perhaps advocate an indicator for a change in descriptive status that could be reasonably tracked and reported out--this can all go into the advanced measure.
- Would the committee consider adding an example report in the appendix?

Finally, a recurring theme regarding the need to establish a data repository and benefits of creating an interface for collection, reporting, and sharing of data was raised. There was a suggestion that the standard be shared out through meetings which emphasize a hands-on component and illustrate how different places with different sets of tools and practices get this data out and report on it. One suggestion came from Athena who is hoping to have a Public Services and Technology Symposium at Penn in the next year that will build on some of the best of the Aeon User's Group meetings, but extend them to other systems, tools, etc.