SAA Annual Conference
RBMS/SAA Task Force
August 4, 2016
Open Forum Comments

Total Attendees: 38
Total Comments: About 50

Questions/Comments Made:

- Who is your intended audience for these stats? Who are we trying to please?
- Have you linked this with money? The cost of supporting collections of certain sizes?
- Where does ILL requests that are digital documents located? Are they a part of the document?
- Digital material exists and we are providing access. Is there a feature that would allow us to measure that?
- Complexity of research questions. How do you measure complexity? Is it time, amount of questions?
- I could use information from both standards to justify asking for resources to a new dean.
- Overwhelmed with questions, interested in complexity. We give people 20 free minutes but can't use staff time to go beyond that without charging a fee. Can't spend a day on a question. How can you measure this when there is money involved? Is there a measure built in for the complexity of the question.
- State Archives. Answering patron requests, does this include reviewing material before granting access (ex. Redaction)?
- Have you talked about switching reference questions received to reference questions answered? Making us the actor rather than the recipient. Should it be how many answers have you provided? Show absolute contributions. Could this be offered in an advanced measure? The same would apply in terms of circulation. The staff using collections on behalf of a patron is still circulation. Didn't see in the document that we would include staff pulling collections and using them in circulation or reference transactions. [NOTE: It is there; see "Staff Reference Use" - an advanced measure under Reference Transactions]
- Regarding received versus answered, the number should be the same, but the framing of it would be different. The bottom line is to demonstrate value. Suggest that we switch to answered so we can set a new model. Introductory information will frame all of this, and we can say that we seek to be more active rather than passive in terms of collecting. Promote a new way of thinking about this.
- If we only measure what people demand of us we are demanding that they ask more of us.
- It is my instinct that the numbers would be the same. Reporting would be different, not how we are counting.
- If you have a person come to the reading room, and then a following day you would count them twice. Continuing effort would count the reply in terms of the transactions turning into a conversation through reference transactions that expand beyond the initial question asked.
- Going back to the audience, there are vehicles for institutions to talk to each other, but what about those institutions that are not universities. They have a need to talk to each other, but maybe not in this standard way.

- I see our repository having to do conversions based on counts already being done. Will there be resources to help with this conversion?
- Wondering, for things like public programming and exhibits, is there a feature in the advanced that evaluation performed (assessment)? Could you have something in there that was related to a follow up survey or accomplishment in terms of how many people were able to answer questions based on the exhibits/event? How do you measure the impact of an event?
- Agree that this type of information is important to collect, but don't see how it would be counted 1-n.
- Should count just if the event was evaluated.
- Interested in assessment. Conducting a survey of pre NARA presidential libraries. Evaluating/Products or outcomes. Value of the number of publications that came from people using the library. Core research content is made available that changes the need to have direct reference interactions.
- End product of public services should be reflected.

- Polling the group to see how people in the crowd are keeping these statistics
- 4 using Aeon
- 8 using libanalytics
- 3 using a different paid option
- 10 using something home grown
- 10 using paper and something else
- 8 using excel to keep statistics

- To whom and how will you be disseminating the surveys. How will he have access to the survey? How will the data be aggregated in the future?
- Can see how institutions will be able to use these standards to compare information across institutions.
- Will there be a central location to report this data to?
- One thing that comes up is that a state will want to do a survey of its institution. If they were using a standard like this, they would hope that all institutions would have an easy time participating because they would all be using the same data points.