

Minutes for SAA/ACRL taskforce meeting at ALA Annual, Sunday, June 28, 1:00-2:30

Present: Amy, Bruce, Emily, Moira

Remote: Christian, Gabriel, Tom

No guests, everyone at Pride Parade.

Note taker: Bruce

Four members and guests from the holdings task force joined in about an hour and fifteen minutes later.

Introductions:

Thanks to Christian and Gabriel for reorganizing the folders on the Google Drive.

Christian brought up his idea of a draft of the standard to help us get out of this impasse. To help with our having a vision of what the final product will be, he has been looking at other standards and how they are organized. He suggested coming up with definitions, putting them together, looking at services, the various ways to count them (using paper counts to using sophisticated technology).

Gabriel has taken the document on collection use and used it a little. He will put it among the documents on the Google Drive. Christian asked if the basic and advanced measures made sense. Gabriel thought there was some repetition. Christian had in mind that the standard should suggest statistics that every repository should keep but also include more advanced measure. He noted the difference between statistics that measure the impact on users versus statistics on operational efficiency.

Discussion of what collection use entails followed: gate count, how gate count is taken, unit count (though holdings group will need to define what a box or volume is), intent of use, frequency of use by same researcher, operational impact, remote use as well as in-house use, mediated vs. unmediated use.

Amy noted that we haven't had great success with efforts of small groups working on individual domains, and asked what the path forward is. Creating definitions was discussed. There are so many things to define, do we need so many definitions? Do we need some type of hierarchy to related definitions to each other? Amy suggested not focusing on definitions, but to work on other aspects as a way to move forward.

Christian has written a draft of the standard based on his review of other standards. He will upload his draft into Google Documents and people from the other domain groups can flush out the domains they are working on using Christian's draft as a model.

A discussion of how people are using the Google documents followed. We decided it is more efficient for people to work and edit directly in Google rather than downloading the document into Word, working on it, and then re-uploading. We will archive all versions so that previous versions can be accessed if needed. Google allows different people to work on the same document at the same time.

We decided to set up a conference call in July to set goals. Amy will send out Doodle poll.

How to create an outline or a table of contents in Google was questioned. Emily has experience creating table of contents and will create one, load it, so as to create the initial structure of the standard.

We talked about the survey. Prior to the group ALA meeting, Amy, Emily, and Bruce met as a subgroup and discussed a survey to send out to collect data of what repositories collect. Amy created a new folder in Google Drive and uploaded the survey draft. She attended the RBMS public services discussion group's meeting where there was a discussion of the type of statistics repositories collected, and she was surprised at how few collected data, so this taskforce to write a standard is greatly needed. The subgroup will have something ready in a few weeks for members of the greater taskforce to review. About five individuals representing different repository types will be tapped to fill out the survey as a trial test. Adjustments will be made as needed. The subgroup will come up with a list of listservs to solicit representatives from various repositories to fill out the survey. Tom recommended we add something in the survey about where (within the unit, library, or greater institution) data is reported.

Amy stressed the importance of case studies of how metrics are collected and on how to bring up a new automated system that assists in collecting data. Can start working on these this year; will open the call for repositories to do such case studies with the survey.

There was a reminder that the taskforce will gather at the coming SAA annual meeting, this year in Cleveland. On Thursday, August 20, the three SAA-ACRL Joint Task Forces will share a lunchtime forum (hope to be able to webcast this). The task force will meet on Friday, August 21, at 1 pm EST. Members not able to attend will be able to participate through Skype.

Members of the holdings taskforce arrived.

Introductions were made.

While it is too late to propose a session for the 2016 RBMS preconference, perhaps it is not too late for a discussion session to share and get input on what the two taskforces are doing, our progress, as it is important to inform people involved in RBMS. We talked about what such a session would look like: having one member from the two taskforces present, having representatives from ArchiveSpace or other software companies participate, presenting actual examples of statistics people are collecting, how to use automation to collect statistics, etc. As for SAA, it is important to keep eyes open for sessions in which the taskforces can participate. We should distribute drafts of our work for people to comment on. Ways of communicating with RBMS and SAA members were discussed such as notifications in journals such as *College and Research News* or *RBM*. Someone will contact Jennifer Sheehan about including something about our work in *RBM*. Our work should include various ways to collect data and various ways in which data can be used. It should include suggestions on how to collect data, from basic to advance counts, and what repositories can do with the collected data. The holdings taskforce has been working on definitions and an overall approach to its task at hand. It was agreed that the taskforces should share our work with each other.