

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holdings Metrics

Conference call: 16 April 2015, 2:00-3:00 EDT

Present

Alvan Bregman; Martha O'Hara Conway; Adriana Cuervo; Rachel D'Agostino; Lara Friedman-Shedlov; Angela Fritz; Emily Novak Gustainis (recorder); Lisa Miller; Katie Rawdon; Cyndi Shein

Absent

NA

I. Update Report for SAA Council

Group decided that the mid-year progress report for SAA Council would be drafted by Emily and Martha and circulated to the group the first week of May for submission to Timothy Pyatt by May 15, 2015. Report will include a review of our plan of work, strategy, and general summary. We should emphasize that the group's work is evolving. Emily will confirm with Tim re: any report format needed.

II. Definitions Work

Cartographic

Lisa created two options for the "cartographic" category based on counting everything that source definitions included. "Cartographic" was fairly consistent across glossaries. However, it covers so many formats that are represented in other categories. She and other group members were concerned about arbitrarily including some formats rather than others (such as photographs).

Questions/discussion points:

- What formats exist and how those are counted?
- Perhaps at a minimum, don't include and at an optimal include?
- Should we be defining by content or by form? Why would we call out this content as opposed to form?
- Cartographic separated out because of maps, not books of maps. Reporting maps relates to unbound materials (sheets).
- If we are only reporting on maps and books, should the category still be called cartographic, which has a much broader definition in all the resources listed?
- Some repositories keep photos with maps, some don't.
- Do we really mean oversized? We wouldn't want storage to dictate.
- Fascicles are bound, would people confuse with an atlas? Likely not.

Decisions:

- Count atlases as books (bound volumes).
- Limit category to physical sheets of maps, whether bound with other maps to comprise a set or not, and globes.

- Digital/GIS not included.
- Martha and Lisa will take another stab at limiting to maps and globes and leave as cartographic. It is the first sentence of NISO. Martha and Lisa will refine for the group.

Graphic/Visual Material

Questions/discussion points:

- Why have category name include both graphic and visual?
 - So that no matter what category you use, you recognize it. Majority of definitions refer to graphic, but there is VRA (and others).
 - May simply call the category “graphic” since the definition includes the word visual.
- SAA includes holographic in visual -- are we OK with that?
- Framed paintings are considered two dimensional. We count three-dimensional things as objects.
- How do you count a Braille book? Do we want to call attention to Braille in the definition? Print for the blind can be considered a graphic work, but most institutions would count it as a book.
- Count artist’s books as books or visual? Should we include “book-like” things without pages (fine art)?
- How do we handle ephemera?
 - Depends on the nature of the ephemera as counted as printed or visual. Up to repository.
- “This includes” vs. “This may include” in definition?
- Martha includes works of art in objects definition. Some architectural items are objects (such as models) and some are not. Posters may also be included.
- Do we need opaque and transparent if we have an appendix of formats?

Decisions:

- Architectural drawings should be in this category.
- Artists books are counted as books (even though they may be non-traditional book shapes)
- Category does not include moving images.
- Separate categories for moving images and objects.
- Need to come back to microform and digital.

Next category: Objects/Artifacts

Next Meeting: May 5, 2:00 EDT

Next Recorder: Lisa Miller