SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Public Services Metrics
Task Force Conference Call
March 10, 2015 / 4:00-5:00PM EDT

Present: Christian Dupont, Emilie Hardman, Sarah Polirer, Amy Schindler, Bruce Tabb, Jessica Lacher-Feldman, Moira Fitzgerald, Gabriel Swift, Elizabeth Yakel

Absent: Tom Flynn

Note taker: Sarah Polirer

Agenda
I. Users Domain - Further thoughts
II. Visits Domain - Currently working on
III. Domain sprints - Is this working?
IV. Announcements & Other Business

Meeting Minutes
Meeting was opened by Amy Schindler at 4:00pm EST.
Amy Schindler opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda items.

Following-up on other business at the close of the last Task Force Meeting February 1, 2015 Amy presented her response from the SAA Dictionary of Archives Terminology working group regarding how the Committee might best interface with the working group. The response she received from Rosemary Pleva-Flynn:

"We are really letting the archival literature drive the starting point for definitions. There are a few references to older ANSI-NISO standards, but not many and not in your topic area. First, we would love if you are citing the yet to be published *Dictionary of Archives Terminology (DAT)* for all of your definitions. But, I know there are several limitations, not the least being that your task force is joint with ACRL/RBMS, with their own preferred definitions too. Also, some terms that you need to define may not actually be defined in the DAT based on how generic the term is. Obviously, once your standard is published, it will enter the archival literature and help us define new or redefine existing terms for the DAT.

"...maybe we can work out something that allows you to feed us lists of terms with possible definitions or suggestions for how to improve existing ones and we can see how it all fits with what we are finding. Then we can come to a consensus on definitions that will support the Public Services standard and the DAT."

A general discussion from the DAT response follows with a discussion of how the Task Force should shape Domain areas, definitions used and working process.

Comments from the Task force included:
General:
  Is the working group using NISO definitions?
  The Task Force wants to be aware of the DAT group's process so the Task Force can be
  responsive and consistent

Christian: Not surprised but understands the response: Archives first, as Library is a different but corollary field; Questions included: What will be the purpose of the Task Force Standard regarding

definitions? What will the final version of the standard look like? How will we use the definitions in the rest of the standard? How should we define our terms? Should we use a synthetic version of the definition?

Amy: Disappointed by Rosemary's response as it did not give the Task Force any direction

Beth: Of two minds: Disappointed but not serious; need to define definition for use and rational behind the definition

Sarah: Disappointed, but maybe the definition the Task Force develops can influence the DAT's definition and make it more inclusive

Christian: What leverage/authority will the Task Force have shaping the definitions? Should we build on relevant definitions, building on the existing definitions and use cross-over definitions? Should we just forge ahead in the project plan?

Amy: Perhaps we should continue and at the Open forums see what feedback is received.

Beth: Forge ahead, as TF has considered it deeply and should have confidence in our work. Put it out for comment.

Amy: The Dictionary will be published online a couple of times of years until it was flushed out. Suggests that we finish with the Domains and then any refinements should be passed along to the Dictionary Group.

Unknown: TF should have a level of transparency and include the Dictionary Group on the outset.

Christian: We should make an acceptable standard. Christian will follow-up with ALA Core standard group as well as NISO folks; Nancy Craft/Cathy Rosa

After the general discussion the Agenda items regarding the specific domains were discussed in relationship to the Dictionary working group, the Task Force definitions and current workflows.

I. Users Domain - Further thoughts
II. Visits Domain - Currently working on

I & II Domain discussions
Emilie: The big question remains where do we go from here?

Next step: Synthesis of the work done; is the term used the best term?

Sarah: Use of a more a generic term to encompass all types of Archival repositories

Christian: The use of synonyms may be appropriate to define the different types of environments, for example a Web environment.

Jessica: Should terms be defined based on type, for example: users as those in a web environment and visitors for researchers on site

Unknown: Should we specify user types and what is being measured?

Christian: What is the concept of a visit (external/internal), how to define specificity of use on a website, concepts for measuring; Do we have two definitions: Users and Visitors?

What is the final form of the document: definitions section and potential measures section.

III. The conversation then moved to agenda item #3 how the Sprint was working in relationship to the domains

Gabriel: Concerned about the length of the document and where the document was heading. Maybe we should not attempt to finalize the document; do a draft first. Also look at the statistics we want to count as part of the standard and include them. Then go back and look at the definitions to see if they make sense.

Emily: Finding the process on bit large to handle and a bit paralyzing and needs a smaller focus. Questions what is the final product?

Beth: What should be the final product be: looking at Goldberg variations, NISO standard, statistics, reporting and Task Force definitions?

Moira: We would be looking at items not addressed by current standards, should not reinvent the wheel

Amy: Hybrid to existing standards; e.g. ARL; not everyone is in a Library setting and definitions should encompass all types of Archival settings

Gabriel: Let's look at what we want to collect; what event do we want to record

Amy: What is best way to move forward?

Sarah: Agree with Gabriel's idea, suggest maybe best to look at the Domains as drafts rather than try to finalize them and add statistics/metric goals to Domain activity #6 in a more concrete fashion

Amy: Do we want to move to Visits? What do we want to capture?

Christian: Has been researching other resources for definitions and measure to define from existing standards to assist in creating a synthetic definition/standard. The group can then come to a consensus as to the best definitions.

It was generally agreed by the Task Force members that the Domain areas are working, but should not attempt to finalize them, but to continue working on the Sprint time table and include specific measures to enable a more complete picture to give a better view of what is needed to be captured. Christian will continue his definitions research; Task force still needs to decide as the final format of the standard; flush out definitions.

IV. Amy discussed the Holdings Task force survey and its status. Holdings Task force has sent out emails to request repositories to share their surveys on what information they collect currently and what they do with the data. Amy will follow-up with Holdings Task force.

With no other business the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm EST.