

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
Thursday, January 5, 2017, 1pm Eastern/ 12pm Central / 10am Pacific.
Meeting Notes

Attending: Amy Schindler (notetaker), Sarah Polirer, Christian Dupont, Emilie Hardman, Gabriel Swift

I. Plan and Schedule for Final Review of Document

-Proposal: All task force members review and comment/contribute to all suggested edits on each domain according to a schedule that we establish during the meeting.

- agreed on the following schedule for the final review of the draft document before version 2 is released to the public. Over the next week our task as a committee is to review and make any changes to the document domain by domain.
- In the Google Doc you can see the changes that have been made recently as "suggestions." If you have any additions or changes to make, please also use the "suggestions" mode (you will find it in the upper right corner of the tool bar that reads "editing," "suggesting," or "viewing.") Please also add any comments you may have to existing comments or start a new comment thread when needed.
- The deadlines for the final review of each domain is:
User Demographics: 1/7
Reference Transactions: 1/7
Reading Room Visits: 1/8
Collection Use: 1/9
Events: 1/10
Instruction: 1/11
Exhibition: 1/12
Online Interactions & Introduction: 1/13
- On January 14th Amy and Christian will do any final revisions and reformatting before online publication. The document will be sent off to the RBMS webteam by the 15th and it should be posted on the SAA and RBMS websites by the 18th.
- Can we save a version of the document showing all of this last group of suggestions before we accept all of the suggestions? Amy investigated options and there isn't anything perfect. We can always go back to the Google revision history (under the File menu). The best bet appears to be just accepting all of the changes after our commenting is completed. Printing as a PDF includes the suggestions, but not the name & date stamp. Plan: 1/14: accept all suggestions; save a copy of document in Google Drive with new name; in original doc revert history to version of document before we accepted the changes.

II. Discussion Items from the Current Draft

-Identify any comments/changes for discussion by the group.

- None identified.

III. Comment Period:

A. Dates of comment period:

- January 18-February 17, 2017

B. Are there specific issues we want feedback on from this comment period that we could include in the announcement and raise at ALA Midwinter? Example: picking up on our December discussion related to Exhibitions domain and how to count born-digital, physical, and digital version of physical exhibit.

- Will not include any specific questions in comment period announcement. Some suggested language:

“In response to v. 1 comments, we’ve added this content, rationales, etc....”

“We’ve incorporated community feedback in this draft; want your eyes on it to ensure it is an accurate reflection.”

“We intend to finalize this document and submit for approvals in April 2017”

C. For the version 2 announcement we should include a brief summary of changes since v. 1. Anything else to include in the announcement? (see above)

D. Do we want to do a webinar presenting version 2? We could schedule this for after ALA Midwinter. The Nebraska Library Commission does a regular webinar every Wednesday morning that we should be able to get ourselves on the calendar.

- Yes. Requested and scheduled for February 8, 2017 at 10am Central.
- Emilie, Christian, and Amy will discuss at ALA Midwinter.

IV. Agenda for Midwinter meeting

-Sunday, January 22, 2017, 1-2:30pm Eastern, Westin Piedmont 2

-Attending in Atlanta: Amy, Christian, Gabriel (likely), Moira, Emilie, Bruce

-Agenda: Same as last meeting. Christian will send out.

V. Other Business

- Sarah was invited to write an article for SAA Business Archives Section newsletter about JTFPS.
- Discussion of appendices or related resources that would be useful.
 - Emilie’s idea of a checklist
 - Gabriel’s earlier idea for a reporting template or similar
 - This is not something we want or need to submit as part of the standard, but would be a “related resource.” Emilie and Gabriel will work on this (beginning after version 2 is released).