

California Local History Digital Resources Project

PROJECT EVALUATION: SURVEY RESULTS

2005-2006 (YEAR 6)

Prepared by the California Digital Library
August 2006

*A project supported by the U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services
under the provisions of the Library Services and Technology Act,
administered in California by the State Librarian*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report contains a redacted summary of responses received from the LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey. The results analysis includes answers from all respondents who took the survey in the 11-day period from Monday, July 24, 2006 to Thursday, August 3, 2006. Thirteen completed responses were received to the survey during this time.

SURVEY RESULTS & ANALYSIS

- 1) The workshop and training materials provided for using CONTENTdm were adequate.

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	2	15.4%
Agree	7	53.8%
Neutral	0	0.0%
Disagree	2	15.4%
Strongly Disagree	2	15.4%

- 2) The process laid out in the CONTENTdm training materials worked as described.

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	0	0.0%
Agree	8	61.5%
Neutral	3	23.1%
Disagree	2	15.4%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

- 3) The installation of CONTENTdm went smoothly.

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	1	7.7%
Agree	9	69.2%
Neutral	2	15.4%
Disagree	1	7.7%

LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey Results

Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
-------------------	---	------

4) Your use of CONTENTdm for creating digital objects went smoothly.

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	0	0.0%
Agree	9	69.2%
Neutral	3	23.1%
Disagree	1	7.7%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

5) Please indicate which method you used to enter metadata into the CONTENTdm Acquisition Station.

Response	Count	Percent
Direct input	7	53.8%
Imported metadata spreadsheet	6	46.2%

6) Why did you choose this method (from question 8)?

Because the cataloguing of materials was the most labor-intensive part of the project. In order to maintain a workflow which would allow us to finish the project during fiscal year 2005-2006, we need to create metadata in advance of outsourcing the photographs for digitization.
Thought it would be fastest.
We used both methods for separate tasks. A metadata framework was imported from an Excel spreadsheet because it reduced duplication of data entry (and I had help from someone who liked that way better...) Additional metadata was then entered from the acquisitions station after a rudimentary record was created.
Seemed to be the easiest way
Simpler -- didn't want to spend time experimenting with importing to make sure it goes right. Also, we were rewriting and making changes to metadata fields up until the end.
We wanted to have the cataloging finished as soon as possible, so this seemed the best method of finishing it before the images were back from the vendor.
It seemed to work best with both the timing of the photograph shipments and the review process set up in house.
It enabled me to create metadata for the photographs while the photographs were being scanned.
We did both.
It was easiest for me to start creating metadata before the digital images were created. I found the shortcuts in Excel easier to use than the Acq station and I could easily copy & paste, or review what I had previously done.
We chose this method because it was the easier of the two.
importing sounded too complicated

LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey Results

7) Selecting objects for digitization and copyright clearance. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	6	46.2%
Inadequate documentation	3	23.1%
Local staffing/resource issues	3	23.1%
Lack of expertise	1	7.7%
Other	4	30.8%

“Other” Responses:

A scrapbook we sent (which laid open flat) had to be disbound by Northern Micrographics. We hadn't anticipated this. We then decided not to send any materials other than individual photographs.

Other institutions (most notably, the Bancroft, were at work posting images to OAC that had been initially selected by OPL for the project, only to make last-minute substitutions to avoid duplication in the online resource.

Photograph curators did not want to send irreplaceable originals in the mail.

It was more time consuming than anticipated

8) Developing a service plan Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	7	53.8%
Inadequate documentation	1	7.7%
Local staffing/resource issues	3	23.1%
Lack of expertise	1	7.7%
Other	2	15.4%

9) Packing, preparing, and shipping items to the imaging vendor based on the weekly schedule. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	13	100.0%
Inadequate documentation	0	0.0%
Local staffing/resource issues	0	0.0%
Lack of expertise	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%

LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey Results

10) Receiving and quality control checking materials sent back to you from the imaging vendor. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	9	69.2%
Inadequate documentation	0	0.0%
Local staffing/resource issues	1	7.7%
Lack of expertise	0	0.0%
Other	3	23.1%

“Other” Responses:
We only received the checklist back from the vendor one time.
More than half of the 1st shipment needed to be sent back to the vendor.
a few people were cropped initially from digitized images

11) Importing images into CONTENTdm Acquisition Station. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	3	23.1%
Inadequate documentation	3	23.1%
Local staffing/resource issues	1	7.7%
Lack of expertise	5	38.5%
Other	4	30.8%

“Other” Responses:
We didn't have adequate documentation and training to successfully import from the worksheet to the acquisition station.
We figured it out very quickly once it had to happen.
some minor issues with error messages and requests for "volume numbers" which were not explained in the documentation
Large TIF files (over 350 MB) required resizing before import
We had to struggle with it but finally got it to work.
Initially there were a few problems because as I remember the instructions were not updated; complex items also posed problems.

12) Cataloging images in CONTENTdm Acquisition Station. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	5	38.5%
Inadequate documentation	1	7.7%
Local staffing/resource issues	4	30.8%
Lack of expertise	4	30.8%
Other	3	23.1%

LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey Results

“Other” Responses:
The handbook is very fuzzy about preferred vocabularies and about how to show place of publication and other descriptors.
Acq Station keeps reminding me of unapproved terms, and resists saving, even when I only edited other fields.
a few glitches with controlled vocabulary feature

13) Uploading images and metadata from CONTENTdm Acquisition Station. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	8	61.5%
Inadequate documentation	0	0.0%
Local staffing/resource issues	0	0.0%
Lack of expertise	1	7.7%
Other	4	30.8%

“Other” Responses:
Importing from the metadata worksheet led to vague error messages in Contentdm. We were initially prevented from batch uploading our last shipment. This was a time-consuming problem, requiring multiple consultations with CDL staff.
We had a large compound object with which I encountered problems the first attempt to upload
There were some clunky work-arounds for dealing with new subject headings -- seemed like this could have been easier.

14) Approving and indexing collections on the CONTENTdm server. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	6	46.2%
Inadequate documentation	2	15.4%
Local staffing/resource issues	0	0.0%
Lack of expertise	2	15.4%
Other	5	38.5%

LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey Results

“Other” Responses:
Needed more detailed training manual. CONTENTdm interface not user-friendly for editing a large group of records.
The software is very, vey clunky when it comes to this step. The time involved was not anticipated and led to some problems for us in budgeting staff hours.
Sporadically encountered a typset error when clicking on something already in the controlled vocabulary
Two-step approve/index process could be streamlined (make it one step)

15) Completing the Collection Description Worksheet. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	11	84.6%
Inadequate documentation	2	15.4%
Local staffing/resource issues	0	0.0%
Lack of expertise	0	0.0%
Other	1	7.7%

“Other” Responses:
The prototype in the documentation didn't fit our collection and I needed to seek additional info from CA State Library staff.

16) Completing the CDL/UC Libraries Digital Assets Submission Agreement and Inventory. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	12	92.3%
Inadequate documentation	0	0.0%
Local staffing/resource issues	1	7.7%
Lack of expertise	1	7.7%
Other	0	0.0%

17) Sending your final submission package to the CDL. Please indicate the nature of any problems:

Response	Count	Percent
No problems encountered	11	84.6%
Inadequate documentation	0	0.0%
Local staffing/resource issues	0	0.0%
Lack of expertise	0	0.0%
Other	3	23.1%

LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey Results

18) Communication between the CDL and your organization via email and quarterly conference calls was sufficient.

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Agree	3	23.1%
Agree	6	46.2%
Neutral	2	15.4%
Disagree	2	15.4%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%

19) If the level of communication and responsiveness from CDL was not adequate, please indicate why. (Please check all that apply.)

Response	Count	Percent
More frequent communication desired	2	15.4%
Different format(s) of communication desired	2	15.4%
Communication with fellow grant recipients desired	4	30.8%
Other	0	0.0%

Other Responses:

We appreciated the timely responses and accessibility of the CDL staff. On the other hand, we feel we could have benefited from sharing of resources and trouble-shooting with other grant recipients.

20) Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your organization's experience with Califa.

(Percentages)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The timetable set by Califa was reasonable.	15.4%	76.9%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%
The level of communication and responsiveness from Califa was satisfactory.	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Your organization was comfortable sending its materials offsite.	7.7%	53.8%	15.4%	15.4%	7.7%
Your organization was provided with sufficient tracking/status information about the materials it sent offsite.	7.7%	84.6%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
The documentation concerning outsourcing provided in the LHDRP Handbook was clear and helpful.	7.7%	61.5%	23.1%	7.7%	0.0%
Your organization's materials were returned in satisfactory condition.	15.4%	69.2%	7.7%	7.7%	0.0%

LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey Results

21) Reflecting on your experience, would you participate in LHDRP again? What benefits, skills, and/or knowledge (if any) did your organization gain from its experience with LHDRP?

<p>We would participate again. The most useful part of the grant was receiving a template for creating metadata reflecting the standards of the CDL and gaining experience in the use of CONTENTdm software. Another significant benefit was becoming a contributor to the Online Archive of California. We now have the skills to continue contributing and are seeking to raise funds to acquire our own copy of CONTENTdm software.</p>
<p>Yes, the software training was the most valuable.</p>
<p>Given an adequate staff and lead time in advance of the project cycle to conduct the necessary research on each object to gather sufficient information in order to adequately describe the items, I would most definitely participate again. The organization as a whole gained nothing from the project, as it lacked interest in becoming involved beyond enjoying the outcomes.</p>
<p>Yes, we had generally a positive experience. We appreciate the amount of time it takes to write descriptions of historic photos, and wish we were able to edit them when we discover more information about them.</p>
<p>Absolutely. the CDL partnership was crucial for us as a first timer. Knowledge about metadata cataloging was gained</p>
<p>Yes, we would participate again. The opportunity to work through each phase of the project under the guidance provided was invaluable.</p>
<p>I would participate in the project again. I was able to update my cataloging skills and the greatest benefit was to obtain digital photographs accompanied by metadata.</p>
<p>Yes. Involvement of multiple staff members was a real plus. Good training opportunities.</p>
<p>The CONTENTdm training unnecessarily complicated what turned out to be something easily learned, even by the likes of me who is not a cataloguer. When you offer the training again, assume no one has any cataloguing experience and proceed accordingly. Start with Step 1 and proceed in order to the last step.</p>
<p>Yes. The library was able to complete its first digital collection which it may have otherwise not been able to. Being on a year long schedule assured the project would be completed.</p>
<p>The LHDRP was very rewarding for our library and we would participate in it again. Our library was able to make a start at digitizing its historical photograph collection and making it available online. We have been able to house a large number of our photos in archival sleeves and boxes to preserve them. The Project Manager and Technical Lead gained knowledge in copyright law and the use of CONTENTdm software which will enable us to continue digitizing our collection,</p>
<p>I would participate in LHDRP again; the program advanced our special collections preservation program, both in knowledge and in supplies, and we learned a lot about preservation in general</p>

LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey Results

22) What additional education or training, if any, could have been provided that would have made your project more successful?

<p>We feel the training in the use of CONTENTdm software was inadequate. We had one workshop which was an overview of the software itself, but it was not specific enough to this grant. Likewise, the training materials were not an adequate reference source for understanding how to use CONTENTdm in practice. We did appreciate the responsiveness of CDL staff in working out the glitches we encountered, but would have preferred more extensive advance training. In addition, we encountered a number of problems synchronizing and uploading the LHDRP worksheet to the CONTENTdm acquisition station.</p>
<p>A seminar on the scanning process at the vendor's end so that we could know that all images needed to be perfectly flat, that accounting for glare and half-toning are not part of the vendor's set-up process when scanning occurs, etc. Having no experience whatsoever with the common vocabularies used by libraries for describing visual images was an obstacle, too.</p>
<p>I came in in the middle of the project and had to play catch up. I did not attend any of the training sessions and had to go through the manual on my own. It wasn't the easiest to figure out, but the telephone support from CDL got me through it. Perhaps if I had been on board from the beginning of the project things would have been easier for me.</p>
<p>More examples of photo descriptions and locally adapted subject headings, so that we know the standards that are expected.</p>
<p>The hands-on portion of the ContentDM workshop was inadequate.</p>
<p>Additional training on cataloging the photographs would have helped. The Contentdm training was very unsatisfactory because the trainers appeared to be "promoting the software" more than teaching how we would use it. Also, state library reporting requirements should be spelled out in a separate section of the manual. This applies to the quarterly and final narrative reports and the financial reports. I feel we made unnecessary mistakes because this information wasn't adequately spelled out from the beginning. Also, we could have used more direction on how to spend the project funds.</p>
<p>Training more focused on this project would have been helpful. More hands on would have been good - less theory, more practice, and more info up front re collection level / item level cataloging and metadata.</p>
<p>The CONTENTdm training, though very helpful, did not address the exact set-up that the library was using, so some of the documentation should have been customized for the shared environment. All of the follow-up was conducted via email or over the phone which was not ideal, but I cannot imagine that any in person one-on-one training would be possible.</p>
<p>An additional class in CONTENTdm was needed. There was so much information given in one class that it was difficult to absorb everything. We would have liked more information about metadata and selection of subject headings in the class.</p>
<p>Best practices for preserving photographs</p>

LHDRP 2005-2006 Project Evaluation Survey Results

23) What advice would you give to others beginning this project?

<p>The need for adequate staffing to execute this project in the prescribed timeframe. Also, the need for staff members with sufficient technical skills to work with CONTENTdm software and with the cataloguing skills to properly describe and assign subject headings to the materials being digitized.</p>
<p>Some project management skills are useful.</p>
<p>Do not, under any circumstances, submit to administrative pressure to participate in this project unless the items to be digitized are in hand, scan-able, and fully documented as to creator, copyright holder, etc., prior to the application. Before a final selection of materials is made, too, I would strongly recommend that these items be searched for in OAC and CDL to make sure that a digital copy has not already been contributed by another institution.</p>
<p>Have a collection of photos that are already researched and well-described, and are able to be sent away for scanning.</p>
<p>Be prepared for frustration. Do not hesitate to ask questions at any point in the process.</p>
<p>It would be helpful to start by reading the narrative reports of other libraries who have already been through the process. This would give a better idea as to what its all about. Start early on providing metadata on the material you will digitize. Again, by looking at what other libraries have done will help a lot. Try to spread the work out over the project year. The minimum staffing for this project is two people, if you have more it will be easier to meet all of the deadlines.</p>
<p>Go for it.</p>
<p>It's very, very LABOR INTENSIVE!</p>
<p>Make sure you have enough time every week to dedicate to this project. I finally blocked out ca. 12-16 hours a week on my calendar and towards the end I had to devote full days to the project. It is also best to have several people working on the project -- in my case I ended up doing the bulk of the project by myself.</p>
<p>Know your photograph collection well before selecting. It's beneficial to have a small group of photographs already preselected in case there is a question of ownership of any of those first selected to be scanned. It's a good idea to have an advisory group already selected to help with any questions regarding provenance of photographs.</p>
<p>Read documentation carefully; make a specific step-by-step week-by-week plan for implementing all objectives; ask questions whenever in doubt</p>