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DLF AIG: Important Links

You do not need to be a member of DLF to join/participate!


DLF Assessment Interest Group wiki, including links to all the white papers and best practice documents and tools discussed today: http://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment

Founded in 2014, the AIG is currently co-chaired by Joyce Chapman (Duke) and Santi Thompson (University of Houston). There were 4 Working groups in 2014/15: User studies, Analytics, Citations, Costs.
User Studies Working Group

Evaluating users of digital libraries and their needs

1. Goals of project
2. Methodology
3. Results and recommendations
4. Next steps
Goals

Guidelines/best practices for assessing facets of digital library value by analyzing user interaction with digital libraries.
Scope

User and Usability Studies

Return on Investment

Content Reuse

Created by Lemon Liu from Noun Project
Examining the literature

1. What research strengths exist in the areas of usability, ROI, and reuse assessment in digital libraries?
2. What gaps exist in these areas of focus?
3. What are possible next steps for the community to address?
# User and Usability Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>User-centered design and assessment</th>
<th>Design strategies through user search behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Gaps</strong></td>
<td>Behavioral observations and examination of user's task context</td>
<td>Over-reliance on standard testing tasks and user feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Users’ research needs</td>
<td>User’s role in system development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Return on Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths</strong></th>
<th>Measurement of time and cost for processing</th>
<th>Theoretical application of ROI to library project management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Gaps</strong></td>
<td>Benefits of cost/benefit analysis</td>
<td>Limited corpus of cost data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No standard methodology for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>More studies</td>
<td>More data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Content Reuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths</strong></th>
<th>Reuse among humanities-focused digital repositories</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Gaps</strong></td>
<td>Patterns of reuse</td>
<td>Web log analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>User groups -- science and social science</td>
<td>Digital repository interface and reuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

Documenting best practices?

Generating assessment toolkit(s)?

Or…?

Wanna get involved?

Contact Santi Thompson:
sathomp3@central.uh.edu

http://bit.ly/1KzCU6S
Analytics

1. Goal and scope
2. White paper methods and recommendations
3. Next steps
Goal

*Develop guidelines and best practices for using analytics in digital libraries*

Scope

Focus on Google Analytics

Guidelines for all experience levels
Literature review

Literature review reveals gap in best practices

“How-to” analytics literature covers: use analytics to improve usability and discoverability, set-up google analytics (case studies), and complete transactional log analysis
White Paper: Metrics Methodology

1. Choose metrics to recommend
2. Define each metric
3. Importance of metric
4. Bolster definition with library-centric examples

Caveat: metrics require interpretation by local organization to be relevant and actionable.
Baseline Google Analytics Metrics Recommendations

A. Content Use and Access Counts
   1. Content Use and Access Counts Defined
   2. Site Content Reports
   3. Bounce Rate
   4. Download Counts
   5. Time
   6. Pageviews
   7. Sessions

B. Audience Metrics
   1. Location
   2. Mode of Access
   3. Network Domain
   4. Users

C. Navigational Metrics
   1. Path Through the Site
   2. Referral Traffic
   3. Search Terms
White Paper: More than Metrics

Approaching analytics: know thyself

Alternative tools and methods: consider trade-offs between tools and methods

Going beyond the baseline: customization and platform specific considerations
Next steps

Options options options

More platform specific metrics?

More examples?

Share metrics?

Discontinue the analytics group?

Citations Working Group

1. Background discussion
2. Methodology
3. Recommendations
4. Next steps

Created by Johan H. W. Basberg from Noun Project
Citations Working Group

DLF AIG Charge

1. What should a citation consist of?

2. How can we best support appropriate citations?

3. To what extent do common citation formats support this?

4. What are the limitations of current digital library software systems for displaying citation information?

5. What are best practices for displaying citation information for reference manager software capture?
Citations Working Group

Draft citation standards, based on what can and can't be incorporated into APA, Chicago, and MLA, that incorporate the necessary elements for digitized special collections and institutional repository content
Citations Working Group

Methodology

Data set citations
Archival/manuscript citations
Web/electronic document citations
Institutional citation recommendations

Citation Styles

APA, Chicago (Notes and Bibliography), MLA
Citations Working Group

Recommendations

Include:

• Item name or title

• Collection name

• Repository information (physical and/or digital)

• Unique identifier (Digital Object Identifiers (DOI), Handle, Persistent Uniform Resource Locators (PURL), citable URL, etc.)
Citations Working Group

Next Steps for these guidelines:

Publication
Adoption
Advocacy

Created by John Winowiecki from Noun Project
Citations Working Group

Next steps for citations working group:

1. What are the limitations of current digital library software systems for displaying citation information?

2. What are best practices for displaying citation information for reference manager software capture?

3. More? Do we as a group start creating scripts/plugins so that the most common DL & IR platforms can automatically generate statements for preferred citations? Do we need to do a bibliometric study of DL items in scholarly literature? Etc.
White Paper: “Guidelines for citing library-hosted, unique digital assets”

http://bit.ly/1MNJ3Ci
Cost Assessment Working Group

Goals

Process & products

Call for data

Created by Gregor Črešnar from Noun Project
Cost Assessment Working Group

Goals

Process & products

Call for data

To aggregate and make freely available a large set of time/cost data on the performance of various tasks involved in the digitization process, in order to assist organizations in digitization project planning and benchmarking.
Cost Assessment Working Group

Library Digitization Cost Calculator

This calculator aggregates available data on the cost and time it takes to perform various activities associated with library digitization. The calculator provides estimates not accuracy, as each institution is different. The tool provides average time and cost information from other institutions who have donated their data to this project. Data is currently limited. This calculator was built by Joyce Chapman, please contact joyce.chapman@duke.edu for more information, or use the feedback form.

Types of scanner
Extent (linear feet)

Hourly pay of student workers
Student benefits as % of pay
Annual salary of staff member
Staff benefits as % of pay
Metadata creation
Average number of scans per item
Induce fastener removal?
Induce corazon review?
Induce intellectual property review?
Induce time to sort materials into items?
Induce cleaning/supporting materials pre-scanning?
Induce time for fragile item handling?
Induce time for disbinding and re-binging items?

Select

Select

To calculate metadata creation time (by item, not total)

Calculations will be for removing fasteners from 100% of items

Calculations will be for review of 100% of items

E.g., locate pp. 1-5 of a discrete document and place them together

This will be calculated as if it were done for 100% of items

This will be calculated as if 100% of items are fragile

This will be calculated as if 100% of items need disbinding

Calculate
Cost Assessment Working Group

Goals

Process & products

Call for data

Created by Takao Umehara from Noun Project
Cost Assessment Working Group

Performed a review of existing literature (published and unpublished) in the areas of

- Collection of time and cost data for digitization
- Existing best practices in quality control and metadata creation
- Found fewer than 20 resources!
Cost Assessment Working Group

Guidelines and definitions (1 of 2)

Preparation of original materials
  Condition review
  Disbinding
  Fastener removal
  Flattening
  Rights review
  Sorting materials into items
  Supporting
  Unique identifier assignment

Image capture
  Film or transparency scanner
  Flatbed scanner
  Manual DSLR camera
  Medium format camera
  Overhead scanner
  Sheet feeding scanner
Cost Assessment Working Group

Guidelines and definitions (2 of 2)

Quality control
   Level 1, 2 or 3
Descriptive metadata creation
   Level 1, 2 or 3
Post-processing
   Alignment/rotation
   Background removal
   Clean up / dust removal

Color correction and tonal adjustments
Cropping images
Stitching
Post-preparation
   De-sorting
   Re-binding
   Re-fastening
Digitization Cost Calculator

People performing the work
- Salary 1
  - Annual salary
  - % benefits
- Hourly 1
  - Hourly pay
  - % benefits

Preparation of original materials
- Condition review
  - % materials
  - Performed by
- Disbinding
  - % materials
  - Performed by
- Fastener removal
  - % materials
  - Performed by

Image capture
- Capture device
  - Dropdown

Quality control
- Level 1
- Level 2
- Level 3

Post-processing
- Alignment/rotation
  - % materials
  - Performed by
- Background removal
  - % materials
  - Performed by

Local fields
- Local Field 1
  - % materials
  - Performed by
- Local Field 2
  - % materials
  - Performed by

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time (hours)</th>
<th>Cost (Salary)</th>
<th>Cost (Hourly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faceover removal</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image capture</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microform creation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $185

Assessment Working Group
Call for data submissions

Call for data submissions (a document that explains what we’re doing and tells you how to contribute your data)

Data submission form (the actual online form for submitting data), or just copy this link http://bit.ly/1LV9oxI

All data submitted to this project will be publicly available, both via aggregate calculations made by the calculator, and by institution on a separate reference page of the calculator’s website.
Cost Assessment Working Group

Call for data submissions

What amount of data do I have to submit?

What format do I submit the data in?

How does the calculator work / how will my submitted data be used?
Questions?

Contact: joyce.chapman@duke.edu


Download documents and follow progress on our wiki: http://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment