My Leicestershire Digital Archive

Evaluation Report

Kate Pontin

April 2011

The content is amazing to me on a personal level. My father was in The Leicester Pageant and some of the photographs of the streets that have since gone were my childhood memories of where I lived. I also found it very easy to navigate.
User feedback

SUMMARY

My Leicestershire Digital Archive is a project that has developed public access through digitisation of a number of collections including material from the Special Collections at the University of Leicester, the Media Archive for Central England (MACE), The East Midlands Oral History Archive (EMOHA), Leicestershire Industrial History Society, Rothley Heritage Trust and Dennis Calow.

An evaluation of the success of the project has been undertaken and is based on the key project objectives which were to:

- Create a collection of digital historical and cultural resources pertaining to Leicestershire that is easily accessible to audiences outside traditional tertiary education boundaries,
- Engage community organisations in the identification and prioritising of material to be digitised,
- Create a core list of material to be digitised based on in-house usage/request statistics,
- Further engage the community in the project by providing support for value-added Web 2.0 functionality to the user interface,
- Provide community associations with CONTENTdm training for digital content creation,
- Create a controlled vocabulary of subject terms.

The findings show that the above objectives have been successfully achieved except that the Web 2.0 implementation has been delayed and will now not happen until the summer of 2011. This has impacted upon other aspects such as user testing. The approach to running the project has provided a strong base for success and has included all partners in decision making and in the process of developing the content. The website has had a number of users, with web statistics showing repeat visits and use of a wide variety of pages. The evaluation does highlight the need for a fully thought out marketing strategy for the future to increase the user base.

Recommendations My Leicestershire History is a valuable resource and thus needs to continue to be supported through:

- Making sure Web 2.0 happens,
- Developing a strategy for **sustainability** which enables the continuation of digitization of data and of continuing to advertise and promote the site with the general public but also perhaps with further funding to support the education sector,
- Promoting the best practice that this project highlights,
- Maintaining contact with the local history societies that have contributed.

Other digitization projects would also benefit from using an approach similar to that trialed here, with the inclusion of partners from voluntary and professional organizations. Including all partners in the setting up, management and practical completion of the project provides a strong structure. It should be remembered that such projects take a great deal of time and require:

- Development of an inclusive management process.
- Early development of a marketing strategy.
- Early inclusion of different user groups to find out what they are interested in and later testing of the site design.
- Considering the types of IT, and associated programmes etc early on, budgeting for appropriate resources and support.
- Supporting and training those involved and using networks to find advice and further support.
- Considering sustainability and the best approaches before the end of the project.

Lastly it must be mentioned that projects such as this rely heavily on the voluntary help those in local history societies (and similar) can give and the skills and knowledge they bring with them. Their enthusiasm and time is central to success.

CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction

My Leicestershire Digital Archive is a project that has developed public access through digitisation to selected items from a number of collections:

- Special Collections managed by the University of Leicester
- The Media Archive for central England (MACE)
- The East Midlands Oral History Archive (EMOHA)
- Community partner Leicestershire Industrial History Society
- Community partner Rothley Heritage Trust
- Dennis Calow

An evaluation of the success of the project has been undertaken, based on the key project objectives which were to:

- Create a collection of digital historical and cultural resources pertaining to Leicestershire that is easily accessible to audiences outside traditional tertiary education boundaries
- Engage community organisations in the identification and prioritising of material to be digitised from the various collections
- Create a core list of material to be digitised based on in-house usage/request statistics
- Further engage the community in the project by providing support for value-added Web 2.0 functionality to the user interface
- Provide community associations with CONTENTdm training for digital content creation
- Create a controlled vocabulary of subject terms to be applied to the ingest of content from all parties submitting material to My Leicestershire

2.0 Methodology

The approach taken used a number of different data sources to strengthen validity.

Tools used:

- Interviews by phone and email of key staff and partners
- Review of available data – meetings' minutes, blog etc
- Web statistics
- Data from testing
- End of Project meeting on 31st March 2011 with associated reflective discussion on project

3.0 Findings

Full data summaries are included in appendix 1.

3.1 Summary of partner feedback

Successes

Feedback suggested that of underlined particular success was the fulfilment of the key task to create a local searchable digital archive. The project has created impetus for local group activity, and helped groups make connections and new links, eg to University Education dept, County Archivist. The project has developed important strategies for developing digital archives including:

- Academic underpinning
- Precision in meta data
- Effective project management
- Training and support

It is seen by the community groups as a good way to reach audiences and they feel the drop page at the head of each collection is a good way to promote local groups

The issues highlighted are:

- That the resource has not yet reached wider audiences and that there is still a need to raise awareness
- The amount of time the project has taken
- Getting equipment – eg analogue/digital converters was slow and limited by budget
- Future cost of maintaining website is a concern
- It is a long way from a single digital portal for all local collections in the area
- That the project needed to know more about user motivation not just testing access etc of site

The future:

- Web 2.0 will improve access and interaction
- There is a need to widen awareness and use to schools, family historians and researchers
- Create opportunities for more groups to add their material
- Have a digital archive council to oversee future development

3.2 Summary of staff feedback

Key successes:

Feedback from staff shows agreement with partners that aims have been achieved. They also feel that the interest in the site and usage is growing. It has been good to test a project in digitisation of local material and that the process has developed skills and interest in all partners and staff.

Best practice highlighted in feedback included:

- Good to use user friendly controlled vocabulary and collection templates
- Working with community partners who have detailed local knowledge
- develop the resource with user testing
- Using community groups develops immediate audience
- Helped to have links to groups already established

Issues

- Time to upload content was even longer than anticipated
- A publicity event in December had limited uptake because of weather etc
- Not able to test Web 2.0 features as this has been delayed by the systems supplier
- More partners involved would have been good eg Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society
- More promotion of site is now needed, perhaps also considering school needs
- Sustaining partnerships will be difficult
- Interface needs more visual appeal

3.3 Summary from User Testing

User testing took place towards the end of the project but unfortunately before Web 2.0 has been implemented. The sample was small and could have been from a wider range of backgrounds. Many of those involved had also already visited the site. However, the testing successfully highlighted both those aspects that worked well and areas for improvement.

The user testing has highlighted some key areas that need to be changed or improved, some of these may happen automatically with the upgrade of the software. The important changes suggested are:

- To include a "landing" page for each collection so users know more about the collection, what it contains, and how it was put together. This will become more important if future collections are to be added as the list on the home page will grow.

- Better "help" pages and re named to be more meaningful

- Change the video icons to show they are a video

- Add a note for the ghost signs co-ordinates

- Look to provide alternative ways into the content with themed browsing and/or map displays of items.

- Add a "u" to favorites and provide a better contact us page

Some of these changes have been implemented and the rest will be implemented when the user interface is upgraded this summer by the systems supplier.

3.4 Summary from End of Project Workshop

Strengths	Weaknesses
Volunteers from the partner organizations – their skills, knowledge and commitment to the project. The amount of time they were able to give to input data. The key contacts that they had.	The enormous amount of **time** it took to input the data – this was underestimated. Need to provide clear information at the beginning of the project and include straightforward support information Also took time to sort out intellectual property through creative commons licence. An explanation was developed to help authors understand it.
Training and support were important	
Good **support from others** eg OCLC/CONTENTdm and others who had done similar projects such as in Canada	**Sustainability** For future inputting – there is little enthusiasm in partner organizations to do more – this might be helped if there was more user feedback. Long term storage? A strategy for sustainability needs to start with consultation with users and potential users. Links could be made to the County Record Office who have digitized data but currently have no delivery platform. Other local history groups could be involved – man power is central to project success and this then often depends on only one or two volunteers in each group
Networking and sharing ideas through the usability workshop	**Further publicity:** Local libraries Museums Other local history societies Family history YouTube Wikipedia Promotional material needed
User testing Getting feedback from users helps establish how effective the design is.	A need for **greater understanding of potential audiences** earlier in the process- what are their motivations and needs The schools market was not part of this project but could be potential users – if appropriate support materials were developed. Funding for a specialist to do

	this would be required
Use of Dublin Core for metadata which is adaptable to the different format needs
Using controlled vocabulary (from lists already developed – see appendix H)
Web 2.0	Downloading for files can be slow
More links between collections
Other outcomes such as local history society publications	Hasn't brought in more volunteers or members to the local history societies

4.0 Discussion

I would like to see more photographs added when they are available, just to keep the site updated and fresh with something new.
User Feedback

As can be seen from the data presented above the approach to running the project has provided a strong base for success. Including all partners in decision making and in the actual process of developing the content has provided opportunity for the inclusion of a wider range of skills and knowledge.

The website has been user tested, with a small number of users. It has attracted users, with web statistics showing repeat visits and use of a wide variety of pages (see data below).

This evaluation also highlights the need for a thought out marketing strategy. Earlier consultation with potential users would have strengthened both the assessment of the site and in increasing the project profile to wider audiences.

The table below considers the initial objectives set and the extent of their completion.

Objective	Summary of findings from interview data
To create a collection of digital historical and cultural resources pertaining to Leicestershire that is easily accessible to audiences outside traditional tertiary education boundaries	The digital archive has been created and has the planned number and range of archives available from all partners involved.

Approaches were used to provide consistent vocabulary and templates

Web 2.0 has been delayed until the summer of 2011
• *We have greatly welcomed the huge spur to grasp the digitization of some of the local materials we knew of. Further, the academic backbone underlying the design, and the precision of the metadata has moved us into a new style of viewing the materials we have been working with.*

Testing of the site helped provide evidence of areas that were confusing and those that were particularly interesting and eye catching. A summary of the testing (see appendix C) suggested that the following improvements should be made: |

	To include a "landing" page for each collection so users know more about the collection, what it contains, and how it was put together. This will become more important if future collections are to be added as the list on the home page will grow. *Better "help" pages and re named to be more meaningful* *Change the video icons to show they are a video* *Add a note for the ghost signs co-ordinates* Web statistics (Appendix G) show that the site is being engaged with. There is a wide-range of users, worldwide but also from the local area. Those who engage with the site use a number of pages and take time to look at them. Many use the site on repeated occasions. Average time 282.04 seconds (nearly five minutes) Average page use: 6.64 Average visits per user: 8.9 Number of users from December 2010 to April 2011: 4173 Feedback forms (Appendix F) are positive and appreciative of the site. They all will be using the site again.
Engage community organisations in the identification and prioritising of material to be digitised from the various collections	The community organisations involved have been fully engaged in the process: • Training and support has been available • Partners were actively involved in choosing and inputting data • All participants have gained from the project including new partnerships, developed skills, shared enthusiasm and they have also all been able to promote their own organisations and collections • Minutes from both the steering group and work team show that key areas of the project were discussed with all partners. These included content, copyright, search categories, IT issues. Project staff responded to conclusions of discussions.
Create a core list of material to be digitised based on in-house usage/request statistics	Done and includes an extended list of items included more videos, oral history interviews, rare books and maps using up spare funds at the end of the project
Further engage the community in the project by providing support for value-added Web 2.0 functionality to the user interface	Web 2.0 has been the only major issue and has been out of the control of the project team. Its failure to happen on time has meant that user testing had to be undertaken before its completion. It will now be undertaken in the summer of 2011.
Provide community associations with CONTENTdm training for digital content creation	Training and support given. Feedback suggests this was appropriate and available when required. • *Who can quarrel with a home visit and one-to one training on the scanner. And always there on the end of the phone and e-mail*
Create a controlled	Successfully developed

vocabulary of subject terms to be applied to the ingest of content from all parties submitting material to My Leicestershire	See appendix for more detail in Appendices E and H • *Time was well spent at the beginning setting up collection templates in order to input the metadata and these could then be applied across all collections. The creation of user friendly "controlled vocabulary" is a real asset and hopefully will help not only enhance the user experience but allow for community groups to create their own items*

4.1 Recommendations

This is a valuable resource and thus needs to continue to be supported.

- Make sure Web 2.0 happens.
- Develop a strategy for **sustainability** which enables the continuation of digitization of data and of continuing to advertise and promote the site with the general public but also perhaps with further funding from the education sector.
- Promote the best practice that this project highlights.
- Maintain contact with the local history societies that have contributed.

Other digitization projects would also benefit from using an approach similar to that trialed here, with the inclusion of partners from voluntary and professional organizations. Including all in the setting up, management and practical completion of the project provides a strong structure. It should be remembered that such projects take a great deal of time and require:

- Developing an inclusive management process.
- Early development of a marketing strategy.
- Early inclusion of different user groups to find out what they are interested in and later testing of the site design.
- Considering the types of IT, and associated programmes etc early on, budgeting for appropriate resources and support.
- Supporting and training those involved and use networks to find advice and further support.
- Considering sustainability and the best approaches before the end of the project.

Lastly it must be mentioned that projects such as this rely heavily on the voluntary help those in local history societies (and similar) can give and the skills and knowledge they bring with them. Their enthusiasm and time is central to success.

Appendices

Data

A   Partner Feedback

1. How has it impacted on your organisation?	The Rothley Heritage Trust is a four person group of local and natural history enthusiasts who have formally entered into a Trust Deed arrangement to give themselves an entity. Three of the people are accredited Heritage Wardens under the County Council's scheme. The Trust is thus the activist side of local history, as against the Rothley History Society, which caters for those who want to come and hear a speaker once a month. Being swept up into the MLDA Project with its defined goals and high-paced timetable has greatly expanded our mindset, whilst at the same time forcing big changes to our own work programme. It has taken quite a lot of time – more than I anticipated - but has created new resources and increased the public exposure of EMOHA. MACE always considered MY LEICESTERSHIRE to be a good thing: it brought together a number of collections that could be searched under 'one roof' and compared in ways previously impossible. This benefit has yet to impact on MACE. The more immediate impact concerns raising awareness of MACE across Leicestershire and developing new audiences, again across Leicestershire. In terms of MACE's part in the delivery of the project the impact was really about resources: attending meetings, fitting in selection, obtaining IP permissions, preparing film for transfer, digitizing, editing and encoding digitized titles around an already busy schedule.
2. How do you feel the project has gone (for you and the organisation)?	We have greatly welcomed the huge spur to grasp the digitization of some of the local materials we knew of. Further, the academic backbone underlying the design and the precision of the meta data has moved us into a new style of viewing the materials we have been working with. It has made it possible to go to local people with collections with the 'flattering' message about their materials being included in this great enterprise. Generally I feel it has gone well – my involvement has mainly been digitising oral history recordings and this has gone pretty smoothly (see below for comments). I would say that the project has fulfilled its key task in demonstrating that it is possible to create a local searchable digital archive using very different media (audio, video, jpegs, works of art, printed books, etc). I've had frequent contact with the Project since October, and believe my views re the detail of the Project are known. They will be repeated at the Workshop on 31st. So I don't wish to have to write them all out again here. Very well. My concern was how the material looked when it was

	uploaded and I think there has been a good compromise between the size of the files for fast download and quality. Flash files may have been better in terms of streaming but WMV files have worked fine.
3. What went particularly well?	Sitting round the table with the people making the running. Having the use of the powerful A3 Scanner. Getting to grips with the mysteries of metadata. Having the oversight of and the contact with the professional library staff. Once everything was set up the digitisation process went well. Ed Kirkland managed our delivery of titles well. Because of the regular meetings MACE was able to keep the management team aware of delays, which occurred throughout MACE's involvement in the project because of other priorities. There was also a pragmatic approach to IP issues, which was refreshing and means that orphaned works have been made available widely.
4. What issues have there been?	No downsides for us. There has always been a way to discuss the format of a particular set of records. The main issue with my work was purchasing equipment for the project and setting it up. The main thorn in the side was buying analogue/digital (A/D) converters. Budget considerations meant that we chose a cheaper option – albeit one that is reviewed on the JISC website – and this has provided a few headaches. I had to get some new connections made up and the units themselves aren't made or designed very well. Having said this I don't believe the quality of the digitised material has been compromised, just that the 'ease of use' factor hasn't been high! The concerns I do have relate (1) to the cost of maintaining the website which, in the present funding circumstances, is something that institutions such as Leicester University cannot possibly meet on an ongoing basis, and (2) that we are still a long way from having one digital archive portal which links to other relevant archives such as the BBC's various deposits, the Record Office for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, the Leicestershire and Rutland Family History Society and the university's own Historical Directories website. Relating to the latter point, My Leicestershire does duplicate some material available elsewhere on the web, and has not looked beyond a few organizations (who are) fairly closely connected with Leicester University. For example, the website has a set of digital images of local art works by George Moore Henton - who was a student of the Leicester College of Art which is now De Montfort University. DMU holds some of Henton's work, so does the City at the Museum and Art Gallery in New Walk, and so does Leicester University. In terms of historical research, the very best way of interpreting Henton's material is for all of it to be placed together in one collection. This may well be impossible physically, but could work digitally. If you Google "George Moore Henton" you find links to most of his deposits, but the My Leicestershire website does not come up

	until Page 4, so maybe the metadata needs to be reconsidered.
	The difficulty of providing access to orphaned works was an issue that we were able to get round once we had the okay to use the titles from depositors that don't own the rights in the material and had agreed a 'take down policy'.
5. What would you do differently if there was a "next time"?	Nothing comes to mind. I'm assuming there would be money available for these: I would want more expensive/better A/D converters and I would also want scans to be made of the typed summaries of each of the interviews (these are more detailed than the summaries we are using but require a lot more time to create). I didn't see any significant consideration of potential USERS of the data in MLDA in the Project (apart from the 'User Tests', which may have been about the mechanics of use, rather than motivations?), and I feel this is a serious weakness. I really can't think of anything!
6. Do you think this way of putting things on the Web works for a local history organisation such as yours?	Notoriously, local history websites are a random hotchpotch. The MLDA approach with its academic backbone and great "searchableness" is a first class way for us to be online. It also forces proper consideration as to what is worth digitizing in this way. As a local history group we have the natural instinct to explain a little more. We welcome the coming development of the 'drop page' at the head of each collection, which will allow a little bit of introduction. Yes, I do. The only other way of presenting our material is via books or CDs, but the Web enables far greater information to be delivered to a wider audience. It works for MACE, although we are not a local history organization. For us it's one of the easiest ways of reaching our audiences. MY LEICESTERSHIRE in some ways duplicates what we are doing on our website (www.macearchive.org.uk) where we have 40,000 catalogue entries with 4,000 of them having video files related to them. Nevertheless, it was the fact that MACE material could be placed into context trough other collections that attracted us to the project and it is this that works for us.
7. What do you feel you have learnt from doing this project eg creating and managing the digitised archives for *My Leicestershire Archive*	Thinking through the options on how to present digital files; single items or compound objects, or dull blown PDF files. Working out what is worth submitting. Working with the meta data precision. By attending a JISC course on digitisation I managed to fill a few gaps in my knowledge of the process, and this was very useful. From a procedural point of view I confirmed my experience that this sort of thing takes a lot of time! Can't say I've learnt a great deal. The process of developing a

	project through to the digitization of film is something we do regularly. That said, it was interesting to get an insight into the workings of a university library.
8. Did you receive adequate training and support?	Who can quarrel with a home visit and one-to one training on the scanner? And always there on the end of the phone and e-mail. Yes I have not been hands-on with this project, so the training element is not relevant.
9. Have the project partnerships been useful? If so, in what way(s)?	EMOHA, MACE and RHT come from different hinterlands. We have had no special additional contact with each other, but enjoyed the mutual enthusiasm. Matters became more exciting when the County Archivist joined the steering group. More of her presence would have been of great interest to us. It has been very useful from a local history point of view to see what the other contributors have put into the project, and the connections made have been useful for EMOHA for networking purposes. Too much history related work is done in isolation and the sorts of connections My Leicestershire is making are invaluable. The partnership with the library may result in MACE developing a relationship with the university's education department.
10. Would you like to continue working together after the end of the project? If so, how?	If more local history groups like RHT are to be encouraged to add material, then a structured body is needed. A system will be needed of identifying groups who want to 'sign up', then a time-limited and mentored programme organised for each group. Some sort of high level 'Digital Archive Council' needs to convene occasionally. This would bring together the leading lights: University Library, the Centres for Urban & Local History, the County Record Office, The Leicester Archaeological and Historical Society Yes. I feel the Archive already has some excellent content on it but I think that many other local history groups or interested individuals would benefit from adding more material to it. The amount of searchable metadata makes this website more useful than many others and I would like to see it expand its collections. This can be encouraged by us working together to promote the website in future and providing support to interested parties.. Yes – see number 9.
11. Do you anticipate that your group will access material on the site in the future?	In the future, on the many occasions when local or other people get curious about Rothley and Leicestershire in general, we now have a magnificent resource to direct them to. When we come across material worth adding, we will surely do so. A by-product of our involvement is that we now hold high-quality scans of everything we have added. Already two printed books have resulted, and two more are under development.

	Yes, a lot! Mainly for teaching, talks, and directing people with local history queries. No Probably not
12. Who do you feel the Archive will appeal to?	In time, a wide range of people. The researchers and the academics first, but gradually as the Google spiders get to work, all manner of family history searchers. Great potential in the schools. It should appeal to anyone with an interest in the history of the region (social, political etc) or with an interest in a particular subject (football, industry etc) – whether they live in the area or on the other side of the world. There should also be interest for students and teachers at all levels and across a range of subjects 'Don't know - possibly researchers, but don't really know even that, without asking some; possibly people who just 'surf the Internet' (if such people exist) and who have an interest in history or the locality. But don't know anyone like that either', Anyone interested in the history of Leicestershire.
13. Are there ways in which you think the Archive could be improved to increase its appeal?	The drop pages at the start of each collection will help, giving a welcome insight into what follows. We are into marketing are we not. That means articles in all the appropriate journals, newsletters and papers. An illustrated lecture delivered round the usual historical My main concern is with the changes that the Content dm team will make in the upcoming revamp of the website – adding Web 2 features will help a lot. The website needs to be more easily searchable than it is at the moment but the ability of users to add comments will add a lot to the material already on the site. In the longer term there may be scope for creating resources which use My Leicestershire and which are targeted at specific groups. The home page could be improved. Searching certain elements of the collections could be improved. 'Don't know without asking some users - whoever they are'. I'm sure the above is a question area for JISC, perhaps even more than for the University, as it's strategic in nature. Unfortunately, I joined the MLDA work a bit late to hear what the strategic position is.

B   Staff Feedback

1.	**How do you feel the project has gone?**	The main aims of the project have been achieved and it has been great to see it grow as the months have gone by, not only in number of items but also with interest in the project. We have met all our data entry requirements, some of which grew rapidly from 50 photos to 200. It has been good to test the digitisation of materials, to see the scope for future digitisation projects and to have a suitable platform to present them on. We have met all our data entry requirements, some of which grew rapidly from 50 photos to 200. It has been good to test the digitisation of materials, to see the scope for future digitisation projects and to have a suitable platform to present them on. Time was well spent at the beginning setting up collection templates in order to input the metadata and these could then be applied across all collections. The creation of user friendly "controlled vocabulary" is a real asset and hopefully will help not only enhance the user experience but allow for community groups to create their own items It is a shame we were not able to have the new interface so that we could have trialled the Web 2.0 features. However it was positive when we did the user testing that the improvements that were suggested will be resolved in the upgrade. I think the project has gone well. We have largely achieved what we set out to achieve. We have not made progress with using Web 2.0 functionality for promoting and using the Archive because of a delay in the system supplier providing this functionality; so this has been out of our control. I think it has been a positive experience for all concerned. We have had a fantastically productive ten months, and I am very proud of the final product. There have been setbacks, most notably not getting CONTENTdm6 in time but we have succeeded in demonstrating that projects between HE and community groups can develop strong working relationships and can produce fantastic outputs.
2.	**What went particularly well?**	Working with the community partners has been a big positive; it was good to prepare training materials for them and to visit them in their homes to set them up and then providing distant support through phone and email. This has given us a platform from which to work to involve more community groups if the project continues. Working with the community groups has also provided an immediate audience and ways into promoting to other history groups. The user testing was really helpful and we were able to assess how users were using the site and what changes we could make to facilitate the varied users. It was really encouraging that the

		"faults/improvements" were all tied in with the new upgrade, rather than fundamental problems.

I was able to attend a lecture given by Michael Wood on campus and give out leaflets to all that attended as well as talking to Michael himself. This allowed us access to a broad group of people.

I think the relationships between the various partners have worked well. The project largely built on relationships which Colin Hyde of EMOHA already had with different organizations and we benefited a great deal from this.

I'm particularly pleased with the relationships we have developed. We have been working with partners throughout the project and the mutual enthusiasm, expertise and drive have been very impressive.
Our approach to IPR has also been effective. By utilising the strategies used elsewhere we were able to get up and running very quickly |
| 3. | **What issues have there been?** | The main issue for me has been the time taken to upload the large documents into CONTENTdm and then to upload from there to the approval queue. Pictures and photographs were easy to upload in multiple amounts but PDFs were more problematic. A large PDF would take a good hour if not longer to upload at each stage and would then hold up the computer for all of that time. We really needed a PC running that only was used to upload the PDF's instead of holding up one PC.

The event in December was disappointing because of the poor uptake, but this was mainly due to the weather and the weekend of the 5th being the first time for 2 weeks that people had ventured out as well as being close to Christmas. I think in a different context at a better time of year there would have been more of an uptake.

Obviously the other issue was not being able to test the new upgrade and to see how the Web 2.0 would work but we can definitely see the potential and how it will work.

I was disappointed that we did not succeed in getting the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society involved in the project given their importance and also because it would have been useful to increase the number of community partners a bit (We tried to get them involved after the project had been running for a few months). Managing volunteers. time and commitment requires patience and tact; I think the project team have done very well with this. I was expecting us to encounter more copyright issues than we did in the end.
We have not had any „show stoppers..

As mentioned, not having CONTENTdm 6 was a blow. The opportunity for user generated input wasn't available to the degree we had hoped. We have still had that input however – by e-mail |

		& at events – and this bodes well for the eventual launch of the tagging, rating, & commenting functionality. We are having a beta phase for Web 2.0 features from 21/3/2011.
4.	**What would you do differently if there was a "next time"?**	I think more publicity for the event would have been good, it was very last minute and greater publicity would have been useful. Maybe holding it somewhere other than the records office would have helped

Possibly have more than 2 community groups involved in adding their items and have more than two people inputting the data to be able to compare the differences and the problems associated with doing it themselves

I would get someone from the University's School of Education involved in the Steering Group – I think we missed schools as a major potential audience at the start as we were focussing more on the local history community. I would give the project a better name – one that includes „history. in the title as this has huge implications for such practical things as Google search results!

Develop better strategies to manage the risks involved. In this case the non-delivery of a critical component such as CONTENTdm6 was not adequately mitigated. We should have acted sooner and used some of our spare resource to develop improvements to our 5.4 instance. I would take a more pessimistic view when assessing risk in future. |
| 5. | **What do you feel the key thinks you have learnt from doing this project eg creating and managing the digitised archives for *My Leicestershire Archive*** | From a personal view this has been a challenge but one that I have enjoyed. I've had to step out of the traditional cataloguing shoes and work with Dublin Core, photographs, videos, interviews rather than books, creating my own controlled vocabularies, adapting as the project has progressed. Being involved with user testing, publicity, training and plenty more. This is the first time I have worked on a project such as this so it has been a really good experience.

Community partners have a great deal to contribute in terms of expertise and content – if you can get the right individuals to work with and they have enough time to work with you. Promotion and publicity requires sustained time and effort and it is difficult to get the time for this even in a project which lasts for almost a year – a lot of time needs to be given to project start up, building the relationships, getting the content etc. You need to be prepared to sustain your promotion and publicity effort well after the formal end of the project if we you are going to get value from the content you have created. Seconding existing staff to a project is a good idea if at all possible – as you get the benefit of their existing experience and expertise and the expertise which they develop during the project.

We leant that:
  - There is huge enthusiasm out there for this kind of project.
  - Digitisation work always takes longer than you think |

		• The various stages of creating a digital product are quite simple but slotting it all together can challenge deadlines • It is important to publicise these collections creatively.
6.	**Have the project partnerships been useful? If so, in what way(s)?**	It has been good to work with EMOHA and MACE to learn about the work that they do, to be able to engage and work with others who normally I would not have had contact with. The partnerships have been very useful in terms of: (a) content provided; (b) ideas and contacts provided; (c) different perspectives for developing and promoting the Archive. Yes. We have hit on a lot of interesting content that otherwise would remain in someone's loft or shed. I think that having a grounding influence (our partners also represent our users) on the project team and steering group has led to a more user focussed end product.
7.	**Would you like to continue working together after the end of the project? If so, how?**	It would be good to maintain these links but am not sure how that would look if we are no longer working on the project, as our paths would not normally cross. I think it would be shame to let the relationships fade away after the end of the project. Exploring how we might work together in the future is very much a work in progress at the moment. From the Library's point of view, the most immediate issue is to find ways of sustaining digitization activity for our special collections – even at a low level – and ensure that the Archive is promoted and used. The Steering Group will continue to meet for a period and promotion will need to be an important focus for the Group I think it is important to keep the product going. My Leicestershire History has huge potential for growth and focussing on publicity in the next few months may open opportunities that do not currently exist.
8.	**What aspects of the model used for creating and contributing content (i.e. multiple formal partners with central mediation) do you feel are transferable, if any?**	It would be good to maintain these links but am not sure how that would look if we are no longer working on the project, as our paths would not normally cross. The community partners contributed content and expertise which the project would not otherwise have had. As long as there is some staff resource for supporting and co-ordinating this activity, I think it could definitely be transferable. But it's not a "cheaper" way of building digital collections. The whole lot is transferrable. It is an excellent way of making use of the enthusiasm, knowledge and skills of local historians and enthusiasts. One thing I would note however is that you need to be upfront about the commitment this take s from them..after all they are volunteers.
9.	**How do you feel about how the profile of**	From the events and contact we have had with the public it seems people are aware of the archive but not actually using it. It was difficult to promote at the beginning with limited content, but as it

	My Leicestershire Archive with the public has developed so far?	has grown there has been more to tell people about. Now that the project stage is complete than it needs to be advertised more but this may be difficult if the content is not being added to. Not much as yet although there is now some anecdotal evidence that the word is spreading through the local history community. Promotion – including visibility to search engines – is key at the moment. It could be better. We have had various limiting factors and of course the publicity phase could only really get going once we had something to publicise. I am hopeful that the next 3-6 months will see a significant increase in use of the website.
	10. Who do you feel the Archive will appeal to?	The archive hopefully will appeal to the general public, for those that grew up in Leicestershire. It will hopefully appeal to the schools that are doing local projects. The historical directories and the Special Collections items will hopefully be used by academics and students. Primarily local historians and schools/Colleges. Anyone who lives or has lived in Leicestershire from casual interest to local historian. This seems to have been borne out by the usages and surveys so far. Once we have solved our Google invisibility problem, we hope to see this more clearly.
	11. Are there ways in which you think the Archive could be improved to increase its appeal?	The Web 2.0 functions will greatly increase the appeal of the archive, people will have a chance to interact with the items, to leave their memories and to bring the items alive. The interface would benefit from more visual appeal (a software upgrade will provide this). Offer browsing by themes (again, we'll be able to do this after a planned software upgrade and have included broad themes in item records). Improve phrase searching (searching for place names is not well supported in basic search). Offer Web 2.0 functionality – RSS feeds, user tagging and comments (again – on the way with the much awaited software upgrade!). Well, the user testing came up with a lot on this topic. We are working on that now, and our software partner OCLC are also addressing these issues in a software update scheduled for May. Content wise most feedback we have says great, nut more please…

C   My Leicestershire Digital Archive user testing results

(Evaluator highlights in blue)

Background:

Why

> To get an insight into our audience and what they expect from the archive
>
> To evaluate whether the archive meets these expectations
>
> To get an insight into user behaviour to inform development of the archive
>
> To collect evidence about the value, quality and usefulness of the archive

Who

We had 10 volunteers who attended on the 22nd and 25th February. From the 10 people we had 4 pairs and 2 individuals. Each session lasted for between 45mins and an hour. The attendees were a mixture of students both undergraduate and postgraduate, academics, support staff and community group members.

Method

The user testing took place in the form of guided tasks, but the tasks were open to interpretation and exploration. We asked people to talk through what they were doing and why to give us an idea of the way people were searching the archive.

Results:

Why do people use the archive?

Of our 10 participants 7 were already familiar with the site and 3 had not looked at it. The reasons given for using the site were:

> Interested in history
>
> Member of Leicestershire Industrial History Society
>
> Lives in Clarendon Park and had seen ghost signs on some of the houses
>
> Member of Rothley Heritage Trust
>
> New to Leicester and wanted to find out about it
>
> Grew up in Leicester and wanted to see what was there that she remembered

How do people find the archive?

9 of our 10 participants used Google to search and 1 used the University of Leicester staff pages. The search terms used were:

> Leicestershire AND history
>
> Leicestershire archive followed by Leicestershire archive online

Leicestershire archive AND university

Leicestershire archive AND library

Leicestershire archive le.ac or used University of Leicester in full

Home page:

All seemed impressed by the homepage. 2 people had seen the home page before the current changes and felt it was much better. Participants liked the photos displayed down the side. They felt the archive drew you in to look further. The search box was where you would expect to find it. Comments were made about having the collections listed on the home page with a description about them, although it was felt that the description could have been more detailed.

Improvements on home page:

There were some suggestions as to how the home page could be improved and these were:

- Search themes displaying on the home page that people may be looking for themselves
- The word "favorite" on the menu bar needs to have a "u" in it.
- More information on collections would be good but maybe landing pages would be better
- Contact us should be a page
- Menu bar is not obvious – too thin?

General searching and display of items:

The items were well presented and the metadata gave plenty of information. One popular query which 3 people raised was what the tick boxes by an item on a page of results could be used for.

Improvements for general display

- Thumbnails could be bigger
- Confusion when first access a media file as to how to get it to play in the browser and maybe an explanation would be helpful.
- When there is a page of results the logical step is to click on the title or creator field to categorize the results further but this does not seem to work in this way – two pairs commented that they would like to order the Nichols volumes within their results.

How are people searching?

The first task we were asking people to carry out was to find a particular ghost sign. Of the 10 participants 4 of the pairs went back to the home page and 2 used a different route.

Searching from home page: from those that selected the collection level from the home page realized that this option did not allow them to search once the collection was open, 2 of the pairs then used the "search" box in the top right hand corner of the screen and 2 used the advanced search.

1 participant used the search box immediately and one used the advanced search.

Navigating an item: we set the task of finding the links in the item record, 4 of the pairs used the blue links, 1 pair ignored the metadata and went straight back to the search box and the other pair said they would do both.

Use of facets

We asked a question that would allow for people to realize the facets could be used and how they would then use them. Although searching was done through both the search box and the advanced search, all pairs used the facets to break down the search and interestingly they all used different ones, which shows the facets we have set are appropriate.

Comments on archive in general:

Ghost signs – these were one of the more popular items but one pair were surprised to find faded painted signs on walls, they had thought it would be more to do with ghosts and felt maybe this could be explained in the description. Calling all ghost signs, "Ghost sign of …" causes navigation issues when alphabetical listing fails.

> "Would be good to have a map interface to this collection"

Ghost signs GPS: in each ghost sign are the Google co-ordinates that can be entered into Google Street View to find the location of the sign. Two of the pairs said this was misleading and they would not have known what the co-ordinates were.

PDF's – some general comments were made about the way PDF's appear and how to use them. Some of the improvements were:

- Could the numbering of the PDF pages match the contents pages as at the moment they differ
- Instructions on how to save a PDF
- Instructions on how to print a PDF
- Could there be a simple download button? – would be good to download a PDF for use on a Kindle…
- Could the PDF icon look more in line with other PDF icons?

Video icons – a comment was made that when looking at the Leicestershire Industrial History Society it is not clear which items are photographs and which are videos and would it be possible to add the "play arrow" icon to the thumbnails.

Menu bar – there were a couple of issues to do with the menu bar:

- Favorite needs a "u"

- Help is misleading and would not normally be used so could a "how to" be added? Or "User Manual" or "Getting started"
- Better search tips (but no one read the ones already there) i.e. Anything in blue is a link

My Favourites – More explanation required. When told how the function works participants said that they would have expected a registration/login.

Information about the archive/the collections/ etc…**Several participants suggest that information needed to be clearer and more prominent. This came around to a discussion of the "landing page" concept we see in the new version.**

One participant thought that themed browsing would make access to the collections easier.

Several participants thought that we needed to highlight "important" items.

Final thoughts from participants:

All would recommend the site

Most were enthusiastic and thought that the site could be successful with more publicity – Facebook links etc.

Most thought that we had interesting content but would like more of it!

People also asked for **feature items** where there are a lot of items in a collection – the Vanished Leicester collection being a good example. The accompanying book is very difficult to find without knowing it is there, and what it is called.

Five words to sum up the site:

"Something for rainy lunch times"

Conclusion:

The user testing has highlighted some key areas that need to be changed or improved, some of these may happen automatically with the upgrade of the software. The important change seems to be:

- **To include a "landing" page for each collection so users know more about the collection, what it contains, and how it was put together. This will become more important if future collections are to be added as the list on the home page will grow.**
- **Better "help" pages and re named to be more meaningful**
- **Change the video icons to show they are a video**
- **Add a note for the ghost signs co-ordinates**
- Look to provide alternative ways into the content with themed browsing and/or map displays of items.
- Add a "u" to favorites and provide a better contact us page

D   SUMMARY OF key areas in committee MINUTES

Steering group minutes are largely reporting meetings. Early comments emphasize the need for the project to be an exemplar one and to therefore work with a small number of organizations.

Minutes of the Team highlight the different stages of the project. Key issues that occur included:

- Copyright
- Inputting of data and the types of data
- Tagging of comments
- Discussion of themes (compared with period)
- Search terms
- How searches work
- IT issues
- Publicity
- sustainability

E   Update on content – 01/02/11

EMOHA Oral histories	All oral histories (122) have been added.
EMOHA BBC Radio Leicester	109 programs have been digitized and are with the project team. 44 are live on the site at present. This has been delayed in the past fortnight due to staff illness but should be finished by 18/2/2011
MACE	All items ready to go live but clearances have still to come through on six of the items
Historical directories	Complete
Ghost signs	Initial collection complete. The additional images scanned at the Records Office event are still to be added.
Vanished Leicester	Initial estimate amount of 400 items exceeded. Approx 750 out of 1000 available have been uploaded. Mr. Calow's accompanying book edited and uploaded.
Special collections	All items added

Content to be added by partners

Leicester Industrial History Society	All initially identified items completed except for two items left to complete as part of an evaluation exercise with project team.
Rothley Heritage Trust	Very much an ongoing process. The initial collection of postcards is complete, as is the Churchwardens Account Book and auction catalogues from the time of the Rothley manor sale. More content has been identified and it is hoped that the process can be continued until 31/3/11 and beyond.

F   Survey Feedback forms

1   How did you hear about the archive?
                Through the Leicester and Rutland Family History Society
How many times have you visited the archive?
                More than once
Why did you come to the archive today?
                To put the site into my favourites
What do you like about the archive?
                The content is amazing to me on a personal level. My father was in The Leicester Pageant and some of the photographs of the streets that have since gone were my childhood memories of where I lived. I also found it very easy to navigate.
What one thing about the archive would you most like to see improved?
                I can't think of anything that needs improving
What changes or additional features would you suggest for this website?
                I would like to see more photographs added when they are available, just to keep the site updated and fresh with something new.
Will you use the site again?
                Yes

2   How did you hear about the archive?
                university website
How many times have you visited the archive?
                This is my first time
Why did you come to the archive today?
                interest in local history
What do you like about the archive?
                local aspect
What one thing about the archive would you most like to see improved?
                Navigation
What changes or additional features would you suggest for this website?
                a search facility
Will you use the site again?
                Yes

3   How did you hear about the archive?
                Leicestershire & Rutland Family History Society Journal March 2011
How many times have you visited the archive?
                This is my first time
Why did you come to the archive today?
                To look at the Directories
What do you like about the archive?
                Brilliant site,
What one thing about the archive would you most like to see improved?
What changes or additional features would you suggest for this website?
                No changes, just keep adding more content when you get it
Will you use the site again?
                Yes
Any other comments on the archive?
        Thank you for a nice afternoon - very interesting

4   How did you hear about the archive?

   Thir L & R Family History Soc

How many times have you visited the archive?

   This is my first time

Why did you come to the archive today?

   To look for the Kelly's and Wright's **directories which** I last consulted in the University Library Hatton Room in the old library in 1960! I lost those notes - a chance to get back that info!

What do you like about the archive?

   Good all round so far!

What one thing about the archive would you most like to see improved?

   Content (what is in it)

What changes or additional features would you suggest for this website?

Will you use the site again?

   Yes

Any other comments on the archive?

   not yet

G Summary of findings from Network User Statistics: Analytics

There are a wide-range of users, worldwide but also from the local area. Those who engage with the site use a number of pages and take time to look at them. Many use the site on repeated occasions.

Average time 282.04 seconds (nearly five minutes)

Average page use: 6.64

Average visits per user: 8.9

Number of users from December 2010 to April 2011: 4173

H   Feedback: End of Project workshop: March 31st 2011

Notes from presentation 31.03.11: Laura Unwin

Usability workshop:

- attended in November
- good opportunity to meet people working on other projects,
- Helped in planning our user testing.
- 10 volunteers
- Series of tasks and talked through what they were doing
- Feedback: facets good, GPS good,
- Feedback into new site: landing pages

Metadata:

Dublin Core:

- Good platform from which to create our records.

General metadata:

- Each collection had own metadata assigned to it.
- EMOHA had interview data they wanted to keep in the records

Controlled vocabularies:

- Locations: we knew that ultimately we wanted to be able to migrate our data but also wanted it to be simple enough so that our community groups could use it. We therefore used the Getty Thesaurus of Geographic names to base out long strings on: United Kingdom—England--Leicestershire—Leicester—Clarendon Park. We then had a shorter string: Leicester—Clarendon Park. This did mean double inputting the same data but it seems to be something the users have appreciated.
- Subjects: again with the locations we wanted to have subjects that could be migrated and some common search themes. We looked at the thesauruses that came as part of CONTENTdm to see if any were suitable. The Thesaurus for Graphic Materials covered all the key phrases we would want to use. Due to it being American some terms needed to be changed in particular around the railway terms.
- Themes: since the start of the project we had wanted to use themes as a way of searching, instead of creating our own themes we used EMOHA's theme list and added to it as new terms came up. Hopefully the themes can be explored more fully in the new version of CONTENTdm.

Descriptions: Collections like Rothley have full and clear descriptions on their items and this is the real difference in having community people who know about the topics to tell us about them, rather than relying on the data I have been able to input with only a small amount of knowledge and time to read/listen to items. This feeds in to the new Web 2.0 features in being able to comment on the photos and hopefully bring them alive to people.

The things I have learnt:

- Dublin Core is adaptable to all media formats
- Metadata can be simplified depending on target audience
- The downside is having to double input data in the location and subject fields
- You don't need to create vocabularies from scratch
- Descriptions from people who know are much more valuable

Notes: Ben Wynne

Present: EMOHA: Colin Hyde. Leicestershire Industrial History Society: Keith Drury, Wendy Freer. MACE: Richard Shenton-McQueen. Rothley Heritage Trust: Terry Sheppard. University of Leicester Library: Evelyn Cornell, Gareth Johnson, Louise Jones, Ed Kirkland, Laura Unwin, Ben Wynne. University of Leicester, Beyond Distance Research Alliance: Palitha Edirisingha. Project evaluator: Jane Seaman

Apologies: Margaret Bonney (Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Records Office); Paola Marchionni (JISC); James Patterson (MACE)

The following is a summary of a round table discussion on issues arising from the project and possible future directions for developing the Archive. The discussion followed a number of presentations from the project partners.

1. Project set up and technical issues

The project set up phase and addressing technical issues were largely covered in the presentations which preceded the round table discussion. EK felt that project set up went smoothly. RS agreed; there were some teething issues in establishing an appropriate technical specification for the digitized video files but these were addressed.

2. Intellectual property issues

BW – there were fewer IPR issues than I was originally anticipating given the diverse range of resources which the project was setting out to provide.

RS – we generally come across few problems in seeking permissions from rights holders. We welcomed the way that the project dealt with 'orphan works' i.e. having a clear take down policy so that if a rights holder subsequently appears and raises objections the item can be 'taken down' from the Archive.

TS – when we asked people for permission to put things in the Archive they have been 'dead flattered'.

KD – People are generally fine about giving permission. However, we need to remember the age profile of many rights holders concerned (advanced years). A lot of explanation is required about what a Web site is and what they are giving permission for. The documentation which the project used for seeking and recording permissions was not suitable for people in this position. People don't know what a creative commons licence is. [BW note to evaluator: we produced a short explanatory document to accompany the formal 'permissions' letter for a public event at the County Records Office in December 2010]

3. Digitization

[Presentations had highlighted how time consuming digitization can be]

CH - You need to be very open and explicit with people about how much time digitizing things – such as audio cassettes – is going to take.

BW – What Terry has done demonstrates what can be achieved with a relatively inexpensive flat bed scanner – although I wouldn't want to underestimate the time which Terry has had to give to this.

LJ – clear user documentation is obviously very important in order to make it as straightforward as possible for community partners to contribute content.

CH – with community partners, the work often falls on the shoulders of one or two individuals.

KD – what about the long term storage of the digital resources we have created?

EK and BW – outlined that we are using the University's long term research data archive for archival copies

4. Working as partners and 5. What would we do differently next time?

TS – 'I felt I'd fallen in the cookie jar!'

BW – We would have benefited from having some input from schools/Education to the Steering Group

LJ – I think the project has demonstrated that this model of working with community partners can be successful. We have more work to do to demonstrate that the resources we have created are actually useful and for whom.

BW – There was an element of opportunism in bidding for the funding for this project; the opportunity arose – we did not necessarily have our audiences well thought out.

KD – That's acceptable for a pilot. But any further investment would require more work to be done on audiences and understanding what their motivations/needs are – such as by interviewing local history researchers.

WF – very good support materials would be needed to enable uptake by schools. You have to make it very easy to use.

LJ – We need to explore whether there is any 'widening participation' funding available that could be used for work with schools.

6. How might the partnerships be continued in the future?

EK and KD – get LAHS involved.

BW – potential to do more with the County Records Office; they have digitized items but don't have a delivery platform?

KD – there is the A2A Web site.

BW – if further funding were available, would each of us want to continue to be involved?

CH – yes, there are lots more oral history interviews that I could digitize!

TS – [mentioned others who could get involved rather than the Rothley Heritage Trust, I think]

RS – [silence]

WF – we don't have the manpower.

LJ – I think we'd need a better understanding of what is needed and how it would be used

JS – It might be useful to do an evaluation 6 months from now to see who is using the Archive and how.

JS – Could you employ students to do further work on the Archive?

LJ – But you still need someone to supervise them.

KD – It is very important to have people who have an understanding of the resources. We have tried getting student volunteers from the University but with no success. Actually inputting the data is the easy bit.

LJ – what are the themes that grab people's attention?

CH – World War II

RS – the Asian community and immigration

CH – We get a lot of visitors to our Web site looking for information on knitting and hosiery

WF – childhood experiences

EC – we need to create more links between collections

KD – public libraries in the area have very good local history sections. I wonder what subjects they find people have most interest in?

7. How do we reach new audiences for the Archive?

EK – we are contacting libraries and museums and publicising the Archive through the University Media and Communications service.

WF – local history organizations are always looking for presenters

PE – produce some YouTube video interviews with the project partners and use Twitter to publicise the Archive.

CH – Contact Carl Vivien in AVS to do some videos.

CH – Create a Wikipedia entry.

KD – Family history is a massive area. The Family History Society should be targeted.

KD – Use ethnic community networks.

LJ – We need to discuss funding with the University fundraisers.

CF – Any possibility of seeking funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund for partnership working with schools?

KD – Need to get downloads from the Archive right. Some files take far too long to download.

BW – We all have a part to play in publicising the Archive. Getting the Archive more used will increase opportunities arising for future funding.

WF – I could publicise the Archive more if I had some promotional material you could give me.

Jane Seaman: Evaluator Notes

Presentations

1.   Project team – What we have learned

Ed and Laura

General

Project set up took a long time

Hosting the system and developing relations with partners was very beneficial for the Library

The training aspect was very important

JISC digital media very useful

Wonderful support from OCLC/Content.dm

Received expert advice from Slovka Manoijovich who had undertaken a similar project in Canada

The user testing day with 10 participants resulted in building in things to the website i.e. landing pages

The community groups had knowledge and back up to create more rounded information – The data was richer for the community input

It would be desirable to carry this involvement with community groups in the future

Key contacts within these groups proved essential

Volunteer time was extensive and crucial

The content list was developed with the partners and took a lot of time – far more than anyone thought

Publicity

The event at the Record Office helped to get the word out

As did posters/flyers, e-mail groups, local papers and links to other websites

Word of mouth is also working

Traffic on site is increasing

What we learnt

- Time consuming
- It was not just a case of overseeing the work
- Don't re-invent the wheel

- Pick and choose what you need
- Respect volunteers time, knowledge and skills
- The project was a better project due to the involvement of partners
- Developing the relationships was important
- This type of project is the future
- The importance of using the right language to be picked up by search engines
- Therefore they have changed their language and traffic from search engines is now 10%
- The name is changing from 'My Leicestershire' to 'My Leicestershire History' to increase the traffic further
- Don't trust your supplier as they may not deliver on time i.e. OCLC did not develop Web 2.0 functionality for the user interface in time

2.   Challenges of digitizing audio and film

Richard and Colin

<u>Richard</u>

They learnt that:

1. Materials from collection could be contextualised with other collections

2. Potential to increase audience and connect people with their moving heritage

- They committed to supplying 25 items but this increased to 31
- It took a long time to digitize the film
- Project costs were reduced as already had the necessary equipment
- The only problem for them was file format – quality and size.
- A compromise was worked out using windows media files – this worked
- Overall the whole process went very well

<u>Colin</u>

- It takes a long time
- He felt it was too much time for the community groups
- Download times are variable and this needs looking into
- Considered download times only an issues if causal visitor, a researcher would spend more time

Main points from both:

1. It was a valuable project
2. Would like to continue
3. Time factor a problem

3.   The Rothley Perspective

Terry Sheppard

This was a local history talk and that did not give any technical detail or reflective information on the project.

- At the end of his presentation questions were asked which resulted in the following information:
- Due to the project books were published i.e. one on postcards
- There were a few extra oral history interviews
- They have not developed a new audience or new volunteers
- They have enjoyed the project (but it has been for them or Terry).

4.   The Leicestershire Industrial History Society (LIHS) Perspective

Keith Drury

- This project coincided with one of the aims of LIHS – to build a digital library
- Their image archive had already been digitized
- They did need to sort out copyright
- Getting permission took a long time as they do not own anything themselves
- Received an induction and training
- In the future they would like to get more users, seek feedback and encourage an interest by the ethic community groups in the area
- There is more LIHS material for future use but the effort to input the data is not there
- More justification from user feedback would encourage people to continue to volunteer their time
- People who volunteer to input material need to have a lot of time and understand the material
- Keith said it was a push pull project - push the data out and pull the people in
- So far it has not pulled the people in
- Keith has concerns that 'My Leicestershire' will not be of interest to ethic groups
- But they could work at it
- Keith also thinks there is a problem with downloading
- This could be helped by the way in which the data is prepared
- Making sure that titles and references are on the same page as drawings and pictures
- They have had no responses/feedback from people using the site
- He sees the site as a shop window for LIHS but this is not happening at present
- For future need guidelines on how to up-date the site
- Keith thinks it has been a good start but needs to consider continued involvement

Comment

All presenters thought the project worthwhile but very time consuming.