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What problems are we solving?

Created by Gregor Črešnar from Noun Project
Background on the DLF-AIG

• Find all info on our wiki page https://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment
• Founded at the end of 2013
• Began working groups in 2014
  – 2014-2015: Citations assessment
  – 2014-present: Web analytics, cost assessment, user studies
  – 2016-present: Metadata assessment, cultural assessment, content reuse sub-group
How our committee works

Created by Iris Roijakkers from Noun Project
Web Analytics working group

https://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment:Analytics

https://osf.io/wr2yq/

Year 2: Annotated bibliography on resources about web analytics, how they are used, what metrics are measured, and what digital libraries do with the data
Cost Assessment working group

https://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment:Costs

• Goal: To aggregate and make freely available a large set of data on the time it takes to perform various tasks involved in the digitization process, in order to assist organizations in digitization project planning and benchmarking
Cost Assessment working group

Digitization Cost Calculator

- **Year 1:** Determine scope of processes included, authored guidelines to guide collection of time data for 20 digitization processes

- **Year 2:** Data collection! “Day of Data” project, collaborated with CLIR’s Technical Director to build a new version of the calculator
Cost Assessment working group

Processes to be performed

Below, enter information for each process for which you want time/cost estimates. Skip whichever processes you will not use. Enter a whole number to represent the percent of scans on which you plan to perform the process, and assign a staff person to the process using the “Performed by” drop down. Use the detailed information in the blue help button next to each process name for a brief definition and to understand what “% Materials” means for a specific process. For example, with “Flattening” the “% Material” represents the percent of scan source material that actually had to be flattened, not that was reviewed for flattening needs. With “Condition review” the “% Materials” is the percent of scan source material that is visually checked -- not the percent that needed conservation attention. Please also reference the more detailed Processes & Definitions document for more information about how each process is defined for this project.

- Capture Device
  - Capture Device:
    - Flatbed scanner (i.e., an Epson 11000XL)
  - Performed By:

- Preparation of Materials

- Quality Control

- Post Processing

- Descriptive Metadata Creation
User Studies working group

https://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment:User_Studies


https://osf.io/uc8b3/

Three core areas of focus

• Usability studies
• Return on investment of digital libraries
• Reuse of digital library materials
User Studies working group


**Year 2:** Focused on developing best practices and guidelines for usability studies [https://osf.io/zfqc3/](https://osf.io/zfqc3/). Work this year divided into four areas:

– Identifying users and user behavior
– Learnability
– Accessibility
– Usability
Content Reuse spin out

https://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment:User/Reuse

A new group under the umbrella of User Studies

• Conducted a needs assessment that would clarify the desired scope and functionality of a potential toolkit designed to measure digital library object reuse.

• Submitted an IMLS grant proposal for funding that would help create a toolkit to provide a roadmap, tools, techniques, and documentation to assess the reuse of materials in order to help libraries plan and deliver content to different user groups
Citations working group

https://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment:Citations

- 2015: Producing a white paper entitled, "Guidelines for citing library-hosted, unique digital assets" https://osf.io/7tpf6/
- Creates recommended citation styles for digital library objects in the hope that this will lead to better tracking of use of these assets by hosting libraries
Cultural Assessment working group

https://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment:Cultural_Assessment

- Inspired by 2015 DLF keynote Safiya Noble on *Power, Privilege, and the Imperative to Act*
- **Year 1:** Working group forms to examine our social and cultural responsibilities for information structures in digital libraries
- **Goal:** To understand how we can assess how well librarians are representing and delivering shared cultural heritage in our digital collections
Cultural Assessment working group

- Working in five groups to address topics:
  - Selection
  - Digitization and preservation
  - Metadata and description
  - Discoverability and publicizing collections
  - Annotated bibliography
Metadata Assessment working group

https://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment:Metadata

• **Year 1**: Creating guidelines, best practices, tools and workflows around the evaluation and assessment of metadata used by and for digital libraries and repositories

• The framing of their work was greatly influenced by **interest, activity and discussion around metadata assessment that occurred just after DPLAfest 2015**
Metadata Assessment working group

• In year one they focused on:
  – Performing an **environmental scan** on the topic of metadata assessment and quality (see draft)
  – Gathering **use cases and definitions** for metadata assessment needs and realities (see in the draft Assessment Framework)
  – Creating a **preliminary framework** and set of recommendations on metadata assessment (see draft Assessment Framework)
Join us!

• Will you be at DLF next week? Attend our session (11/7, 11am), followed by our lunch meet up!

• Join our (low activity) listserv
  https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/digital-library-assessment

• Want to join a specific working group? Contact the leader on the next slide.

• Interested in leading/starting a new area of digital library assessment? Email Santi Thompson
Thank you!

https://wiki.diglib.org/Assessment

Costs Assessment: Joyce Chapman, joyce.chapman@duke.edu
Web Analytics: Molly Bragg, molly.bragg@duke.edu
Cultural Assessment: Hannah Scates Kettler hannah-s-kettler@uiowa.edu
User Studies: Jody DeRidder, jlderidder@ua.edu
Content Reuse (and general questions/interest):
Santi Thompson, sathomp3@Central.uh.edu
Metadata Assessment: Christina Harlow, cmharlow@gmail.com
Citations: Elizabeth Joan Kelly, ejkelly@loyno.edu