

# Evaluation Report: Deliverable 6.1.1

---

*Deliverable Type: Public Report*  
*Number: D6.1.1*  
*Contractual Date of Delivery: 30 November 2003*  
*Nature: Final*

*Task WP6*

*Name of responsible: Costantino Thanos (ISTI-CNR)*

*Authors: M. Bruna Baldacci, Stefania Biagioni,  
Francesca Borri, Costantino Thanos, ISTI-CNR*

Contact info: [costantino.thanos@isti.cnr.it](mailto:costantino.thanos@isti.cnr.it)

## **Abstract**

This evaluation of the impact of the demonstrated technologies was carried out through the definition, compilation and analysis of specific questionnaires for each available test-bed. The complete documentation has been made available to the public through the D-Lib Center web site (<http://dlibcenter.iei.pi.cnr.it/>).

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Self Publishing Environment .....	3
3.	Open Access to DLs Environment.....	4
4.	Digital Library Based Collaboration Environment.....	5
5.	Web Journal Preservation Environment .....	6
6.	Building a Geospatial Digital Library.....	8
7.	Audio/Video Digital Library Environment.....	9
8.	Lesson Learned .....	10
9.	Appendix.....	11
9.1.	Self Publishing Environment – Questionnaire Synthesis .....	11
	<i>Questionnaire details [percentage values]</i> .....	11
	<i>Documentation &amp; Applicability</i> .....	12
	<i>Comments</i> .....	12
9.2.	Open Access to DLs Environment – Questionnaire Synthesis .....	12
	<i>Questions on the course</i> .....	13
9.3.	Web Journal Preservation Environment – Questionnaire Synthesis.....	16
	<i>Questions on the course</i> .....	16
	<i>Form of exposition</i> .....	18
	<i>Organization:</i> .....	18
9.4.	Building a Geospatial Digital Library – Questionnaire Synthesis .....	19
	<i>Questions on the course</i> .....	20
9.5.	Audio/Video Digital Library Environment – Questionnaire Synthesis .....	23
	<i>Questions on the course</i> .....	24

## 1. Introduction

The evaluation of the impact of the demonstrated technologies was carried out through the definition, compilation and analysis of a specific questionnaire for each available test-bed. These questionnaires were customized for each user community involved in the training sessions but all had sections requesting participants to assess interest and difficulty of the course content by giving each module one of the following values: high, medium, low, and to give advice to improve the course. In all questionnaires, a section on the “Applicability” of the testbed being presented was inserted and comments were requested.

A total of 145 participants attended the courses organised by the D-Lib Centre. In the different courses, the ratio between participants and filled in questionnaires was as follows: Self-Publishing: 41/20; Open Access to DLs: 29/16; Digital Library Collaboration Environment 15/10; Web Journal Preservation: 20/11; Building a Geospatial Digital Library: 25/18; Audio/Video Digital Library :15/12

## 2. Self Publishing Environment

Four courses on Self Publishing were held (April 10-11 and 22-23, May 8-9, June 6-7 2002) with a total of 41 participants. The course content – both introductory module and manuals - was previously submitted to and discussed with a group of experts (head librarians) from the University Libraries of Pisa. The context and the content of the presentations was also discussed and tested by the students attending a Course on Cultural Heritage organised by the “Scuola Normale” of the University of Pisa.

Most participants were librarians coming from either Departments of Natural Sciences and Humanities. This gave us the opportunity to discuss the applicability of ETRDL to manage grey literature in fields different from Informatics/Mathematics.

At the end of the course held in June 2002 a questionnaire was sent to the participants in all courses. The questionnaire was designed to investigate the participants’ assessment of 1. interest and difficulty of the course modules, i.e. Tutorial, Demo, and Training Session; 2. the documentation provided. The questionnaire also included questions regarding expected uses of the ETRDL System and a request for general comments .

Twenty participants [48,78% of the total – mostly participants who had attended the courses held in May and in June] answered the questionnaire. The results of the questionnaire can be summarized as follows:

1. Interest in the course modules was given the following values: Tutorial: 94.74; Demo Test-bed: 89.47%; Training session: 84.21. No course module was assessed with a low value. With respect to difficulty, 52% of the respondents assessed the course as being of medium difficulty, whereas 43% considered it easy. More detailed results are given in the tables below (percentage values):

<b>Interest:</b>	High	Medium	Low
TUTORIAL	94.75	5.25	-
DEMO TESTBED	89.47	10.53	-
TRAINING SESSION	84.21	15.79	-

<b>Difficulty:</b>	High	Medium	Low
TUTORIAL	5.26	57.89	36.84
DEMO TESTBED	-	66.67	33.33
TRAINING SESSION	5.55	33.33	61.11

2. About 90% of the respondents found the documentation complete, although approximately 18% considered it highly difficult to understand mainly due to their own poor knowledge of English, language in which the user guide is written.
3. With respect to applicability, about 90% of the responses were affirmative: ETRDL was considered to be of general applicability provided that the entry field "Classification" - where controlled term/codes are to be entered - is linked to the appropriate classification schema.
4. Overall comments on the course were very positive. Participants stated that the ETRDL functions were easily understood and learned during the course, even without the use of manuals. Some participants asked that some kind of remote help would be set up in order to use the prototype for their internal documents. Two negative comments regarded i) incompleteness of the documentation and the fact that it was in English, and ii) incompleteness of information regarding installation and maintenance costs. Two participants were doubtful as to how scholars would accept e-publishing; this is a political issue that will still be in discussion for much time in the future.

### **3. Open Access to DLs Environment**

The two courses on "Open Access" were attended by a total of 29 persons but only 16 filled in the questionnaire designed to evaluate the course. The questionnaire was structured in several sections that can be grouped as follows: 1.Generalities; 2. Evaluation of the two modules introducing Digital Libraries and SCHOLNET; 3. Evaluation of two SCHOLNET Demos, regarding User Functions and Administrator Functions; 4. Evaluation of the module giving instructions on how to create a digital library. Participants were also requested to give suggestions to improve the course and to suggest possible applications of the SCHOLNET System.

Participants' responses can be summarized as follows:

1. All respondents [16 respondents: 13 librarians at different level of responsibility, 3 coming from Universities/Research Institutions] judged the course "overall valuable".
2. The introductory modules were considered to be of high interest by 77.29% of participants. 40.38% of the responses assessed the course as being of medium difficulty, whereas 59.61% considered it easy.
3. The SCHOLNET Demos were considered to be of high interest by 58% of respondents and of medium interest by 42%. With respect to difficulty, responses were as follows: high: 7.69%; medium: 63.18%; low: 29.11.
4. Instructions given to create a Digital Library were considered to be of high interest by 86.66% of respondents; medium interest: 13.33%. This module is rather new, in the panorama of the courses on D.L.s, This is probably the

reason why it was considered to be rather difficult: high 23%; medium 30.76%; low 46.15.

Detailed results of the questionnaire are reported in the Appendix. Their synthesis is given in the tables below (percentage values):

<b>Interest:</b>	High	Medium	Low
INTRODUCTORY MODULES	77.29	19.37	3.33
SCHOLNET DEMOS	58	42	-
CREATING A D.L.	86.66	13.33	-

  

<b>Difficulty</b>	High	Medium	Low
INTRODUCTORY MODULES	-	40.38	59.61
SCHOLNET DEMOS	7.69	63.18	29.12
CREATING A D.L.	23	30.75	46.15

5. This section of the questionnaire requested suggestions regarding the content of the course, the form of exposition and the organisation. Suggestions were given by nine respondents. Most suggestions made by librarians regarded organization: in particular, more practical experimentation and more PC's for practical work were requested; one respondent stated that the form of exposition was "not clear enough" because of the "unusual terminology". Two respondents – a manager of information resources coming from the Public Administration and a student – suggested that the course could benefit by providing an overview of how Digital Libraries meet the needs of professionals other than librarians.
6. All responses indicated SCHOLNET as applicable in the participants' work environment especially for: i) managing and sharing unpublished and/or unfinished documents (6 options); ii) creating e-learning environments (2 options); iii) disseminating educational information (2 options); iv) all SCHOLNET services (2 options); v) the organization of thesis archives (1 option); vi) creating collaborative environments (1 option); vii) for documentation in the Public Administration (1 option); D.L. merging bibliographic records, archival description and electronic documents (1 option). The most useful/innovative functions were considered to be "Publishing/Dissemination" and "Annotation", followed by "Configuring ad hoc collections".

#### **4. Digital Library Based Collaboration Environment**

The course on "D.L. Based Collaboration" was attended by 15 persons; 10 filled in the questionnaire designed to evaluate the course. The structure of the questionnaire was as follows: 1. Generalities; 2. Evaluation of the course modules: Introduction to Digital Libraries; Building a Digital Library; Collaborative work; Demo. Participants were also requested to give suggestions to improve the course and to suggest possible applications of the CYCLADES System.

Participants' responses can be summarized as follows:

1. Nine participants were Librarians coming from Universities/Research Institutions – one of them declared to be interested in CYCLADES as a system manager. A system manager came from the CILEA Computing

Centre. All participants were interested in the collaborative work capability of CYCLADES; Both Publishing/Dissemination and Searching functions were given 3 hits.

- All participants judged the introductory module highly interesting and of low difficulty. Both modules on “Building a D.L.” and “Collaborative work” were also considered of high interest by all participants. With respect to difficulty: - the former was considered as being of low difficulty by 80% participants, whereas 20% considered it of medium difficulty; - the latter was considered as being of low difficulty by 25% of participants whereas 75% considered it of medium difficulty. The “Demo” module was assessed by only two participants. Interest was given 100% responses. Difficulty: Medium 50%; Low 50%.

The assessment values can be better visualised in the tables below (percentage values):

<b>Interest:</b>	High	Medium	Low
INTRODUCTION TO D.L.’s	100	-	-
BUILDING A D.L.	100	-	-
COLLABORATIVE WORK.	100	-	-
DEMO	100	-	-

  

<b>Difficulty</b>	High	Medium	Low
INTRODUCTION TO D.L.’s	-	-	100
BUILDING A D.L.	-	20	80
COLLABORATIVE WORK.	-	75	25
DEMO	-	50	50

- Suggestions were given by two participants. A Librarian suggested to make reference to a library framework. Another participant requested more time to share experiences.
- All responses can be considered as judging CYCLADES applicable in the participants’ work environment even though two responses were expressed as “Probably” and “Not at the moment”. Anticipated uses were i) collaborative work service; ii) e-learning and iii) Building a D.L. for academic e-publishing.

## 5. Web Journal Preservation Environment

The course on “LOCKSS - Permanent access to On Line Journals” was attended by a total of 20 persons but the related questionnaire was filled in by 11 participants : 10 librarians and 1 student.

The course was given, and the questionnaire was prepared, by the LOCKSS Organization team.

The questionnaire was structured in the following sections: 1. Interest in the LOCKSS philosophical and practical reasons; 2. Evaluation of the course modules: 2.1 – Introduction to LOCKSS Concepts; 2.2. – LOCKSS Technical Details (Collect, Preserve, Disseminate); 2.3 – LOCKSS Demo; 2.4 – Collection Development and Management; 2.5 Practical LOCKSS: i) Platform; ii) Daemon & Content/Plugs In; 3. Suggestions to improve the course with reference to Content, Form of Exposition and Organization.

Responses to the questionnaire can be summarized as follows:

1. LOCKSS is a collaborative distributed system designed to assure that libraries can access to the on-line technical journals they subscribe to. The preliminary question was, therefore, whether participants were interested in the LOCKSS aims and practice. 10 responses were positive; 1 response was expressed as «not so much» and motivated by having found the discussion on the «philosophical reason» very interesting but not completely convincing.
2. The course modules were given very different evaluations. For example, it may be interesting to note that «Interest» was given a very high percentage value in the introductory module, whereas this value progressively decreases in the successive, more technical modules. Difficulty was given rather high values.
  - 2.1 - The introductory module was considered to be of high interest by 90.90% of respondents; medium interest: 9.09%. 72.72% of the responses assessed the module as being of low difficulty, whereas 27.27% considered it of medium difficulty.
  - 2.2 – The module on the LOCKSS technical details was considered to be of high interest by 72.72% of respondents; medium interest: 27.27%. 45.45% of the responses assessed the module as being of medium difficulty; both high and low difficulty were given the same evaluation: 27.27%.
  - 2.3 – 2.4 – Both modules, Demo and Collection Development and Management, were given the same evaluation: Interest: High 54.54%; Medium 45.45%. Difficulty: High 18.18%; Medium 72.72%; Low 9.09%. One participant considered the LOCKSS demo as being addressed mainly to system administrators but not very interesting for librarians.
  - 2.5 – The interest in the two modules on practical LOCKSS (Platform; Daemon & Content/Plugs In) was identical: High 45.45%, Medium 45.45%, Low 9.09%. Difficulty, instead, was given the following values: Platform: High 10%, Medium 80%, Low 10%. Daemon & Content/Plugs In: High 45.45%, Medium 54.54%.  
Practical LOCKSS modules received some comments, mostly regarding participants' personal poor ability to understand modules contents. Very positive evaluation came, instead, by the two technicians who attended the course but did not fill in the questionnaire.

The assessment values can be better visualised in the tables below (percentage values):

<b>Interest:</b>	High	Medium	Low
LOCKSS CONCEPTS	54.54	45.45	-
TECHNICAL DETAILS	72.72	27.27	-
DEMO	54.54	45.45	-
COLLECTION MANAG..	54.54	45.45	-
PRACTICAL LOCKSS-1	45.45	45.45	9.09
PRACTICAL LOCKSS-2	45.45	45.45	9.0

<b>Difficulty</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
LOCKSS CONCEPTS	-	27.27	27.27
TECHNICAL DETAILS.	27.27	45.45	27.27
DEMO	18.18	72.72	9.09
COLLECTION MANAG..	18.18	72.72	9.09
PRACTICAL LOCKSS-1	10	80	10
PRACTICAL LOCKSS-2	45.45	54.54	

At the end of each module, the questionnaire asked whether more details were needed. There were two YES responses for each module, on average.

3. Suggestions regarding Content and Form of Exposition were given to improve the course, whereas Organization was considered pretty good; one respondent suggested to include hands-on instructions to the course documentation. With respect to content, most comments judge content too technical for librarians; splitting the course in two different courses – one addressed to system administrators and one to librarians – was also suggested. Comments about form of exposition reflect participants' difficulty in understanding technical matter. Detailed comments are reported in the Appendix to this document.

## **6. Building a Geospatial Digital Library**

The course on the Alexandria Digital Library software was attended by professionals of very different types – information engineers, system administrators, software developers, GIS specialists, etc – with a total of 25 persons. The course was given, and the questionnaire was prepared, by ADL specialists. The questionnaire was filled in by 18 participants, 61% coming from University or Research Centres. The questions may be grouped as follows: 1. Participants' interest in the course. 2. Evaluation of course modules: Introduction and Problem Background; Alexandria Digital Library Architecture and Technology Session; Case study and Hands-on sessions (Lab sessions) 3. Suggestions to improve the course. 4. Applicability. 5. Comments on ADL services.

The results of the questionnaires can be summarized as follows:

1. 100% respondents found the course “overall valuable”; seven respondents attended the course for the purpose of managing an institutional or personal digital object collection.
2. Interest in the course modules was given the following values: Introduction: High 88%. ADL Architecture: High 64.70%, Medium 35.29%. Lab sessions: High 42.86%, Medium 50%. The Architecture module was the only one to be considered rather difficult (High Difficulty 5.88%, Medium 70.59%, Low 23.52%) whereas the other two modules were given values of medium-low difficulty as follows: Introduction: 47%-53%. Lab sessions: 43%-57%. All the given values are presented in the tables below (percentage values):



<b>Interest:</b>	High	Medium	Low
INTRODUCTION	88.23	11.72	-
ADL ARCHITECTURE	64.70	35.29	-
CASE STUDY (Lab sessions)	42.86	50	7.14

  

<b>Difficulty</b>	High	Medium	Low
INTRODUCTION	-	47.05	52.94
ADL ARCHITECTURE	5.88	70.59	23.52
CASE STUDY (Lab sessions)	-	42.86	57.14

3. Suggestions regarding Content, Form of Exposition and Organisation were requested to improve the course. 50% of the respondents commented and gave a lot of suggestions on the content of the course; the analysis of responses regarding content let us think that probably it would have been better to split the activities in more than two days. With respect to Form of Exposition, one respondent requested more hands-on exercises whereas more detailed slides were requested by another respondent. Organization was generally considered good, but one participant suggested to split the course in two groups: «users» and «software/system experts». Details of suggestions are reported in the Appendix.
4. 72.22% considered ADL software as “potentially applicable” to their work environment, 16.66% as “applicable”, but two respondents suggested to add capabilities to manage vector data. One negative comment stated the ADL system inefficiency to meet the requirements of the collections in a Philosophy Department library.
5. 26.88% responses found «Distributed collection management» the most useful/innovative service; «Management of Heterogeneous collection» was given 24.39% hits; both «Spatial query/retrieval» and «Query retrieval of heterogeneous collections» were given 19.51% hits.

## 7. Audio/Video Digital Library Environment

The course was attended by 15 participants, mainly interested in research or reference on historical film or A/V material. The questionnaire was structured as follows: 1. Generalities; 2. Questions on the course; 3. Questions on usability.

12 participants filled in the questionnaire, even if not in all its parts.

The responses to the questionnaire can be summarized as follows:

1. 3 participants were between 20-30 years old, 6 between 31-40, 2 over 41 and one over 51. Three participants were librarians, the others were interested in research and scientific studies or in reusing historical film material to make new products.
2. The course was structured in the following modules: i) Theoretical lessons (Introduction to Audio/Video D.L.s; Automatic Indexing Techniques; Metadata Models; Metadata Editor); ii) Training on the ECHO System; iii) Training on the Metadata Editor. All modules were judged to be “highly” interesting by about 65% participants. With respect to difficulty, the sole ECHO Training was considered to be of high difficulty by 9% of participants.

A synthesis of the questionnaire responses is given in the tables below (percentage values).

<b>Interest:</b>	High	Medium	Low
THEORETICAL LESSONS	66.66	33.33	-
TRAINING - ECHO	66.66	33.33	-
TRAINING – METADATA ED.	63.63	36.36	-

<b>Difficulty:</b>	High	Medium	Low
THEORETICAL LESSONS	-	58.33	41.61
TRAINING - ECHO	-	75	25
TRAINING – METADATA ED.	9.09	90.90	-

3. 91.67% of participants considered the ECHO system a valuable support to perform their specific work. Few positive comments were made.

## 8. Lesson Learned

- **A tutorial on Digital Libraries is needed in each course**, despite its specific content. Courses are generally attended by different persons, in most cases inexperienced of conceptual and technical issues related to advanced D.L. architecture, document models and services.
- **Users strongly prefer to have courses in their native language.** This was apparent since the first call for the course on “Self-publishing”. This course, given in Italian, was attended mainly by Italian librarians due to their difficulty to attend courses given in English. However, the difficulty in understanding a language different from one’s own becomes general when it is coupled with a poor knowledge of a course technical matter.
- **Courses should be targeted to specific professional user’s categories.** This confirms our original idea that two types of courses should be given. Unfortunately the separate calls initially addressed to technicians received no more than one/two applications; it was thus decided to give a unique course for both librarians and technicians. However, since the majority of attendants in all courses was librarians, we noticed that interest progressively decreased as modules became more technical.
- **In many cases it was evidenced the need to extend the duration of the course (3 days).** More time for experimentation and training was requested in all courses where concepts and services very different from the traditional ones were presented. This didn’t happen in the course on self-publishing, probably because ETRDL services regard more “traditional” documents and functions which, in fact, were easily understood and used during the training.
- **The experimental part of the courses is considered extremely useful and it was suggested to extend it in the future.** A related issue is, however, the ratio between participants and available work stations. Experience suggests no more

than two attendants per work station.

- **On-line access to the courses (course material and prototype systems) is considered extremely helpful in order to complete the training of people that attended the course and to attract other participants.** The on-line access to the prototypes presented in the courses is important also from a “political” point of view. Most attendants are not responsible for the library they come from, and the on-line access make them capable to report on the system services they judge applicable in their work environment.

## 9. Appendix

### 9.1. Self Publishing Environment – Questionnaire Synthesis

•	<b>Tutorial</b>			
•	Degree of interest	low...	medium...	high...
•	Degree of difficulty	low...	medium...	high...
•	<b>Demo of ETRDL</b>			
•	Degree of interest	low...	medium...	high...
•	Degree of difficulty	low...	medium...	high...
•	<b>Training session</b>			
•	Degree of interest	low...	medium...	high...
•	Degree of difficulty	low...	medium...	high...
•	<b>Documentation</b>			
•	Degree of difficulty	low...	medium...	high...
•	Sufficient (?)	yes ...	not ...	
•	<b>Applicability of ETRDL in your field</b>	yes ...	not ...	

20 Participants (48.78% - mostly participants in the last two courses) answered the questionnaire giving the following values:

	High	Medium	Low
Interest	89.48%	10.52%	0
Difficulty	3.63%	52.73%	43.64%

#### *Questionnaire details [percentage values]*

<b>Interest:</b>	High	Medium	Low
TUTORIAL	94.74	5.25	0
DEMO TESTBED	89.47	10.53	0
TRAINING SESSION	84.21	15.79	0
<b>Difficulty:</b>	High	Medium	Low
TUTORIAL	5.26	57.89	36.84
DEMO TESTBED	0	66.67	33.33
TRAINING SESSION	5.55	33.33	61.11

***Documentation & Applicability***

Participants were also requested to assess:

- Quality of the released documentation
  - Applicability of ETRDL to the requirements of their library environment
- Participants' assessment of Documentation [percentage values]
- Clearness:
    - High: 23.53%
    - Medium: 58.82%
    - Low: 17.65%
  - Completeness:
    - Yes 89.47%
    - No 10.53%
  - Applicability of ETRDL to the requirements of the participants' library environment:
    - Yes: 89.47%
    - No : 10.53%

***Comments***

Very positive comments in most cases.

The two negative ones regard:

- Incompleteness and English language of documentation
- Incompleteness of information regarding installation and maintenance costs

Two participants were doubtful as to how scholars would accept e-publishing

**9.2. Open Access to DLs Environment – Questionnaire Synthesis**

Your function:		
LIBRARIAN	11	<b>68.75 %</b>
SYSTEM LIBRARIAN	2	<b>12.5 %</b>
SYSTEM MANAGER	1	<b>6.25 %</b>
STUDENT	1	<b>6.25 %</b>
PHOTO CLERK	1	<b>6.25 %</b>

Organisation, please choose one of the following:

\* 18 responses versus 16 participants

<input type="checkbox"/> University	9	<b>50%</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Research Institution	4	<b>22.22 %</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Administration	4	<b>22.22 %</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Industry	-	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	1	<b>5.55 %</b>

Could you give us an indication of how often you use online catalogues?:

daily : 15 **93.75 %**                      weekly : 1 **6.25 %**

Do you find the course valuable overall?

Yes: 16 **100 %**

Are you interested in SCHOLNET as a User or as a Digital Library Manager? \*

\* 18 responses versus 16 participants

User 7 **38.89 %**                      Digital Library Manager 11 **61.11 %**

### **Questions on the course**

1. Please assess interest and difficulty of course content by giving the course modules one of the following values: High, Medium, Low.

- Introduction to Digital Libraries
  - Interest [15 responses versus 16 participants]
    - High 11 73.33 % Medium 3 20%      Low 1 6.66 %**
  - Difficulty [13 responses versus 16 participants]
    - High -                      Medium 4 30.76 %      Low 9 69.23 %**
- Introduction to SCHOLNET
  - Interest
    - High 13 81.25 % Medium 3 18.75%      Low -**
  - Difficulty [14 responses versus 16 participants]
    - High -                      Medium 7 50%              Low 7 50%**
- SCHOLNET Demo: Users Functions
  - Interest
    - High 10 62.5 %      Medium 6 37.5%      Low -**
  - Difficulty [14 responses versus 16 participants]
    - High -      Medium 8 57.14%      Low 6 42.85%**
- SCHOLNET Demo: Administrator Functions
  - Interest [15 responses versus 16 participants]
    - High 8 53.83 %      Medium 7 46.66%      Low -**
  - Difficulty [13 responses versus 16 participants]
    - High 2 15.38%      Medium 9 69.23%      Low 2 15.38%**
- How to create a Digital Library
  - Interest [15 responses versus 16 participants]
    - High 13 86.66 %      Medium 2 13.33%      Low -**
  - Difficulty [13 responses versus 16 participants]
    - High 3 23%              Medium 4 30.76%      Low 6 46.15%**

## 2. Any suggestions to improve the course?

*[In Sections 2 and 3 participants are identified by an ordinal number in order to correlate comments with responses on applicability]*

1. (Manager of information resources - Public Administration)

The course could benefit by providing an overview of how Digital Libraries fit together with services and needs of other professionals than librarians, e.g. information officer, managers of innovation, science directors, research administrators, etc.

2. (Librarian. Reference, Doc. Delivery, Web site)

A course + 2 workshops (3 days + 3 days full immersion). Two workshops about OpenDLib: How does it work? How to set up it? In my opinion, people should operate (divided into two groups) in a realistic environment (e.g.: you are going to create a D.L. in your institution: what to do? Step by step, etc.)

3. (Librarian)

ORG: More practical experimentation

5. (Librarian)

ORG: More structured PC sessions

7. (Librarian)

FORM OF EXP: Organisational exposure of concepts is not clear enough; it is therefore difficult to understand at times. Unusual terminology.

9. (Photo clerk)

CONTENT: Check task list: Task 4: unable to follow instructions. The rest of content is very useful and well presented.

ORG: You need some more PC's for practical work!

13. (Librarian)

ORG: More assistance in the Lab.

14. (Student)

CONTENT: Although The course covers many fields of interest, technical aspects & issues are not discussed

EXP: Good / upload the material into the site

ORG: Good / separate technical from non technical (librarians) to enrich the discussions

16 (Librarian)

EXP: Too fast in some points

## 3. Do you consider SCHOLNET as applicable to your work environment?

YES **14** YES in the future **2**

- If YES, please indicate what use you anticipate

*Anticipated uses:*

- Managing and sharing unpublished and/or unfinished documents: 40%
- Creating E-learning environment: 13%
- Creating collaborative environment: 6%
- Creation of a Digital Libraries merging bibliographic records, archival descriptions and electronic documents both proprietary both free 6%
- All functionality 13%
- Organization of a thesis archive 6%
- Dissemination of educational information 13%
- Documentation and services management of a community of local public administrators 6%
- If NO, please motivate your negative answer

.....  
4. Which services do you find most useful or innovative ?

- Publishing/dissemination **31.57%** [12 hits]
- Searching **10.52%** [4 hits]
- Annotation **31.57%** [12 hits]
- Configuring ad hoc collections **21.05%** [8 hits]
- Others, **5.26%** [2 hits: participants 9 and 14]
  - [9]
    - The “open” aspect
    - Incorporation of multimedia
    - Being able to get recommendation from other communities, sharing e-learning tools and generally cooperating and networking is most advantageous
  - [14]
    - Commenter

### 9.3. Web Journal Preservation Environment – Questionnaire Synthesis

20 Participants

from Universities/Research Institutions

Questionnaire were filled in by 11 participants:

10 Librarian

1 Student

- Are you interested in LOCKSS?
  - as a Librarian .....10
  - Both as a Librarian and a System Administrator.....1.
- One objective of the course is discussing and diffusing philosophical and practical reasons for techniques and methods for: (1) building and providing access to local e-journals collections; (2) leveraging an international technical and social international preservation and archiving system.  
Do you agree with arguments discussed in the course?  
YES....10.... NO [not so much]....1  
[One comment under “YES” : “YES, absolutely; the vision underlying LOCKSS is a really refreshing "subversion" of many current dogmas, besides being an efficacious, practical model in preserving and archiving”]
- If NO [NOT SO MUCH], please motivate :  
I find the discussion very interesting but not completely convincing: I find a bit amazing (and giving up) this new Middle Age vision, not trusting in big organizations and organized cooperation: if mankind will not be able to support its own knowledge transmission, well, thereis no hope for them.  
Moreover I find some superficiality in not facing big questions such as the changes in formats, that is by now one of the worse problem in using old electronic documents. It is supposed that someone does and support the costs of it but who? the bigger problem is with documents whose producer has disappeared: who else will be in charge of the change of format? Not the LOCKSS system, I understand.

#### *Questions on the course*

1. Please assess interest and difficulty of course content by giving the course modules one of the following values: High, Medium, Low.

- **Introduction to LOCKSS Concepts**

Interest High 10: **90.90%** Medium 1: **9.09%** Low...

Difficulty High Medium. 3: **27.27%** Low 8: **72.72%**

- **LOCKSS Technical Details (Collect, Preserve, Disseminate)**

Interest High 8: **72.72%** Medium 3: **27.27%** Low...

Difficulty High 3: **27.27%** Medium 5: **45.45%** Low 3: **27.27%**

More details needed? YES 1 NO.....



**If Yes, please specify;**

Probably a practical demo on how the system actually works and is managed would have helped in understanding

- **LOCKSS Demo: Voting**

Interest High 6: **54.54%** Medium 5: **45.45 %** Low...  
 Difficulty High 2: **18.18 %** Medium 8: **72.72 %** Low 1 **9.09%**  
 More details needed? YES 2 NO.....

**If Yes, please specify:**

- I missed a practical example of an e-journal lockss-installation.
- More information is required if we wish to start working with it.
- Number of details doesn't matter: the question is that the Demo was addressed mainly to system administrators but it was not very interesting in the view of a librarian, as I am.

- **Collection Development and Management**

Interest High 6: **54.54%** Medium 5: **45.45 %** Low...  
 Difficulty High 2: **18.18 %** Medium 8: **72.72 %** Low 1: **9.09 %**  
 More details needed? YES 2 NO.....

**If Yes, please specify:**

- I missed a practical example of an e-journal lockss-installation.
- I would have appreciated a practical demo (maybe it has been given during the final hours when I was not present?)

- **Practical LOCKSS: Platform**

Interest High 5: **45.45 %** Medium 5: **45.45 %** Low 1: **9.09 %**  
 Difficulty High 1: **9.09 %** Medium 8: **72.72 %** Low 1: **9.09 %**  
 More details needed? YES 2 NO.....

**If Yes, please specify:**

- I would have preferred a shorter exposition with a lesser but more "librarian-oriented" set of details.
- Probably my personal IS abilities are not deep enough to understand all the info which I was being given.

- **Practical LOCKSS: Daemon & Content; Plug-ins**

Interest High 5: **45.45 %** Medium 5: **45.45 %** Low 1: **9.09 %**  
 Difficulty High 5: **45.45 %** Medium 6: **54.54%** Low...  
 More details needed? YES 3 NO.....

**If Yes, please specify:**

- I would have preferred a shorter exposition with a lesser but more "librarian-oriented" set of details.
- Probably my personal IS abilities are not deep enough to understand all the info which I was being given.
- More details would be required if we would decide to become a participant.

2. Any suggestions to improve the course?

Content:

- Most interesting
- Perhaps it would be better to split the matter in two courses, one addressed to system administrators, the other to librarians. Furthermore, more time should be given to publishers-related matters.
- I find some technical details too specific for librarians.

- Less technical details and more demonstration of how LOCKSS works, with hand-on.
- Personally by now I do not think I'd be able to manage by myself the entire technical stuff (installing and similar matter), I'd anyway need my IS Dep's help. So that kind of info could be either less detailed (provided that part of the job would be performed by a technician) or meant as directed to a less expert audience
- I suggest to organize two distinct courses for Librarians and for System Administrators, as the two professions are rather separate in Italy

### ***Form of exposition***

- I think that Ms. Reich did a great job in explaining the background and ideas behind LOCKSS. Mr. Rosenthal did his best to explain the technical details to us. I am afraid that he had to face the biggest difficulties, because apparently most of his audience had problems understanding some of the concepts he explained. I only wish that both Ms. Reich and Mr. Rosenthal would make their PowerPoint presentations available to us
- Please speak louder and slower: we are listening to a foreign language speech
- The technical part should take into account the fact that the audience is made for the greatest part of librarians; therefore it should be as simple as possible and it should provide no more information than required to run the system.
- Nothing to improve.
- More clarity in the presentation of overall purpose, function and future of LOCKSS system before getting bogged down in the details would be welcome.
- Both speakers were very good and friendly

### ***Organization:***

- It was great! Perhaps the program should be distributed at least a day earlier and signs should be appended on the doors on the previous evening. However, once again, thank you for organizing it and for booking the hotel!
- The course was well organised
- Nothing to improve
- Include hands-on.
- Pretty good.

## 9.4. Building a Geospatial Digital Library – Questionnaire Synthesis

Functions:	
Information engineer	3
GIS Specialist	2
Librarian/Documentalist	3
System administrator	2
Software developers	3
Researcher	2
Director	2
Network manager	1

Organisation, please choose one of the following:

<input type="checkbox"/> University	5
<input type="checkbox"/> Research Institution	6
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Administration	1
<input type="checkbox"/> Industry	2
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	4

- Could you give us an indication of the frequency of using online digital libraries?: 17 responses  
 daily : 5 = 29.41%                      weekly : 6 = 35.29%  
 monthly : 2 = 11.76%                      hardly ever : 4 = 23.52%
- Do you find the course valuable overall?  
 Yes 18 = 100%                      no.....
- Are you interested in the Alexandria Digital Library software for the purpose of managing any institutional or personal digital object collections? [*Note: The filled questionnaires have been numbered 1-18. The number that precedes any of the following responses makes reference to such a number so that any response can be considered in its context*]  
 1 - I'm interested in the technology more than in the product itself, but this is only related to my collection.  
 2 - Especially in the gazetteer to support spatially referencing species/specimen databases.  
 3 - I attended the course in order to get a first hand information about geospatial D.L.. But there was no actual project or Institution need for my participation  
 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16 – Yes  
 10 – Yes, I'm interested in the framework especially for its capability of aggregating distributed pieces of information and its support for geographically restricted queries  
 11- Yes, but only if it can manage vectorial maps  
 12 - NO

15 – In many cases it may be very useful. For specific spatial data is insufficient, especially for the metadata search

19 – Yes, I found it very interesting and I plan to contribute [?]

20 – I was wondering whether it may be of use, to us of ICE-Italian Trade Commission, to “adopt” such a geographic material-oriented software into a geographic-economical digital collection/s management tool to collect, and make available the pieces of information (virtually, millions of documents) that at the present are printed, kept for a while and then discarded (for lack of spaces, etc.).

In order to build up a rich collection of reports, newspapers, grey literature & more, in the digital format and make this Virtual Documentation Centre consultable, especially from the offices abroad and by the “twin” Public Administrations (Foreign Affairs → that might one day become another “feeder” of a single documentation centre) and research centres (especially at the EU level), the existence of a SW that supports a distributed set of collections and that allows temporal queries (based on metadata) is interesting, if it is “adoptable” to our needs and effective and easy to use.

The external users should be able to locate business opportunities and offers wherever in the world, from dedicated info points.

### *Questions on the course*

1. Please assess interest and difficulty of course content by giving the course modules one of the following values: High, Medium, Low.

- Introduction and Problem Background – 17 responses  
Interest High 15 = 88.23% Medium 2 = 11.76 Low...  
Difficulty High... Medium 8 = 47.05% Low 9 = 52.94
- Alexandria Digital Library Architecture and technology sessions – 17 responses  
Interest High 11 = 64.70% Medium 6 = 35.29% Low...  
Difficulty High 1 = 5.88% Medium 12 = 70.59% Low 4 = 23.52%
- Case study and Hands-on sessions (lab sessions) – 14 responses  
Interest High 6 = 42.86% Medium 7 = 50% Low 1 = 7.14%  
Difficulty High... Medium 6 = 42.86% Low 8 = 57.14

2. Any suggestions to improve the course?

*[Note: The filled questionnaires have been numbered 1-18. The number that precedes any of the following responses makes reference to such a number so that any response can be considered in its context]*

- **Content**
  - 1 - I will spend more time for technical aspects.
  - 2 - See organization, I did expect some handsome [?] session, deeper technical insight.
  - 4 – It might be more interactive, with test on the catalogue, and practical examples of implementation.
  - 6 – It would be better to describe and implement some real alternative case of study, instead of the geographical maps only.
  - 7 – It’s OK, but I think that speakers use more examples of searching objects.
  - 10 – I think it illustrated briefly but exhaustively the software.
  - 12 – to show a functional scheme of the system.

- 15 – Further and more in detail information on architecture.
- 16 – In the lab session it would be useful to show how to add a single item and its metadata to a collection.
- 18 – OK.

- **Form of exposition**

- 1, 18 - Ok
- 5 – I would like more hands-on exercises eg. Install.
- 12 – More detailed slides in order to follow them during the exposition.
- 15 – good.

- **Organization**

- 1 - Ok
- 2 - Split into at least two groups: users (e.g. archivists) and software/system experts
- 7 – very good
- 15 – good
- 18 – Programme, URLs to navigate in advance (always useful) and printed material (but possibly a CD) BEFORE COURSE BEGINS

3. Do you consider the Alexandria Digital Library software as applicable to your work environment?

*[Note: The filled questionnaires have been numbered 1-18. The number that precedes any of the following responses makes reference to such a number so that any response can be considered in its context]*

YES 3 = 16.66%      Potentially 13= 72.22%      NO 2 = 11.11%

- **If YES, please indicate what potential use you anticipate**

- 1 - We have daily images of Europe for the last 20 years to find and show with correlate information
- 4 – It could be used, for example, for technical reports and obviously for maps collections. Other object collections could be scientific publications, like paper, abstracts about a specific continent
- 5 – GIS & management of objects
- 6 – to extends the ancient books digital metadata catalogation
- 9 – collecting documents
- 10 – I'd like to extend the framework's capability for expressing complex queries
- 11 – Yes, but only if it can manage vectorial maps

- **If NO, please explain your negative answer and tell us if you have any suggestions on how to improve applicability of the ADL software**

3 – No, only because I'm working in a philosophy department library at the moment and this kind of issues doesn't belong to its collections! Anyhow, even when the ADL is inherent with the collection, two main problems are apparent to me: i) records duplication (redundancy won't get on well with library's searching and retrieval tools) ii) gazzetter : there would be a need to create a real authority file connecting to a unique and predefined location name the not-chosen (but existing!) ones, which means its other names in space (=/ languages) and time (ex: Costantinople/Bisantium and so on)

15 – We don't have data to share with the community. The data we use are GIS data (mainly vector), not well described by the metadata structure

- **Further comments**

1 - More examples and more practical example would be welcome.

- 2 - I will transfer your knowledge, ADL system to the ... which "sent" me here and we will evaluate your concepts/technology
- 11 – It will be very useful if it can manage vectorial data such as multi-layered maps
- 12 – to add vector data management services
- 18 – Thank you very much, it was really interesting and inspiring

4. Which services do you find most useful or innovative ? – 17 responses with multiple values

- Spatial query/retrieval 8 = 19.51%
- Collection management 4 = 9.75%
- Distributed collection management 11 = 26.88%
- Management of heterogeneous collections 10 = 24.39%
- Query/retrieval of heterogeneous collections 8 = 19.51%

5. What functionality, if any, would you like to see added to the ADL software  
*[Note: The filled questionnaires have been numbered 1-18. The number that precedes any of the following responses makes reference to such a number so that any response can be considered in its context]*

- 2 – In general it is my opinion that your technology will get a higher acceptance in Europe when integrating some Open GIS specification
- 5 – GIS type converted operations
- 8 – multilingual use interface
- 11- Support for vectorial data especially SVG and SHP formats
- 12 – GIS capabilities for spatial query
- 15 –It needs to handle more fields in metadata and search capabilities for spatial data
- 18 – Ideally, a report creating tool (meta-tagging the indexing content in order to put the various pieces of info available together , e.g.

QUERY : "PISA" + " BuildReport" command

RESULT:

- A map of the area
- Statistics (economical/demographic)
- Public administrators addresses, websites, telephone
- Latest 10 pieces of info added to the collection
- Business opportunities
- etc.

## 9.5. Audio/Video Digital Library Environment – Questionnaire Synthesis

Name:

**12 Responses**

Function: **Librarian: 2**

or

Educational grade: **University degree: 3**      **High School: 2**

No responses by the other participants

Organisation:

1. Age (please circle)

20-30 : **3=25%**      31-40 : **6=50%**      41-50 : **2=16.66%**      51-60 : **1=8.33%**

2. On average, how many hours per day do you use a computer at work?

0: **1=8.33%**    3: **2=16.66%**    4: **1=8.33%**    6: **4=33.33**    7+: **4=33.33**

3. On average, how many hours per day do you use a computer at home?

1: **4=33.33%**    2: **5=41.66%**    3: **1=8.33%**    4: **2=16.66%**

4. On average, how many hours per week do you use the internet ?

2: **2=16.66%**    3: **1=8.33%**    6: **2=16.66%**    7+ : **7=58.33%**

5. Could you give us an indication of the frequency of you using online catalogues?:

daily: **5=41.66%**      weekly: **3=25%**      monthly: **4=33.33%**

6. Could you tell us why or how you would like to use ECHO?: [16 answers]

- data entry      **4 hits**
- browsing historical film material      **5 hits**
- reference      **4 hits**
- research      **9 hits**
- scientific studying      **5 hits**
- reuse of historical film material in new products      **2 hits**
- other, namely [cataloguing; development]      **3 hits**

**Questions on the course**

- Theoretical lessons on “Introduction to Audio/Video Digital Libraries, Automatic Indexing Techniques, Metadata Models, Use of the Metadata Editor”.
 

Level of interest	Low -	Medium <b>4=33.33%</b> High <b>8=66.66%</b>
Level of difficulty	Low <b>5=41.66%</b>	Medium. <b>7=58.33%</b> High -
- Exercises on the use of the ECHO system
 

Level of interest	Low -	Medium <b>4=33.33%</b> High <b>8=66.66%</b>
Level of difficulty	Low <b>3=25%</b>	Medium <b>9=75%</b> High -
- Exercises on the use of the metadata editor [11 answers]
 

Level of interest	Low -	Medium <b>4=36.36%</b> High <b>7=63.63%</b>
Level of difficulty	Low	Medium <b>10=90.90%</b> High <b>1=9.09%</b>
- Do you think that the ECHO system (or other similar systems) is usable in the fields you are interested in?  
**YES 11=91.67% [see also \* below] NO 1=8.33%**
- If your answer is yes, please explain which use you intent to make of The ECHO system:
  - Indexing Films
  - Analytical description of A/V material in very large archives
  - Cataloguing music material (playing live music, playing specific scene, etc)
  - Indexing A/V material, especially dialogues
  - To allow a fast cataloguing of A/V material
  - A professional use
  - Advanced organization of the university library
  - Cataloguing video collections
  - Searching films archives via WEB
  - Organizing courses on e-learning
  - Scientific. I would like to open the ECHO system to A/V artistic documents
  - Scientific studying and research
- If your answer is no, please explain why
  - Probably the system is too expensive
  - It is only an experimental prototype, but parts of it are useful
- Comments and Observations
  - Everything was very well organized – Thanks
  - Very interesting course, despite its application difficulty. I hope the system can be utilized and integrated with functions specific to the various research areas
  - I have learned a lot from the theoretic part. There exist high standardisation problems.