


APPENDIX 8. RESPONSES TO SUMMIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Q1 Recommendation: Explore support for a shared digital content system in Washington and Oregon, possibly based on the Washington Rural Heritage project. The goal of a regional system would be to include content from throughout the region, working with a diverse set of institutions. Additionally, the system could be used to host digital collections that are considered to be “at risk” due to limitations at the local level, although the primary purpose of the system would be access, not preservation. Another element of such a system would be expanded training opportunities around digital content and digitization for all interested institutions.

Answered: 16 Skipped: 2




	I do not support this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I have no opinion on this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I strongly support this recommendation	Total	Weighted Average
How strongly do you support this recommendation?	6.25% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	18.75% 3	37.50% 6	37.50% 6	16	5.88

#	Comments:	Date
1	Shared digital content system would encourage consistent metadata.	6/25/2015 12:09 PM

Q2 Recommendation: Support existing collaborative programs such as Washington Heritage Online, Washington County Heritage Online, and Southern Oregon Digital Archives, as well as newspaper programs in both Washington and Oregon. Encourage these existing programs to add new members and seek funding to improve long-term sustainability of their services. As new standards and best practices for digitization, digital preservation and access, and metadata are developed, encourage existing projects to migrate their systems to keep up.

Answered: 16 Skipped: 2




	I do not support this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I have no opinion on this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I strongly support this recommendation	Total	Weighted Average
How strongly do you support this recommendation?	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	12.50% 2	18.75% 3	43.75% 7	25.00% 4	16	5.81

#	Comments:	Date
1	I support the digital newspaper programs, but the Washington County and Southern Oregon programs have a more limited scope and I don't believe they have the capacity to grow into a larger program at this time	6/18/2015 12:43 PM

Q3 Recommendation: Support the option of participation in the Orbis Cascade Alliance’s Content Creation & Dissemination (CCD) Program for OCA members. This program will continue the regional aggregation of archival finding aids through the Archives West Portal and may eventually support platforms for sharing and preserving digital content, with the possible long-term goal of contributing metadata about that content to DPLA. Support for this effort could include promotion of the CCD program in regional marketing materials and grant funding for specific CCD projects and programs that serve broader regional goals.

Answered: 17 Skipped: 1




	I do not support this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I have no opinion on this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I strongly support this recommendation	Total	Weighted Average
How strongly do you support this recommendation?	11.76%	0.00%	5.88%	29.41%	17.65%	29.41%	5.88%	17	4.53
	2	0	1	5	3	5	1		

#	Comments:	Date
1	Orbis excludes non-academic libraries from its membership and decision-making structure. This policy would exclude many important collections housed in historical societies and government archives.	6/25/2015 4:40 PM
2	In my opinion, this recommendation would leave too many small and/or rural cultural heritage organizations in OR & WA without representation. It would also place emphasis on the aggregation of archival finding aids when models like the DPLA tend to favor item-level access & description of digital collections.	6/20/2015 7:21 PM
3	My repository is not a member of Orbis and would have difficulty justifying the expense of membership	6/18/2015 12:43 PM

Q4 Recommendation: Encourage institutions in Washington and Oregon to form one or more initial collaborative project(s) focused on eventual participation in the Digital Public Library of America, perhaps through the DPLA/Stanford/DuraSpace “Hydra-in-a-Box” project. While the “Hydra-in-a-Box” software will not be ready for distribution sooner than fall 2017, a regional project could apply for LSTA, IMLS, or other funding to resolve issues of digital content and metadata aggregation, shared governance, and long-term support for infrastructure and staffing of the resulting repository system.

Answered: 15 Skipped: 3




	I do not support this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I have no opinion on this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I strongly support this recommendation	Total	Weighted Average
How strongly do you support this recommendation?	0.00% 0	6.67% 1	0.00% 0	26.67% 4	33.33% 5	6.67% 1	26.67% 4	15	5.13

#	Comments:	Date
1	Interest at my institution to participate in DPLA is lukewarm at best. The sense is that more universal searching and other infomatic developments will outpace the DPLA model.	6/25/2015 12:09 PM
2	I think this *could* potentially work, and although I am very interested to see how Hydra-In-A-Box develops, I don't think the platform software or getting content into DPLA should be the main focus or end goal of a regional project.	6/20/2015 7:21 PM

Q5 Recommendation: Develop various written materials (toolkits, outreach materials, etc.) focused on broad community participation and establish a shared email list for distribution of materials and project updates. Whenever possible, outreach materials should be submitted to existing publications, such as the Oregon Heritage Commission's Heritage Bulletins or the Northwest Archivists regional association's Easy Access newsletter. A volunteer group of editors including representatives of a variety of types and sizes of institutions should be organized to ensure that materials are jargon-free and broadly accessible.

Answered: 17 Skipped: 1




	I do not support this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I have no opinion on this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I strongly support this recommendation	Total	Weighted Average
How strongly do you support this recommendation?	0.00%	5.88%	5.88%	11.76%	23.53%	11.76%	41.18%	17	5.53
	0	1	1	2	4	2	7		

#	Comments:	Date
1	I am sure this is a more common and pesky problem for institutions and organizations that have minimal IT support. and if this recommendation helps, then we're all for it.	6/25/2015 12:09 PM
2	Best practices & instructional material should be shared freely, but without leadership or funding I don't see this option really bearing fruit.	6/20/2015 7:21 PM
3	Especially the last sentence.	6/18/2015 2:12 PM

Q6 Recommendation: Host a summit of funding agencies to work toward adoption of shared standards for digitization and metadata. The Oregon State Library and Oregon Heritage Commission are already meeting regularly and sharing information about their funding opportunities, and these conversations can be expanded to include other regional funders.

Answered: 17 Skipped: 1




	I do not support this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I have no opinion on this recommendation	(no label)	(no label)	I strongly support this recommendation	Total	Weighted Average
How strongly do you support this recommendation?	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5.88% 1	11.76% 2	47.06% 8	35.29% 6	17	6.12

#	Comments:	Date
1	I am in favor of this, but in theory, any organization working on digital projects would already be making informed decisions about digitization and metadata standards, and long-term interoperability and accessibility.	6/20/2015 7:21 PM

Q7 I would like to comment on the following discussion topic reports:


Answered: 18 Skipped: 0



Answer Choices	Responses
Outreach & Communication	11.11% 2
Leadership & Collaboration	11.11% 2
Training Opportunities & Needs	0.00% 0
Digitization Priorities	11.11% 2
Funding Sources & Needs	11.11% 2
Infrastructure (Providing Content and Services)	0.00% 0
Standards & Best Practices	11.11% 2
I do not want to comment on any discussion table topics.	44.44% 8
Total	18

Q8 Please rank order the recommended actions in the area of outreach and communication.

Answered: 2 Skipped: 16



	1	2	3	4	Total	Score
Create a public packet to be used in outreach	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	2	3.00
Convene a social media task force	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	2	2.50
Identify opportunities for collaborative crowdsourcing	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	2	3.50
Launch an awards program	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 2	2	1.00

Q9 Please suggest ways to recruit members to an Outreach & Communications advisory group.

Answered: 2 Skipped: 16

#	Responses	Date
1	Be very clear about what the priorities are and which groups are being targeted for outreach.	6/24/2015 11:44 AM
2	post at universities, this survey	6/18/2015 5:40 PM


Q10 Please provide any additional comments or feedback about the Outreach & Communications discussion.


Answered: 1 Skipped: 17

#	Responses	Date
1	Some of the outreach that needs to happen will require travel to the more remote areas of Washington/Oregon. (Which is something the Wa. Rural Heritage Project did and seemed really effective for participation.)	6/24/2015 11:44 AM

Q11 For the first goal, development of one or more shared portals or platforms for digital content, please help us prioritize the scope of the portals.

Answered: 5 Skipped: 13






■ Strongly agree
 ■ Agree
 ■ Neither agree nor disagree
 ■ Disagree
■ Strongly Disagree

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
A shared portal should be developed for the Oregon and Washington region, perhaps expanding to other states if funding and interest allow, with all types and sizes of institutions encouraged to contribute.	40.00% 2	40.00% 2	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5
Separate shared portals should be developed for Oregon and Washington, with all types and sizes of institutions encouraged to contribute.	20.00% 1	40.00% 2	20.00% 1	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	5
Groups of institutions should develop their own common platforms or portals at local or statewide levels, with no requirements about size or type of participating institutions.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	40.00% 2	40.00% 2	20.00% 1	5
Funding and effort should be concentrated at the local level. Shared platforms or portals are not a state or regional priority.	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	20.00% 1	80.00% 4	5

Q12 Please prioritize the following responsibilities of a regional steering committee for digital collections.

Answered: 5 Skipped: 13



	Highly important	Important	Not needed	Total
--	------------------	-----------	------------	-------

Setting standards for metadata	60.00% 3	40.00% 2	0.00% 0	5
Setting standards for digitization	100.00% 5	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5
Developing a strategic plan for collaborative activities	100.00% 5	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5
Promoting the effort through outreach, communication, and advocacy	80.00% 4	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	5
Providing training opportunities	80.00% 4	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	5

Q13 Please suggest ways to recruit members to regional or statewide steering committees for digital content.

Answered: 3 Skipped: 15

#	Responses	Date
1	A statewide task force should be assembled by the end of 2015, to meet in early 2016. This could be coordinated by the OSL or OHS.	6/25/2015 4:43 PM
2	would it make sense to have both a WA and OR steering committee and then have them meet once or twice a year to coordinate their various projects, exchange information, etc?	6/25/2015 12:17 PM
3	Maybe reach out to the large institutions who have robust digitization programs and delegate outreach to them. They most likely know their smaller communities and might have the resources for outreach.	6/24/2015 11:47 AM


Q14 Please provide any additional comments or feedback about the Leadership & Collaboration discussion.


Answered: 2 Skipped: 16

#	Responses	Date
1	I think a strategic plan is the highest priority so that all involved know how to move forward.	6/24/2015 11:47 AM
2	I would love to see the Oregon State Library take a leadership role in either developing a statewide digital project, or in forming a collaborative effort with the Washington State Library, leveraging their Washington Rural Heritage project as a model.	6/20/2015 7:24 PM

Q15 For the following training topics, please indicate the level of training you think is most needed at your institution.

Answered: 1 Skipped: 17





- Beginner (we have not had any training on this topic)
- Intermediate (we understand the basics but need more information)
- Advanced (we need custom or specialized training in aspects of this topic)
- Expert (we could provide training to others)

■ Expert (we could provide training to others)

	Beginner (we have not had any training on this topic)	Intermediate (we understand the basics but need more information)	Advanced (we need custom or specialized training in aspects of this topic)	Expert (we could provide training to others)	Total
Digitization of documents and photographs	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0
Digitization of newspapers and books	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0
Digitization of audio and video recordings	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0
Descriptive metadata for digital objects	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0
Finding aids and metadata for collections	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	1
Preservation of digital objects	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	1
Copyright, privacy, and other legal concerns	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	1
Development of policies for digitizing and providing access to collections	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	1
Funding for digital projects, including grant writing	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0


Q16 Please provide any additional comments or feedback about the Training Opportunities & Needs discussion.

Answered: 1 Skipped: 17

#	Responses	Date
1	We are fine with digital projects, but have lacked staff and training to convert finding aids into EAD.	6/25/2015 1:39 PM

Q17 Please identify your institution's level of need with respect to the three digitization & digital conversion priorities.

Answered: 3 Skipped: 15



	We do not need assistance with this type of material	(no label)	(no label)	(no label)	We urgently need assistance with this type of material	Total	Weighted Average
Audio-visual materials	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	33.33% 1	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	3	3.00
Existing born-digital materials in obsolete formats or on unsupported platforms	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	66.67% 2	0.00% 0	3	3.33
Materials from under-represented communities, including first nation communities	0.00% 0	33.33% 1	0.00% 0	66.67% 2	0.00% 0	3	3.33

Q18 If your institution has other digitization or digital conversion needs, please list the most urgent need here.

Answered: 1 Skipped: 17

#	Responses	Date
1	We need a better platform for text-based digital objects	6/25/2015 1:37 PM


Q19 Please provide any additional comments or feedback about the Digitization Priorities discussion.

Answered: 1 Skipped: 17

#	Responses	Date
1	We would like a shared platform in the NW.	6/25/2015 1:37 PM

Q20 What is your institution's approximate total budget for digitization, metadata, and digital projects, excluding staff?

Answered: 2 Skipped: 16




Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than \$5,000 per year	50.00%	1
\$5,000 - \$10,000 per year	0.00%	0
\$10,000 - \$20,000 per yer	0.00%	0
\$20,000 - \$40,000 per year	0.00%	0
More than \$40,000 per year	0.00%	0
Don't know	50.00%	1
Total		2

#	Other (please specify)	Date
	There are no responses.	

Q21 How many staff members or volunteers currently work on digitization and digital projects at your institution? Please report your answer in terms of full-time equivalents (FTEs).

Answered: 2 Skipped: 16




Answer Choices	Responses
Less than 1 FTE	50.00% 1
1-2 FTE	0.00% 0
2-5 FTE	50.00% 1
Greater than 5 FTE	0.00% 0
Don't know	0.00% 0
Total	2

#	Other (please specify)	Date
	There are no responses.	

Q22 What are the current sources of funding for digitization and digital projects at your institution? Mark all that apply.

Answered: 1 Skipped: 17




Answer Choices	Responses	
Grant funding (federal)	100.00%	1
Grant funding (state)	0.00%	0
Grant funding (other)	0.00%	0
Endowment	0.00%	0
Institutional funding (line item)	0.00%	0
Institutional revenues from other sources	0.00%	0
Total Respondents: 1		

#	Other (please specify)	Date
1	We find \$ as needed from the library budget. We just finished a small grant.	6/25/2015 1:36 PM

Q23 What is the current primary source of funding for digitization and digital projects at your institution?

Answered: 2 Skipped: 16



Answer Choices	Responses
Grant funding (federal)	50.00% 1
Grant funding (state)	0.00% 0
Grant funding (other)	0.00% 0
Endowment	0.00% 0
Institutional funding (line item)	0.00% 0
Institutional revenues from other sources	50.00% 1
Total	2

#	Other (please specify)	Date
1	Find \$ as needed; grants when possible.	6/25/2015 1:36 PM

Q24 Please provide any additional comments or feedback about the Funding Sources & Needs discussion

Answered: 2 Skipped: 16

#	Responses	Date
1	We need funding for additional server space and staff.	6/25/2015 1:36 PM
2	great session, but more people needed to attend this one. So many of the things that people want to do require the funding to make it possible, but so, but so many people were reluctant to attend this meeting. I think that this should have been a mandatory part of the larger group discussion.	6/24/2015 5:37 PM

Q25 What system(s) does your institution currently use to present content online?

Answered: 1 Skipped: 17

#	Responses	Date
1	ContentDM, PTFS ArchivalWare	6/25/2015 1:34 PM

Q26 Do you contribute any content to a shared system or system hosted at another institution?

Answered: 1 Skipped: 17

#	Responses	Date
1	No	6/25/2015 1:34 PM

Q27 Please provide any additional comments or feedback about the Providing Content & Services discussion.

Answered: 0 Skipped: 18

#	Responses	Date
	There are no responses.	

Q28 If your institution is currently looking for a new system to manage online content, what criteria will you use to select the new system?

Answered: 0 Skipped: 18

#	Responses	Date
	There are no responses.	


Q29 If your institution has its metadata or digitization profiles available online, please share the URL(s) so that they can be included in a toolkit for use by other institutions.

Answered: 1 Skipped: 17

#	Responses	Date
1	n/a	6/25/2015 8:39 PM

Q30 Has your institution developed a crosswalk or other method to prepare its metadata for sharing with other institutions?

Answered: 2 Skipped: 16



Answer Choices	Responses
Yes	50.00% 1
No	50.00% 1
Don't know	0.00% 0
Total	2


Q31 Please provide any additional comments or feedback about the Standards & Best Practices discussion.

Answered: 0 Skipped: 18

#	Responses	Date
	There are no responses.	

Q32 I would like to comment on the following discussion topic reports:


Answered: 10 Skipped: 8



Answer Choices	Responses
Outreach & Communication	0.00% 0
Leadership & Collaboration	10.00% 1
Training Opportunities & Needs	0.00% 0
Digitization Priorities	0.00% 0
Funding Sources & Needs	0.00% 0
Infrastructure (Providing Content and Services)	10.00% 1
Standards & Best Practices	0.00% 0
I do not want to comment on any discussion table topics.	100.00% 10
Total	10

Q33 Please indicate which profession you most identify with:

Answered: 16 Skipped: 2




Answer Choices	Responses
Librarian	43.75% 7
Archivist	43.75% 7
Museum professional	12.50% 2
Total	16

#	Other (please specify)	Date
1	archaeologist	6/25/2015 8:40 PM
2	anthropologist	6/18/2015 5:47 PM

Q34 Please tell us what state you work in:

Answered: 17 Skipped: 1




Answer Choices	Responses
Oregon	76.47% 13
Washington	23.53% 4
Total	17

#	Other (please specify)	Date
	There are no responses.	

Q35 Please rate the overall value of the Summit to you on a scale of 1-5, with five being the most valuable in terms of knowledge gained, networking opportunities, or potential for further collaboration.

Answered: 17 Skipped: 1




	Not valuable at all	(no label)	Not sure	(no label)	Very valuable	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	5.88%	5.88%	11.76%	41.18%	35.29%	17	3.94
	1	1	2	7	6		

#	Other (please specify)	Date
1	I left overwhelmed. Jargon and network speak bogged down communication with those practiced in metadata. Must be made accessible to those responsible for digital archives, but not trained in the technical aspects.	6/18/2015 2:15 PM

Q36 Please rate the following options for further networking and sharing of information, with 1 being your top recommendation. Note that funding for these options has not been identified.

Answered: 17 Skipped: 1



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	Score
Email list for Summit attendees and others who may choose to join.	12.50% 2	0.00% 0	6.25% 1	18.75% 3	18.75% 3	18.75% 3	25.00% 4	16	3.13
Webpage with information about existing collaborative projects, standards and best practices, and both training and funding opportunities.	11.76% 2	5.88% 1	41.18% 7	11.76% 2	11.76% 2	11.76% 2	5.88% 1	17	4.35
Additional low or no-cost training opportunities at a variety of levels.	12.50% 2	12.50% 2	25.00% 4	18.75% 3	25.00% 4	6.25% 1	0.00% 0	16	4.50
Annual or regular meetings like the Summit to continue the conversation.	23.53% 4	41.18% 7	11.76% 2	5.88% 1	11.76% 2	5.88% 1	0.00% 0	17	5.41
Packet with outreach materials to share at my institution and with other institutions in the area.	6.67% 1	13.33% 2	0.00% 0	13.33% 2	0.00% 0	40.00% 6	26.67% 4	15	2.87
Shared digital asset management system to which my institution can contribute content.	13.33% 2	6.67% 1	6.67% 1	26.67% 4	13.33% 2	20.00% 3	13.33% 2	15	3.67
Formal organization with separate steering committee to pursue funding and provide opportunities for collaboration, including participation in DPLA.	23.53% 4	23.53% 4	11.76% 2	5.88% 1	17.65% 3	0.00% 0	17.65% 3	17	4.59

Q37 Do you have any other comments about the Summit or digital projects in Oregon and Washington?

Answered: 3 Skipped: 15

#	Responses	Date
1	There is such a great need for coordinated digital access to archival materials. The summit was a great first step and I hope that the steering committee can build on the momentum.	6/26/2015 7:12 PM
2	no	6/25/2015 8:40 PM
3	The most valuable thing to me about Summit in this initial stage was learning more about the smaller institutions, their collections, and their needs and priorities.	6/24/2015 11:49 AM