

2012

COPPUL DIGITIZATION INITIATIVES AND PRACTICES: Summary of Survey Results

Rhys M.G. Stevens, M.L.I.S.
Librarian, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada

REPORT PREPARED IN COLLABORATION WITH THE
DIGITAL CURATION GROUP - COUNCIL OF PRAIRIE AND
PACIFIC UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES (COPPUL)

March, 2012



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
COPPUL UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES PARTICIPATING IN SURVEY	4
QUESTIONS – SECTIONS 1-9	5
1. COMPLETED & IN-PROGRESS PROJECTS @ COPPUL LIBRARIES	6
1.1 Currently involved in the development of collections of digitized materials?	6
1.2 What is the main web address (URL) for collections of digitized materials?	6
1.3 How many digitized projects are complete and publicly available?	6
1.4 Are there digitized projects currently in progress but not yet available?	8
1.5 Are statistics being collected to determine usage of your digitization projects?	8
1.6 Based on access statistics, what are the most highly accessed collections?	8
1.7 Materials digitized include those from the following categories	10
1.8 Is there a mechanism in place to obtain user feedback?	11
2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT @ COPPUL LIBRARIES	12
2.1 Has an in-house guide been created for digitization processes?	12
2.2 Are in-house staff resources dedicated to digitization?	12
2.3 Digitization equipment purchased include those from the following categories	13
2.4 Is specific digitization-related work outsourced to digitization vendors?	14
2.5 What digital library software tools being used to host collections?	14
2.6 Does your organization have an Institutional Repository (IR)?	15
2.7 Does your IR also host digitized materials?	15
3. FUNDING @ COPPUL LIBRARIES	16
3.1 How have digitization projects been funded?	16
3.2 Have funds been received to support students involved in digitization projects?	17
3.3 If additional funds were received what activities might be initiated?	17
4. SELECTION OF MATERIALS @ COPPUL LIBRARIES	19
4.1 How are materials identified and selected for digitization?	19
4.2 Partnerships with the following types of organizations	21
4.3 Facilitate arrangements for students or faculty seeking to digitize material?	22

4.4 Are you aware of groups involved in their own separate digitization initiatives?	22
5. LEGAL ISSUES @ COPPUL LIBRARIES	23
5.1 Involve a copyright officer for materials selected for digitization?	23
5.2 Had to obtain permissions from rights holders prior to digitization?	23
5.3 How does your Library / Archive keep track of permissions?	24
6. METADATA CREATION @ COPPUL LIBRARIES	26
6.1 What metadata standards are used to describe locally-digitized objects?	26
6.2 Which staff units are responsible for the creation of metadata?	27
6.3 Has georeferencing been used to identify locations?	28
7. INTEROPERABILITY @ COPPUL LIBRARIES	29
7.1 Which online tools can be used to discover your digitized materials?	29
7.2 Affiliations with organizations related to digitization?	30
8. PRESERVATION ISSUES @ COPPUL LIBRARIES	31
8.1 Strategies to ensure the preservation of locally-digitized resources?	31
8.2 Campus-wide digital preservation strategy or set of guidelines?	31
8.3 Affiliated with a "Preservation Network"?	31
8.4 Preserve "born digital" materials?	32
8.5 Aware of other departments that preserve digitization-related content?	32
9. COMMENTS FROM COPPUL LIBRARIES	33
CONTACTS FOR DIGITIZATION @ COPPUL LIBRARIES	35

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An email invitation to participate in The Survey of Digitization Initiatives and Practices @ COPPUL Libraries was distributed to COPPUL Library Directors in October 2011. Directors were asked to forward the survey invitation to individuals with digitization-related responsibilities at their institutions. Survey responses from 14 individuals representing COPPUL libraries were received between October-November 2011.

The purpose of the survey was to:

- Identify COPPUL libraries involved in digitization-related initiatives;
- Create an inventory of digitization projects @ COPPUL libraries (including archives);
- Establish an up-to-date listing of digitization-related contacts at COPPUL libraries;
- Collect general information about the digitization-related management and operational processes at COPPUL libraries.

The survey contained a total of 47 questions and it was estimated to have taken respondents approximately 20 minutes to complete assuming some information had been previously compiled.

The survey itself was developed to be completed online using the LimeSurvey tool¹. A “printable version”² of the survey was available for participants preferring to prepare information prior to initiating the online form.

Completed & In-Progress Projects @ COPPUL Libraries

- All survey participants (14/14) were involved in the development of collections of digitized materials. In total, there were 297 complete and 74 in-progress digitized projects across institutions. Commonly types of materials digitized were archival content, theses/dissertations, books, journals/magazines, newspapers, and photographs. A majority of institutions (12/14) had developed a digitized collections “home page” and most (10/14) collected statistics to determine usage. Fewer (7/14) provided a mechanism to obtain user feedback. Based on responses from 10/14 participants, highly accessed collections generally included significant local historical content.

Project Management @ COPPUL Libraries

¹ <http://www.uleth.ca/lib/surveys/index.php?sid=89561&lang=en>

² http://people.uleth.ca/~rhys.stevens/Survey_Digitization_Oct_2011.pdf

- Slightly more than half of respondents (8/14) reported that an in-house digitization guide had been created. Most (12/14) indicated that they had in-house staff resources dedicated to digitization (ranging from 0.25 FTE to 6 FTE) although specialized work was often outsourced to vendors (13/14). Equipment commonly purchased for digitization-specific purposes were flatbed scanners (13/14), SLR digital cameras (9/14), and lighting kits (8/14). Digital library software tools used to host collections were often DSpace (10/14), CONTENTdm (8/14), and locally-developed solutions (5/14). Nearly all respondents (12/14) reported having an Institutional Repository (IR) which often hosted digitized materials (10/14).

Funding @ COPPUL Libraries

- Respondents reported that sources of digitization project funding were most frequently national grants (12/14), internal collections budgets (12/14), and faculty/research grants (10/14). Many institutions (12/14) used a portion of these funds to support students involved in projects. 11/14 survey participants responded to the question regarding the future allocation of additional digitization funds. They anticipated funds would be used to further existing projects (4/11) and develop specific special collections (3/11).

Selection @ COPPUL Libraries

- 14/14 survey participants responded to a question regarding selection of materials. They indicated that selection decisions were determined by library/committee recommendation (6/14), availability of grant funding/partnerships (5/14), and faculty suggestions (4/14). Participants also reported that digitization partnerships had been formed with public libraries (9/14), government libraries (9/14), and historical societies (8/14). Most respondents (10/14) indicated that they facilitated arrangement for students or faculty seeking to digitize materials. Less than half (6/14) were aware of separate digitization initiatives at their institutions led by “non-library / non-archives” groups.

Legal Issues @ COPPUL Libraries

- Half (7/14) of respondents involved a copyright officer to assist with determination of copyright status for materials selected for digitization. Most (12/14) had had to obtain permissions from rights holders and half of those (6/12) reported obtaining a signed contract. Specific methods used to contact participants were via letter, email and telephone. Of the 13/14 respondents answering this question, most used paper files (10), databases (3), and electronic files (3) to track copyright permissions.

Metadata Creation @ COPPUL Libraries

- The metadata standard most frequently used by respondents to describe locally-digitized objects was Dublin Core (11/14). The staff units responsible for the creation of metadata records were commonly technical services/cataloguing (11/14), archives (5/14), and digital initiatives-related (5/14). Many respondents (8/14) had used georeferencing in the metadata for objects.

Interoperability @ COPPUL Libraries

- All respondents (14/14) reported that one or more online tools could be used to discover locally-digitized materials. Most common amongst these tools were the local OPAC (11/14), Canadiana.org (9/14), and a provincial digital portal (7/14). More than half (8/14) of respondents reported digitization affiliations with provincial, national or international groups.

Preservation Issues @ COPPUL Libraries

- More than half (8/14) of respondents reported that specific steps or strategies had been developed to ensure the preservation of locally-digitized resources. The same proportion (8/14) was affiliated with a “Preservation Network”. Most respondents (9/14) reported that their organization preserved “born digital” materials but none (0/14) indicated that their organization had a comprehensive, campus-wide digital preservation strategy or guidelines. About half of respondents (7/13) were aware of other departments within their organization that preserved their own digital content.

Comments From COPPUL Libraries

- Half of survey participants (7/14) provided additional comments. Comment themes identified by more than one participant included: plan to improve the resource discover layer (3); developing a digital preservation plan/strategy (2), and; differentiating between types of content included in different local repositories (2).

Thanks to members of the COPPUL Digital Curation group for their comments on the survey in development; COPPUL Director Gwen Bird for distributing the survey announcement; Jake Cameron for setting up LimeSurvey³; and participant libraries. **For additional details, contact Rhys Stevens (rhys.stevens@uleth.ca).**

³ <http://www.limesurvey.org/>

COPPUL UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES PARTICIPATING IN SURVEY

As of October 2011, COPPUL was comprised of 22 degree-granting institutions in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. AUCC (Association of Universities & Colleges of Canada) status is a criterion for membership⁴.

A total of 14 survey responses were received from the 22 eligible COPPUL members.

University Library	Province	FTE Students
University of Manitoba	Manitoba	27,613
Brandon University [John E. Robbins Library]	Manitoba	2,460
University of Regina [Dr. John Archer Library]	Saskatchewan	10,014
University of Calgary [Libraries and Cultural Resources]	Alberta	26,025
Vancouver Island University Libraries	British Columbia	6,672
University of Saskatchewan	Saskatchewan	16,243
University of Victoria Libraries	British Columbia	16,528
University of Northern British Columbia [Northern BC Archives & Special Collections, Geoffrey R. Weller Library]	British Columbia	3,431
University of Alberta Libraries	Alberta	33,886
Simon Fraser University Library	British Columbia	20,203
University of Winnipeg	Manitoba	6,922
University of British Columbia	British Columbia	41,990
Athabasca University	Alberta	7,701
University of Lethbridge	Alberta	6,911

⁴ <http://www.coppul.ca/about.html>

QUESTIONS – SECTIONS 1-9

1. COMPLETED & IN-PROGRESS PROJECTS @ COPPUL LIBRARIES

1.1 Currently involved in the development and/or support of collections of digitized materials?

14/14 participants answering this question indicated that their institutions were involved in the development and/or support of collections of digitized materials.

As of October, 2011 there were 22 COPPUL member institutions. A total of 14 survey responses were received from the 22 eligible COPPUL members.

- **Yes = 14**
- **No = 0**

1.2 What is the main web address (URL) for collections of digitized materials?

12/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that their organizations had a main web address (i.e., “home page”) for collections of digitized materials.

- **No main web address [Brandon]**
- <http://umanitoba.ca/libraries/> [Manitoba]
- **N/A [Regina]**
- <http://www.ucalgary.ca/digitalinitiatives/browse> [Calgary]
- <http://viuspace.viu.ca/> [Vancouver Island]
- <http://library.usask.ca/spcoll/Digital-Projects.php> [Saskatchewan]
- <http://library.uvic.ca/dig/UVicDigitalCollectionsIndex.html> [Victoria]
- <http://nbca.unbc.ca/> [Northern British Columbia]
- <http://library.ualberta.ca/digitization/> [Alberta]
- <http://content.lib.sfu.ca> [Simon Fraser]
- <http://archives.uwinnipeg.ca/> [Winnipeg]
- <http://digitalcollections.library.ubc.ca/index.php> [British Columbia]
- <http://digiport.athabascau.ca> [Athabasca]
- <http://digitallibrary.uleth.ca/cdm/> [Lethbridge]

1.3 How many digitized projects (i.e., separate collections) are complete and publicly available?

12/14 survey participants answering this question provided a figure for their completed and publicly available digitized projects. Figures reported by individual institutions for available projects ranged from 2 to 100.

There were a combined total of 297 complete and publicly available digitized projects reported across COPPUL member institutions. This total slightly under represents the actual number of complete and public available projects within COPPUL member institutions (several respondents indicated that their totals included only specific project types, e.g., CONTENTdm).

- **N/A [Brandon]**
- **10⁵ [Manitoba]**
- **4 [Regina]**
- **36 [Calgary]**
- **2 [Vancouver Island]**
- **Not indicated⁶ [Saskatchewan]**
- **40 [Victoria]**
- **24 [Northern British Columbia]**
- **13 [Alberta]**
- **100 [Simon Fraser]**
- **4 [Winnipeg]**
- **30⁷ [British Columbia]**
- **18 [Athabasca]**
- **16 [Lethbridge]**

⁵ Manitoba indicated that selections from physical collections are being digitized (not entire contents).

⁶ Saskatchewan indicated that Library and Archives collections created separately and a combined figure was unavailable.

⁷ UBC indicated that this figure only includes CONTENTdm collections.

1.4 Are there digitized projects (i.e., separate collections) currently in progress but not yet available?

14/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that they have digitized projects currently in progress but not yet available. Figures reported by individual institutions for in progress projects ranged from 2 to 15.

There were a combined total of 74 in progress digitized projects reported across COPPUL member institutions.

- **Yes = 14**
- **No = 0**

1.5 Are statistics being collected to determine usage of your digitization projects?

10/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that statistics are being collected to determine usage of their digitized projects.

- **Yes = 10**
- **No = 4**

1.6 Based on access statistics, what are the most highly accessed digitized collections?

10/14 survey participants answering this question provided information about their most highly accessed digitized collections.

Virtually all institutions reported that highly accessed collections included significant localized historical content (e.g., newspapers, institutional history, area images, etc.). Other types of highly accessed collections included ETDs and specialized academic materials (often associated with well-known individuals).

- **Not all collections have usage stats, so it is difficult to provide comparative information. [Manitoba]**
- **Regina College History. [Regina]**
- **Our custom collections, Our Roots and the Alberta Heritage Digitization Project. [Calgary]**
- **Gordon Edmondson Sturgeon Collection. [Vancouver Island]**
- **Pitirim Sorokin Collection; A. W. Purdy Digital Archive; Postcard Collection; Electronic Theses & Dissertations; no data on Archives digitization projects. [Saskatchewan]**
- **The British Colonist; The Colonial Despatches; Institutional Repository; UVic Journals; The Governor's Letters; The Anarchist Archives; Gisele Freund photographs of James Joyce. [Victoria]**
- **Two collections from Peel's Prairie Provinces are accessed the most: Western Canadian Newspapers and Henderson's Directories. [Alberta]**
- **Art images; Bill Reid Centre Collection; BC Multicultural Photograph Collection at the Vancouver Public Library. [Simon Fraser]**
- **Local history collections, collections that support curriculum. [Athabasca]**
- **Southern Alberta Newspapers; University of Lethbridge Institutional Repository; Blackfoot Digital Library. [Lethbridge]**

1.7 Materials digitized include those from the following categories:

	Books	Journals / Magazines	Government Documents	Newspapers	Theses / Dissertations	Music Recordings	Radio Recordings	Film / Video / TV Recordings	Maps	Documentary Art / Photography / Portraiture	Archival	Natural History	Other
Manitoba	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*	*	A
Brandon	*	*		*							*		B
Regina		*			*					*	*		
Calgary	*	*	*	*	*				*	*	*		
Vancouver Island	*				*					*			C
Saskatchewan	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
Victoria	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	*		
UNBC											*		
Alberta	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
Simon Fraser	*	*	*	*	*			*		*	*		
Winnipeg		*		*	*						*		D
British Columbia	*		*	*	*	*			*	*	*		
Athabasca	*	*	*	*	*			*		*	*	*	
Lethbridge	*	*	*	*	*				*	*	*	*	
TOTAL	11	11	9	11	12	3	4	6	7	11	13	3	
Other Indicated Content Types: A) University of Manitoba: Winnipeg building information; B) Brandon University: Student yearbooks; C) Vancouver Island University: Oral histories; D) University of Winnipeg: Oral history audio recordings.													

Of the 14 survey participants answering this question, materials digitized included: Books (11/14); Journals / Magazines (11/14); Government Documents (9/14); Newspapers (11/14), Theses / Dissertations (12/14); Music Recordings (3/14); Radio Recordings (4/14); Film / Video / TV Recordings (6/14); Maps (7/14); Documentary Art / Photography / Portraiture (11/14); Archival (13/14); Natural History (3/14).

1.8 Is there a mechanism in place to obtain user feedback on the digitized collections you have made available?

7/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that there was a mechanism in place to obtain user feedback on their digitized collections.

- **Yes = 7**
- **No = 7**

2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT @ COPPUL LIBRARIES

2.1 Has an in-house guide (e.g., flow-charts, instructions, etc.) been created for digitization processes?

8/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that an in-house guide was created for digitization processes.

- **Yes = 8**
- **No = 6**

2.2 Are in-house staff resources dedicated to digitization?

12/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that there was in-house staff resources dedicated to digitization.

Of those participants indicating staff resources, there was a range between 0.25 FTE and 6 FTE.

- **Yes = 12 (~5 FTE; 1.5 FTE; 4.0 FTE; 0.25 FTE; Technically 1 FTE librarian; numerous other employees that have significant component of digitization in their assignments; 5-6 FTE; 2 FTE; 1.5 FTE; 5FTE; 1.5FTE; ~1.5 FTE across numerous individuals).**
- **No = 2**

2.3 Digitization equipment purchased include those from the following categories:

	Flatbed Scanner	Oversize Scanner	Book Scanner	Microfilm Scanner	SLR Digital Camera	Lighting Kit	Copy Table	A-V Digitizing Equipment	Other
Manitoba	*	*		*	*	*			
Brandon	*								
Regina	*				*	*	*	*	
Calgary	*	*		*	*				
Vancouver Island		*			*			*	
Saskatchewan	*		*		*	*	*	*	High Speed Scanner
Victoria	*	*	*		*	*	*		
UNBC	*			*		*			
Alberta	*		*			*			Microfiche Scanner
Simon Fraser	*		*	*				*	
Winnipeg	*	*		*					
British Columbia	*	*	*		*	*	*		
Athabasca	*		*		*			*	Ortery scanner
Lethbridge	*				*	*	*		
TOTAL	13	6	6	5	9	8	5	6	

Of the 14 survey participants answering this question, digitization equipment purchased included: Flatbed Scanner (13/14); Oversize Scanner (6/14); Book Scanner (6/14); Microfilm Scanner (5/14), SLR Digital Camera (9/14); Lighting Kit (8/14); Copy Table (5/14); A-V Digitizing Equipment (6/14).

2.4 Is specific digitization-related work outsourced to digitization vendors?

13/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that specific digitization-related work outsourced to digitization vendors.

- **Yes = 13**
- **No = 1**

2.5 What digital library software tools being used to host locally developed digitized collections?

	CONTENTdm	DSpace	Greenstone	Custom Open Source	3 rd Party Hosting	Locally Developed Solution	Other
Manitoba		*		*	*	*	Luna
Brandon							DBTextworks
Regina	*	*		*		*	
Calgary	*	*			*	*	
Vancouver Island		*					
Saskatchewan	*	*		*		*	
Victoria	*	*					
UNBC							ICA-AtoM
Alberta						*	Fedora
Simon Fraser	*			*			Drupal
Winnipeg		*					
British Columbia	*	*					
Athabasca	*	*					
Lethbridge	*	*			*		
TOTAL	8	10	0	4	3	5	

Of the 14 survey participants answering this question, digital library software tools being used to host locally developed digitized collections included: CONTENTdm (8/14); DSpace (10/14); Greenstone (0/14); Custom Open Source (4/14), 3rd Party Hosting (3/14); Locally Developed Solution (5/14).

2.6 Does your organization have an Institutional Repository (IR)?

12/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that their organizations have an Institutional Repository (IR).

- **Yes = 12**
- **No = 2**

2.7 Does your IR also host digitized materials?

10/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that their Institutional Repository (IR) hosted digitized materials.

- **Yes = 10**
- **No = 4**

3. FUNDING @ COPPUL LIBRARIES

3.1 How have digitization projects been funded?

	Internal Collections Budget	Other Internal Budget Funds	Provincial Grants	National Grants	Donations	Faculty Grants / Research Grants	Other Sources	Has Funding Supported Students?
Manitoba	*	*	*	*	*	*		*
Brandon	*	*		*		*		*
Regina	*	*	*	*				*
Calgary	*		*	*		*		*
Vancouver Island							A	
Saskatchewan	*	*	*	*	*	*		*
Victoria	*	*		*	*	*		*
UNBC		*	*	*	*			*
Alberta	*	*	*	*	*	*		*
Simon Fraser	*		*	*		*		*
Winnipeg	*	*		*		*		*
British Columbia	*	*		*		*		*
Athabasca	*		*	*		*		
Lethbridge	*		*					*
TOTAL	12	9	9	12	5	10		12
Other Sources of Funding: A) Vancouver Island University: Surplus Carryforward								

Of the 14 survey participants answering this question, digitization projects been funded in the following ways: Internal Collections Budget (12/14); Other Internal Budget Funds (9/14); Provincial Grants (9/14); National Grants (12/14), Donations (5/14); Faculty Grants / Research Grants (10/14).

3.2 Have funds been received to support students involved in digitization projects?

12/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that funds been received to support students involved in digitization projects.

- **Yes = 12**
- **No = 2**

3.3 If additional funds were received in the digitization budget, what digitization-related activities might be initiated?

11/14 survey participants answering this question provided a response regarding digitization-related activities that might be initiated if additional funds were received in the digitization budget.

Specific activities identified by more than one participant included: Increased Focus on Current Projects (4); Special Collections (3); Preservation (2); Historical Newspapers (2); Theses (2); Rare Books (2).

- **Other historical newspapers, especially completing the digitization of the [local city newspaper], the [local student newspaper], selected rare books, University records in particular Senate & Board of Governor's minutes.**
- **Back-scanning of theses; Digitization and streaming of audio and video; on-demand photograph digitization and delivery/serving.**
- **Focus on digitizing unique local collections; catch-up on requests to add items to the local histories collection.**
- **More rapid completion of projects, faculty research.**
- **Preservation, build/support current projects.**
- **[Local city newspaper]; [local special collections]; [local] video tapes; historic music collections; WWI and WWII military maps; [local] bibliography books; [local] early maps; [local] early postcards; [university] theses pre-2003.**

- **Digitization of materials that fall outside of traditional grant parameters, such as digitization for preservation of content.**
- **Everything and anything – the demand is very high for digital initiatives.**
- **More content from our Special Collections would be digitized.**
- **General/rudimentary scanning and metadata creation/construction and metadata review/editing.**
- **Further development of current collections and other collections relating to [local region].**

4. SELECTION OF MATERIALS @ COPPUL LIBRARIES

4.1 How are materials identified and selected for digitization at your Library / Archive?

13/14 survey participants answering this question provided a response regarding how materials are identified and selected for digitization.

Specific responses identified by more than one participant included: library/committee recommendations (6); availability of grant funding/partnerships (5); faculty suggestions (4); no copyright issues (3); value/interest (3); thematic criteria (3); preservation (2); championed by an individual (2); supporting teaching and research (2); technically feasible (2).

- **Someone championed them.**
- **In the process of developing a policy that would cover this. Have to be technically possible & with no copyright problems; suggested by faculty for research or teaching, of local interest or value, or proposed by partners, sponsors, or funders.**
- **We identify potential materials thematically and by medium. Within these large groups, items to be digitized are, for the former, selected based on the unique or representative quality of the item, and, for the latter, on preservation criteria and age.**
- **We have worked in the past with grant-funded projects creating the priorities; however, we are moving to a more planned approach with a Digital Collections Steering Committee to help set priorities.**
- **To date these pilot projects have been selected to assess technology, workflows, rights management, faculty relationships.**
- **Signature research areas for the University; collections strengths, research needs, thematic criteria.**
- **Library identifies some areas; Faculty suggest some projects; Some are suggested by individual librarians and archivists.**
- **When budget money permits, we allocate funds according to preservation need; when seeking grants we must follow the guidelines**

to determine which fonds/collections would most likely receive funding.

- It's a combination of institutional priority and opportunity (e.g., funding from partners; collection availability; timing). Digitization is part of the collection development strategy.
- Potential value to users, copyright status.
- Strategic review and project portfolio established Spring 2011.
- Projects can be proposed by librarians and archivists, by faculty, through collaborations, as a response to grant funding, etc.
- We do not have a specific process, but do try to focus on [local area].
- At first, when funding came from [provincial] grants, a request for feedback was sent by email to local library / archive / heritage community asking for potential items of interest they'd like to see digitized. That provided a starting point for additional follow-up. More recently, efforts have been made to initiate collections that have direct relevance to teaching, research and scholarship at the [local university].

4.2 Partnerships with the following types of organizations with respect to digitization initiatives:

	Historical Societies	Museums	Public Libraries	Government Libraries	Other
Manitoba	*	*	*	*	Other archives; Association of Manitoba Archives; Other COPPUL Libraries
Brandon					
Regina	*			*	
Calgary	*	*			
Vancouver Island					
Saskatchewan	*	*	*	*	Provincial archives; Special libraries
Victoria			*	*	Humanities computing
UNBC		*	*	*	University Libraries
Alberta	*	*	*	*	Provincial archives; LAC; Canadiana.org
Simon Fraser			*		
Winnipeg				*	Consortium/Associations; Academic Libraries
British Columbia	*	*	*	*	
Athabasca	*		*		
Lethbridge	*	*	*	*	Other University Libraries
TOTAL	8	7	9	9	

Of the 14 survey participants answering this question, digitization partnerships were established with the following types of organizations: Historical societies (8/14); Museums (7/14); Public Libraries (9/14); Government Libraries (9/14).

4.3 Facilitate arrangements for students or faculty seeking to digitize material for their own research purposes?

10/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that they facilitated arrangements for students or faculty seeking to digitize material for their own research purposes.

- **Yes = 10**
- **No = 4**

4.4 Are you aware of any "non-library / non-archives" groups involved in their own separate digitization initiatives at your institution?

6/14 survey participants answering this question were aware of any "non-library / non-archives" groups involved in their own separate digitization initiatives.

- **Yes = 6**
- **No = 8**

5. LEGAL ISSUES @ COPPUL LIBRARIES

5.1 Involve a copyright officer to assist with the determination of copyright for materials selected for digitization?

7/14 survey participants answering this question involved a copyright officer to assist with the determination of copyright for materials selected for digitization.

- **Yes = 7**
- **No = 7**

5.2 Had to obtain permissions from rights holders prior to digitization of in-copyright materials?

12/14 survey participants answering this question obtained permissions from rights holders prior to digitization of in-copyright materials.

Of those survey participants who had obtained permissions from rights holders, 6/12 specifically reported obtaining a contract (i.e., signed permissions form).

Specific methods of contact were indicated by several participants and included: letter (4); email (4), and; telephone (2).

- **Yes = 12**
- **No = 2**

“Yes” Response Details:

- **Via email, letter, telephone call.**
- **We research the materials and contact the rights holders by e-mail or by phone.**

- **We wrote letters or emails and requested a signed permission form to be returned.**
- **Obtain release as part of workflow.**
- **Letter writing campaign. Communications with colleges for electronic theses and dissertations. Press releases.**
- **Seeking wording and or a contract for use.**
- **We contact the donor and draw up formal contract agreement for use.**
- **Contact rights holders to secure letters of permission.**
- **Contact them to seek permission.**
- **Contacted them to ask permission.**
- **Tracked through our copyright office and another copy stored on our own server as well as a paper copy in the library.**
- **Letter and/or email request. Prefer signed permissions letter authorizing usage of materials.**

5.3 How does your Library / Archive keep track of permissions or correspondence related to copyright?

13/14 survey participants answering this question reported on methods used to keep track of permissions or correspondence related to copyright.

Specific methods used to keep track of permissions or correspondence were indicated by several participants and included: paper file (10); database (3), and; electronic file (4).

- **All material donated to the archive have the rights signed over to the archive.**
- **For private archival fonds, keep records with the project files; for [institutional repository] etds going forward, through the e-submission system, for retro digitized we are not, for research publications in**

[institutional repository], keeping paper records.

- **We track copyright in an in-house database.**
- **We have binders arranged by year; however, we are currently in the process of digitizing our permission slips.**
- **Scanned and linked.**
- **Folders.**
- **Individuals involved keep documentation.**
- **Via regular e- and paper-based filing systems.**
- **Copyright Office and a database.**
- **Printed agreements.**
- **Files signed permission forms.**
- **Tracked through our copyright office and another copy stored on our own server (as well as a paper copy in the library).**
- **Permission letters and/or correspondence on file (paper) with Library Administration office.**

6. METADATA CREATION @ COPPUL LIBRARIES

6.1 What metadata standards are used to describe locally-digitized objects?

14/14 survey participants answering this question reported on metadata standards used to describe locally-digitized objects.

Specific metadata standards by participants included: Dublin Core (11); MARC (2); Locally-developed (2); EAD (2); METS/ALTO (2); MODS (2); RAD (1); Archival (1), and; ETD-MS (1).

- **Archival.**
- **Dublin Core and ETD-MS, MODS & METS in our digital asset management system, use Art & Architecture thesaurus for [local collection].**
- **DC, QDC, RAD, and a locally developed schema.**
- **Modified Dublin Core.**
- **DC extended.**
- **Dublin Core, modified DC, EAD, MARC.**
- **Modified Dublin Core.**
- **Did use Dublin Core now reliant upon metadata created by our database.**
- **MARC; METS/ALTO; MODS, EAD; Dublin Core (simple and qualified).**
- **Whatever works best for the material and principle users.**
- **None currently.**
- **Dublin Core.**
- **Dublin Core.**

- **Based on Modified Dublin Core.**

6.2 Which staff units are responsible for the development and creation of metadata records for digitized materials?

14/14 survey participants answering this question reported on which staff units are responsible for the development and creation of metadata records.

Specific staff units responsible include: Technical Services/Cataloguing (11); Archives (5), and; Digital Initiatives-Related (5).

- **Archives.**
- **Technical Services and Archives & Special Collections.**
- **Archives & Special Collections; and Technical Services.**
- **Metadata Services in Collections Services.**
- **Tech services.**
- **Description and Discovery (technical services); Special Resources Portfolio; Client Services.**
- **Libraries Cataloguing Unit.**
- **see above [Archives].**
- **Metadata and cataloguing staff; non-academic support staff; Young Canada Works students.**
- **Systems, Cataloguing, end users (contributors of material).**
- **Archives; Cataloguing/Metadata; Scholarly Communication.**
- **Digital Initiatives with support from Technical Services.**
- **Currently position is unfilled and frozen [Digital Initiatives].**

- **Library cataloguing staff in consultation with members of the Digitization team.**

6.3 Has georeferencing in the metadata for digitized objects (e.g., maps) been used to identify locations?

8/14 survey participants answering this question used georeferencing in the metadata for digitized objects.

- **Yes = 8**
- **No = 6**

7. INTEROPERABILITY @ COPPUL LIBRARIES

7.1 Which online tools can be used to discover your digitized materials?

	OPAC	Canadiana.org	WorldCat.org	Amicus	Provincial Portal	HathiTrust.org	Other
Manitoba	*	*					
Brandon	*						
Regina	*		*	*	*		Various repository search engines
Calgary	*	*	*				
Vancouver Island	*						Summon, Google, Google Scholar
Saskatchewan	*	*	*	*	*		
Victoria	*	*	*		*		
UNBC	*	*			*		
Alberta	*	*	*		*		Internet Archive; Open Library
Simon Fraser	*	*					
Winnipeg		*					
British Columbia		*			*		
Athabasca				*			
Lethbridge	*		*		*		
TOTAL	11	9	6	3	7	0	

Of the 14 survey participants answering this question, tools used to discover digitized materials: OPAC (11/14); Canadiana.org (9/14); WorldCat.org (6/14); Amicus (3/14); Provincial Portal (7/14), and; HathiTrust.org (0/14).

7.2 Affiliations with provincial, national or international organizations related to digitization?

8/14 survey participants answering this question reported affiliations with provincial, national or international organizations related to digitization.

Specific affiliations reported by more than one participant include: B.C. Digitization Coalition/West Beyond the West (4); Canadiana.org (2), and; LAC (2).

- **Duraspace, NDLTD.**
- **Saskatchewan Digital Alliance; University of Saskatchewan; Library & Archives Canada (various units).**
- **WorldCat, OCLC Collection of Collections, canadiana.org, formerly LHCADL.**
- **B.C. Digitization Coalition.**
- **BC Bibliography Project; BC Digitization Coalition.**
- **Canadiana.org; CRKN; LAC; Open Content Alliance; Internet Archive; OCLC.**
- **Canadiana.org, BC Digitization Coalition.**
- **West beyond the West.**

8. PRESERVATION ISSUES @ COPPUL LIBRARIES

8.1 Developed specific steps or strategies to ensure the preservation of your locally-digitized resources?

8/13 survey participants answering this question developed specific steps or strategies to ensure the preservation of locally-digitized resources.

- **Yes = 8**
- **No = 5**

8.2 Does your organization have a comprehensive, campus-wide digital preservation strategy or set of guidelines?

0/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that their organization had a comprehensive campus-wide digital preservation strategy or set of guidelines.

- **Yes = 0**
- **No = 14**

8.3 Is your organization affiliated with a “Preservation Network” (e.g., LOCKSS) to provide mutual redundancy, interoperability, standards and perpetual preservation?

8/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that their organization affiliated with a “Preservation Network” (e.g., LOCKSS) to provide mutual redundancy, interoperability, standards and perpetual preservation.

- **Yes = 8**
- **No = 6**

8.4 Preserve "born digital" materials?

9/14 survey participants answering this question indicated that their organization preserved "born digital" materials.

- **Yes = 9**
- **No = 5**

8.5 Aware of other departments within your organization that preserve their own digitization-related content?

7/13 survey participants answering this question are aware of other departments within their organization that preserve their own digitization-related content.

Specific digitization-related content reported included: photographs (2); documents (2); data files (2); video (1); web sites (1), and; books (1).

- **Yes = 7**
- **No = 5**

"Yes" Response Details:

- **Documents, video.**
- **Data files.**
- **Websites, data, books.**
- **Photographs.**
- **It is definitely happening, but we only have information about what's been preserved by Library services.**
- **Archives.**
- **Institutional records.**
- **Recent campus publications; campus photographs.**

9. COMMENTS FROM COPPUL LIBRARIES

7/14 survey participants answering this question provided additional comments.

Specific comment themes included: plan to improve the resource discovery layer (3); goal of developing a digital preservation plan/strategy (2); differentiating between types of content included in different local repositories (2), obtaining and making available digital content from other campus units (1); funding challenges (1), and; expectation that growth of digitized content will continue (1).

- ***One of our archivists is presently on leave developing a preservation plan and studying TDRs. We moving our digital materials to our Digital Asset Management (DAM) which is using the Islandora model. It will hold digital materials from other units on campus. We are moving the descriptions of our fonds to AtoM, an international standard descriptive system. Note: in terms of answering the question about which collections are complete, most of the digital collections do not hold all of the materials from a collection, nor is it desirable that they do.***
- ***Discovery in our catalogue is at the collection level. Digital materials can also be found at the image/page level in our Summon catalogue. Digitization standards, etc. can be found at [on our website].***
- ***We have not provided all the information because of some difficulty in compiling the information and in some cases explanation are required (see below); Ques #8 - The Archives recently came under the Library's responsibility. We are compiling their digitization work and ours. So an accurate number is not available. ; Ques #22 - We have an IR of the University's ETDs. We also have a dSpace repository of our librarians' scholarly output. There is no comprehensive University IR. Ques #31 - We have a librarian that is lead on copyright issues who is consulted where appropriate. ; Ques #38 - through our resource discovery layer, i.e., Primo.***
- ***This is a moving target and hard to track exactly so it is difficult to be definitive. I think it is essential for Canada to develop a national digitization funding agency for large projects like our [local projects]. Without a source of outside funding it is very difficult to complete projects like these of national and international importance. It would be useful if you could send us back a copy of this submission for our records.***

- *Re: #23 – IR has some of our material, but it is not an exclusive home for digitized content. ; Re: #38 – Not all digitized materials are currently in our catalogue, but we are working towards 100% coverage and improving our discovery strategies. ; Re: #42 – A comprehensive, campus-wide digital preservation strategy is high on our list, and currently a work in progress. We have strong institutional commitment to such a strategy. The [local university] has a deep commitment to both digitize and preserve outputs of our digitization services. Continued growth in this area is expected.*
- *I would be interested in hearing the responses about digital preservation.*
- *I've included titles and descriptions for our current digital collections in CONTENTdm. I haven't included new collections or digital collections in other systems, so the list is definitely not comprehensive. I also didn't include partnerships, start/end dates, # items etc as it would take too long to gather this information. Hope this is ok.*
- *A couple collections in development: [local collections].*

CONTACTS FOR DIGITIZATION @ COPPUL LIBRARIES

COPPUL University	Digitization Contact	Phone	Email
University of British Columbia	Bronwen Sprout	(604) 827-3953	bronwen.sprout@ubc.ca
Vancouver Island University	Dana McFarland	(250) 740 6332	dana.mcfarland@viu.ca
University of Victoria	Mr. Chris Petter	(250) 721-8247	cpetter@uvic.ca
U. of Northern British Columbia	Erica Hernandez-Read	(250) 960-6602	hernande@unbc.ca
Simon Fraser University	Mark Jordan	(778) 782-5753	mjordan@sfu.ca
University of Alberta	Peggy Sue Ewanyshyn	(780) 492-0243	peggysue.ewanyshyn@ualberta.ca
Athabasca University	Colin Elliott	(780) 675-6824	coline@athabascau.ca
University of Lethbridge	Rhys Stevens	(403) 329-5176	rhys.stevens@uleth.ca
University of Calgary	Mary Westell	(403) 220-3764	westell@ucalgary.ca
University of Saskatchewan	Ken Ladd	(306) 966-5946	ken.ladd@usask.ca
University of Regina	Donald Johnson	(306) 337-2584	donald.johnson@uregina.ca
University of Manitoba	Carell Jackimiek	(204) 474-6997	Carell_Jackimiek@umanitoba.ca
University of Winnipeg	Michael Hohner	(204) 786-9812	m.hohner@uwinnipeg.ca
Brandon University	Chris Hurst	(204) 727-9688	Hurst@Brandonu.ca