

LHDRP 2009-2010 Project Evaluation (2nd-3rd Quarters)

Summary

Prepared by the Califa Library Group and California Digital Library

SECTION 1: General Experience

1. What additional education or training, if any, could have been provided that would have made your project-related work more successful?

- 1) I thought that the training was good. I do wish that there was some element of "hands-on" scanning training.
- 2) A webbased follow-up (refresher) to contentDM would have been nice.
- 3) A scanning workshop to better understand the NMT process and to plan for post-grant-year work.

2. What advice would you give to others that are applying to participate in the LHDRP?

- 1) Don't try to do this in a year when you are moving your library! I misjudged how much work it would be to do the project and found myself really scrambling at times.
- 2) Use the LHDRP Handbook so you know exactly what is involved in the project. This will help in the planning.
- 3) Realize that there is help at hand - and that despite the intensity of the work and involvement required, grant staff are amazingly supportive and available for consultation.
- 4) Allow more time for it than you anticipate. It's not difficult but it is time consuming.

SECTION 2: Metadata Creation: Working with CONTENTdm

3. "The process laid out in the CONTENTdm training materials worked as described".

Strongly Agree		1	20%
Agree		3	60%
Neutral		0	0%
Disagree		1	20%
Strongly Disagree		0	0%
Total		5	100%

4. The initial installation of your CONTENTdm Project Client software:

No problems encountered		3	75%
Inadequate documentation		0	0%
Local staffing/resource issues		1	25%
Lack of expertise		0	0%
Other, please specify		1	25%

Comments

1)had some issues with installation - not sure what the problem was

5. Your use of CONTENTdm for creating digital objects:

No problems encountered		2	50%
Inadequate documentation		0	0%
Local staffing/resource issues		1	25%
Lack of expertise		1	25%
Other (please specify)		1	25%
Please indicate the nature of any problems:		2	50%

Comments

1)problems with importing metadata
2)Contentdm problems

6. Problem importing images into your CONTENTdm Project Client:



No problems encountered		4	100%
Inadequate documentation		0	0%
Local staffing/resource issues		0	0%
Lack of expertise		0	0%
Other, please specify		0	0%

7. Cataloging images in your CONTENTdm Project Client:


No problems encountered		3	75%
Inadequate documentation		0	0%
Local staffing/resource issues		0	0%
Lack of expertise		1	25%

Other, please specify		0	0%
-----------------------	--	---	----


8. Uploading objects from our CONTENTdm Project Client to the Califa server:

No problems encountered		2	67%
Inadequate documentation		0	0%
Local staffing/resource issues		0	0%
Lack of expertise		0	0%
Other, please specify		1	33%

9. Approving and indexing objects on the CONTENTdm server:

No problems encountered		4	100%
Inadequate documentation		0	0%
Local staffing/resource issues		0	0%
Lack of expertise		0	0%
Other, please specify		0	0%



10. Would you like to see anything modified with regard to how CONTENTdm was used for the project?


No		3	60%
Yes, please specify		2	40%
Total		5	100%

Comments


1) More hands on training and support on Contentdm processes

11. Estimate the average timespent by your staff creating complete metadata for an individual object (either in the CONTENTdm Project Client or on the Metadata Worksheet):

Less than 1 hour		3	60%
1-5 hours		1	20%
1 day		0	0%
1-5 days		0	0%
more than 1 week		0	0%





Other, please specify		1	20%
Total		5	100%

12. Did you already have some information about your objects (e.g., collection records or donor files, information on the objects themselves, etc.) that facilitated metadata creation?




Yes		4	100%
No		0	0%
Total		4	100%
0 Responses			

Section 3: LSTA Reporting Process

13. The instruction for the LSTA reporting forms were clear:

Strongly Agree		1	20%
Agree		2	40%
Neutral		1	20%
Disagree		1	20%
Strongly Disagree		0	0%
Other, please specify		0	0%
Total		5	100%

14. The LSTA reporting forms were easy to complete:

Strongly Agree		1	20%
Agree		3	60%
Neutral		1	20%
Disagree		0	0%
Strongly Disagree		0	0%
Other, please specify		0	0%
Total		5	100%

15. Any additional comments or suggestions?

1) Please keep this program going - it's a wonderful way to involve coworkers, volunteers, library public and larger community in a small digitization effort with great rewards.