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Digital Library Task Force Report
Executive Summary

The phrase “Digital Library” can mean many things for many people. “Digital Library” seemed too limiting and could potentially imply ownership of the projects, funding, and responsibility to only one organization on campus, as opposed to being an inclusive, collaborative and cooperative venture, involving many university departments and divisions. Alternatively, “University Digital Initiatives” is a term broad enough to cover all existing digital endeavors on campus without inadvertently labeling or assigning responsibility to one or more specific university departments. The task force identified 3 separate and distinct areas of digital information collection, organization, preservation and access. These three areas are the University’s Institutional Repository, University Archives, and Library Collections. It is this third component that the task force has focused its discussion and recommendations.

The University of Richmond Libraries have made a substantial beginning on the Library Collections portion of the “University Digital Initiatives”. We have assembled external digital resources and have begun to digitize materials unique to the University of Richmond or its library collections. Increasingly, we seek to provide interconnectivity between the digital resources and to enhance public access to them. The work in digitizing the Collegian and the World War II documents will provide practical experience in working out many of the issues identified in this report, and provide practical experience with some of the software necessary to develop digital collections, and lay the groundwork for future efforts—whether in the “Institutional Repository,” “Archives” or “Library Collections.”

As the Digital Library Task Force recommends the following actions:

- A standing Review Board for Digital Library Collections be established and be the centralized application point and review process for all digital projects.

- The Review Board assumes the ongoing responsibility of evaluating and prioritizing Digital Library Collections projects according to the criteria outlined in this report. (The Review Board should also assume responsibility for changing these criteria to meet emerging conditions and technological developments.)

- The Review Board assumes the responsibility of recommending internal resources and staff for Digital Library Collections projects, and identifies external sources of funding.

- The Review Board establishes a relationship with the University’s Development Office in order to secure external sources of funding.

- The Review Board assumes the responsibility of communicating its existence and activities to the wider University of Richmond community.

- The existing Digital Library Collection projects identified in this report should be seen as already having the approval of the Review Board. Production status, spending levels and time commitments of these projects should be reported at regular intervals to the Review Board by the projects’ managers.
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Definitions

Because the phrase “Digital Library” can mean many things for many people, the first assignment for the task force was to define what it would mean for the University of Richmond Community. “Digital Library” seemed too limiting and could potentially imply ownership of the projects, funding, and responsibility to only one organization on campus, as opposed to being an inclusive, collaborative and cooperative venture, involving many university departments and divisions. Alternatively, “University Digital Initiatives” is a term broad enough to cover all existing digital endeavors on campus without inadvertently labeling or assigning responsibility to one or more specific university departments. So what would make up the University of Richmond’s Digital Initiatives? The task force has identified 3 separate and distinct areas of digital information collection, organization, preservation and access. These three areas are the University’s Institutional Repository, University Archives, and Library Collections. For the University of Richmond, the Institutional Repository would be a place for the intellectual property, produced at the university, to be stored and archived, whether it is article preprints, lab notes, datasets, student created web pages, video files, learning objects, course outlines and other “gray literature” produced during the course of scholarly teaching and research. The Archives will likely be charged with collecting, organizing, and preserving, in some form, the electronic documents and communications generated within the University, as well as be interested in digitizing items currently available only in hard copy to enhance ease of access or preservation of the originals. There will be instances when the repository and the archives will overlap. The third component of the Digital Initiatives is Library Collections. This group of digital information is defined as purchased, leased and/or locally produced databases, ejournals, electronic reserves, image collections, and digitized document collections. It is this third component that the task force has focused its discussion and recommendations.

Institutional Repository

Borrowing very liberally from Clifford Lynch’s article Institutional Repositories: Essential Infrastructure for Scholarship in the Digital Age (ARL Bimonthly Report 226 February 2003):

“A university based institutional repository is a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members. It is most essentially an organizational commitment to the stewardship of these digital materials, including long-term preservation, as well as organization and access or distribution. While operational responsibilities for these services may be situated in different organizational units at different universities, an effective Institutional Repository is a collaboration among librarians, information technologists, archives and records managers, faculty and university administrators and policy makers. A key part of the services that comprise an institutional repository is the management of technological changes and the migration of digital content from one set of technologies to the next. An institutional repository is not simply a fixed set of software and hardware.

An institutional repository will contain the intellectual works of faculty and students – both research and teaching materials – and also documentation of the activities of the institution itself.
in the form of records of events and performance and observational data captured by members of
the institution that support their scholarly activities.

At the most basic and fundamental level, an institutional repository is a recognition that the
intellectual life and scholarship of our university will increasingly be represented, documented
and shared in digital form and that a primary responsibility of our university is to exercise
stewardship – both to make them available and to preserve them.”

Why not at U or R?
At this point in time, the need and desire for a University of Richmond Institutional Repository
was determined to be low and not pressing, when compared to the creation of digital Library
Collections and the development of the University Archives. The concept is exciting, but in
reality, a sizable task in addition to getting support and commitment from administration. The
committee determined that the level of expertise and the technology (DSpace, FEDORA,
Greenstone, etc) needed to build an IR was not currently present on campus and that the effort,
training, and money expended for such a system would not justify the level and quality of
content it would receive. It was agreed that the idea of an Institutional Repository might be better
taken on as a partnership with other institutions (i.e. ACS, VFIC, etc.).  
(Since the creation of this Document, the University of Richmond has been awarded a
grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services. In the grant proposal, University of
Richmond committed to the establishment of an Institutional Repository System by December
2004, in order to host and maintain the 1.4 Terabytes of data created by this project.)

University Archives
The university archives will contribute to the comprehensive digital initiatives framework, with a
mandate for ensuring that the university’s records are gathered together and preserved (or,
alternatively, systematically destroyed on an approved schedule) regardless of format. This will
necessitate cross representation when either group is developing policy. However, it is desirable
to view the Digital Library Collections as more focused on providing content of current interest
to primary user groups (faculty and students), while the mission of the archives is to provide a
permanent collection of the institution’s history and accomplishments.

In many instances, the university archives is still administered separately from the university’s
other library collections. An example of complete separation is Duke University, where the
archives are a separate library department, housed and accessed separately from any other library
collection (http://www.lib.duke.edu/archives). Even where the archives is administered in
conjunction with other collections, as at the University of North Carolina
(http://www.lib.unc.edu/mss/uars), it is common for the archives to have a separate webpage,
information page, finding aids, etc.

The strongest intersection between the archives and the rest of the digital initiatives lies in the
concept of the institutional repository (IR). We have discussed the IR in terms of collecting
subject-area content within the university, like a digital collection, and as a way of managing the
university’s intellectual property, which seems to me to fall within the purview of the university
archives. Whether or not the archives takes a role in creating and/or structuring the IR, it will
probably fall to them eventually to make sure that the content survives.

Digital Library Collections – Today
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Collection Development: Defining Scope, Planning for Growth and Management

The University of Richmond Libraries have already begun contributing to the university’s digital initiatives by developing digital collections and digital library services and are moving forward to expand efforts in this area. University of Richmond Libraries first began developing digital collections in the 1990’s. First, the Libraries began building electronic collections by purchasing citation databases and then slowly branching out to electronic versions of traditional print reference works and collections of full text journals, poetry and books. In addition to purchasing commercially-produced resources, the libraries began to evaluate and collect freely available web sites. Access points to these open resources were initially made available through subject-specific web pages, and are now being added to the online public access catalog (OPAC). Increasingly, the Libraries seek to provide seamless access across our collections of online databases and quality web sites, as well as digitized versions of materials unique to the University of Richmond.

As of 2003, the UR Libraries have purchased subscription access to over 150 commercially produced databases that support the University’s curriculum. Special emphasis is placed on databases providing full-text access to scholarly content and primary source materials. The considerations of support for the UR curriculum, scholarly quality and full-text access remain constant and govern our long-term collection development strategy despite the changing nature of information technology and the information industry. The UR libraries seek to provide permanent access to high-quality scholarly materials in digital format for the greatest number of simultaneous users possible within the framework of software licensing agreements. When making a purchase decision, it is imperative to consider long term access, archiving issues, ability to interconnect with other electronic resources, and whether one is purchasing or leasing content.

Locating and accessing scholarly content using digital resources has become the preferred mode of research for faculty and students. Several reasons for this trend are the relative ease of access, ability to combine various activities, convenience of accessing research materials from home and number of multiple simultaneous users able to access a single document. As a result, the UR libraries have increasingly moved from print-based access to their scholarly journals and reference materials to digital access. To date we have access to over 10,000 full text journals, 150 databases, and 27,000 e-books). Electronic access enables a greater number of users to access a wider array of titles. Whenever considerations of cost, the University curriculum and long-term accessibility to materials permit, we will continue to move from primarily print-based collections, to primarily digital collections.

The development of the library web pages—especially the Research Guides by Subject/Major—also contribute to the concept of the digital library. Early in the collection of electronic resources, the libraries were sensitive to the need to provide users with a simple, easily-understood interface, with easy access to the digital materials that will be most useful for their individual needs. We continue to explore computer applications and developing technology that will enhance the digital library experience and allow users seamless, integrated access across digital collections. In 2002 the Libraries invested in the creation of a “Journal Locator” web page. This service provides information on all the periodical/journal publications available to the University community as a whole, no matter the format. Users have the ability to search for a known item, or browse through alphabetical lists. Later that same year, the Library committed
itself the OpenURL technology and the developing Endeavor product, LinkFinderPlus, an OpenURL link resolver. By making several citation databases open URL-enabled, we are able to take the user from identifying a valuable resource to linking them to the full text, whether it is available in digital format at the desk top, or traditionally in a print book or journal. Because this is a new technology with format standards to be established, it is just beginning to develop its role within the digital library. Also in 2002, the Libraries started the implementation work process for ENCompass for Resource Access (ERA). This Endeavor product performs federated searching of subscription databases and other digital collections created by the University of Richmond Libraries.

In 2003, we began applying our collection development skills to a different and exciting area, the creation of local digital collections. A digital library collection is maintained by the library, with responsibility for providing access and preservation into perpetuity resting solely with the University of Richmond Libraries. A list of current digital project is located in Appendix A and a list of technologies, hardware and software being used to develop these collections and projects are in Appendix B.

**Recommended Procedures and Policies for the Management of Digital Library Collections**

Currently there is no centralized venue for the proposal, planning, creation or presentation of digital projects or collections. This presents many challenges and sometimes duplication of effort and missed opportunities for collaboration. In an effort to streamline the process of submitting a project for consideration as a digital library collection it is recommended that this become a centralized process, involving many different stakeholders, with a standing review board committee.

**Digital Library Review Board Committee Structure**

**Mission**
The faculty, students, and staff of the University of Richmond are producing a good deal of scholarly material which may be best organized, accessed, distributed and preserved in digital format and as a component of the Library collection. Once these materials do enter the Library collection, the Library has accepted the responsibility for long-term management, including, when necessary, the migration of the material to different digital formats. The commitment of time, skills, hardware and software that is necessary for the development of these digital collections is not insignificant. Therefore, it is imperative that the Library has a review procedure for selecting the materials that will be brought into the Library’s digital collection.

The Digital Library Review Board will have the responsibility to review all potential projects using specified criteria, develop an estimated budget for the project, and provide a reasonable timeline for its completion. The Review Board will make a recommendation to the University Librarian (or the Director of the Law Library) as to whether the proposed project should be considered for inclusion in the Digital Library. When multiple projects are competing for time, the Review Board will assign a priority to the competing projects.

**Committee Members**
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The committee is composed of individuals with the expertise to appropriately evaluate the scholarly importance of the potential projects and the knowledge to assess the technical aspects of the project. The faculty representatives will provide critical oversight on the value of projects since acceptance of a project into the digital library is a long-term commitment for the Libraries. Ad hoc members may be added in order to better evaluate the subject of the digital projects and the contribution it would make to the field at large.

The Chair of the Committee will be appointed by the University Librarian and the Director of the Law Library.

The members will be:

Faculty
- Chair, University Library Committee (or their representative)
- Chair, Law Library Committee (or their representative)

University Library
- Head, Bibliographic Access Services
- Head, Cataloging
- Head, Library Systems
- Outreach & Instruction Services – 1 representative

Law Library
- Public Services – 1 representative
- Technical Services – 1 representative

Collaborators
- Visual Resource Collection Manager
- Director, Center for Teaching, Learning & Technology

**Digital Library Collection Criteria, Considerations & Workflow**

After the Review Board is established, its first priority is to develop an actual application process for projects to be considered for becoming digital library collections. The first step in this process, would be to create a web presence, explaining the Board’s function, membership, and the Digital Library Collection application process, as well as provide examples of current projects. Forms like those attached in Appendix C are recommended.

**Initial Criteria for a Digital Library Collection Project**
For a project to be considered as a Digital Library Collection, it must meet 2 initial criteria:
- A digital collection must have long-term informational value that supports the University of Richmond’s mission
- A digital collection must have unique intrinsic or added scholarly value

**Considerations**
Once it has been determined that the project meets initial criteria for a digital library collection, it should be reviewed and ranked in regards to the following considerations:
- Sustainability of digital collection
- File size, type and formats within a digital collection
- Ownership
Cost to create and maintain
Staffing
Safety of original materials during digital collection creation
Quality of original materials
Audience
MISSION of University

Considerations may change in weight and priority due to changes in the U of R mission and goals, research climate, and other outside influences. It is up to the Review Board to monitor the considerations and weight them accordingly as time proceeds and circumstances evolve.

Approval
Approved projects will be passed on to appropriate library director (Law or BML) for implementation.

Implementation
The Review Board will make recommendations for what staff and technologies should be involved as well as an estimated timeline and completion date.

Projects will be carried out by “Implementation Team” consisting of a Project Manager and other designated staff. The project manager will be responsible for keeping the project, on time, on task and on budget. Regular status reports will be made to the Review Board by the Project Manager.

Libraries will be responsible for maintenance and preservation of all projects passed to them.

Funding
Potential funding sources should be included when a project is submitted to the review board. The Review Board may suggest funding resources but should not be responsible for securing funding.

The Task Force recommends that the Review Board establish a working relationship with the University’s Development Office and Foundation, Corporate & Government Relations Office and appoint one or more liaisons to those offices. While the actual path of funding requests for digitization projects will likely hinge on the content of the projects, the timing of the requests, and many other factors that cannot now be specified, the Review Board should take the proactive steps of educating the Development and FCGR Offices on the purposes of the Digital Library, its potential for advancing both the scholarly mission of the University as well as its public profile, and information on how the Review Board processes and evaluates project proposals. The Review Board may want to suggest possible funding sources that Development and FCGR can monitor for opportunities. Finally, the Review Board may want to bring to the attention of Development and FCGR certain completed or in-progress projects that will both inform these offices about the purposes of the Digital Library program as well as offer examples of Digital Library work that can be shared with potential granting entities.

Conclusion
The University of Richmond Libraries have made a substantial beginning on the Library Collections portion of the “University Digital Initiatives” described above. We have assembled
external digital resources and have begun to digitize materials unique to the University of Richmond or its library collections. Increasingly, we seek to provide interconnectivity between the digital resources and to enhance public access to them. The work in digitizing the Collegian and the World War II documents will provide practical experience in working out many of the issues identified in this report, and provide practical experience with some of the software necessary to develop digital collections, and lay the groundwork for future efforts—whether in the “Institutional Repository,” “Archives” or “Library Collections.”

As the Digital Library Task Force concludes its study, it is recommended:

- A standing Review Board for Digital Library Collections be established and be the centralized application point and review process for all digital projects.

- The Review Board assumes the ongoing responsibility of evaluating and prioritizing Digital Library Collections projects according to the criteria outlined in this report. (The Review Board should also assume responsibility for changing these criteria to meet emerging conditions and technological developments.)

- The Review Board assumes the responsibility of recommending internal resources and staff for Digital Library Collections projects, and identifies external sources of funding.

- The Review Board establishes a relationship with the University’s Development Office in order to secure external sources of funding.

- The Review Board assumes the responsibility of communicating its existence and activities to the wider University of Richmond community.

- The existing Digital Library Collection projects identified in this report should be seen as already having the approval of the Review Board. Production status, spending levels and time commitments of these projects should be reported at regular intervals to the Review Board by the project’s managers.
Appendix A: List of Current Local Digital Projects

**Digital Library Collections:**

*The Collegian*
This project will make the entire run of the Collegian available online from 1914 to the present. Current the collegian is only available on microfilm through the Virginia Baptist Historical Society. Online access would increase the paper’s accessibility. It will be searchable, with patron being able to view the articles and advertisements.
Status: Currently in the final stages of project negotiation with Endeavor and Byte Managers.
File Formats: PDF images, TIFF files, and text files. XML encoded EAD

*World War II documents*
281 items. 11,000 pages; file formats: estimate storage size:
This collection represents various war time publications including pamphlets dealing with various topics such as life of the enlisted man and returning to civilian life, to magazines produced by various branches of the armed forces.
Status: Necessary hardware and software has been installed in BML. Scanning will begin on a production basis in September. It will take approximately 20 weeks to finish the digitization of this collection.

*WW II Maps Collection*
Set of 320 issued by the U.S. government outlining weekly troop movements during the course of WWII. Maps also include images (photos, drawings, etc) of other military activities – examples of Russian military vehicles, tanks, and so forth. The imaging of the collection can be outsourced to the Library of Virginia for the total cost of $11,143.33. This would include a full color scan@270 dpi, saved as a TIFF file, and thumbnail cover images. Files would be saved to DVDs and would approximately 360 MB each. Project would take 6 to 8 weeks to complete. These Images would be great classroom tools, especially if they were utilized in MDID.

*Shelley Bankruptcy Opinions Collection – designated as a digital library collection*
We are currently developing plans for this collection as a text. It is text only. There are 595 opinions in this collection, totaling 5,996 pages. What will take the most time will be composing the “head notes” for each opinion.

*Sutton Collection of Far East Military Tribunal Materials*
This collection includes the proceedings of the Tribunal, as well as exhibits, depositions, opinions, etc. The collection, which contains approximately 90,000 pages, will probably be delivered in both image and text formats. Some research will be necessary to prepare adequate structure and metadata for the collection

*MDID Image Collections –*
The Madison Digital Image Database is an online content delivery system. Instructors use MDID to generate online slide shows that can be used in the classroom, annotated for student review and archived for testing or future use. MDID brings the digital image library into the teaching and learning process both inside and outside of the classroom. It needs to be rolled out.
to many faculty on campus (outside of Art) to help them manage their personal collections that they use in class and to potentially allow entire departments to take advantage of everyone’s collections. Biology is ready to go – waiting for time to show them MDID. Cost is in server space and issues of cataloging of images by the faculty.

**Potential Digital Library Collections:**

*Looking at Prints*
Website and exhibition produced jointly by University Museums, the Department of Art & Art History and ATS; both components of the project are scheduled to go on view in January 2004. Using print examples from the University Museums' permanent collection and from work created by a 2003 summer fellow, the project introduces four basic printmaking methods: Intaglio, Relief Printing, Lithography and Screen Printing. The website component of this project uses text, still images and video and will be permanently accessible to the university community at large.

*GIS artifacts*
Raw datasets, massaged datasets, maps, figures, images, etc. Faculty already have materials that could be added into a single collection. ATS is starting on this using presently available servers and simple searching strategies.

*175th anniversary*
This web-based project is growing into something of its own collection. ATS is digitizing audio and video taped interviews of people of historical importance and plans to make them available off the website. ATS is also digitizing significant photos. The plans for this site are growing every day and will provide some digital access to archived materials when it is done (which is May, 2005). This project has been incorporated as part of ATS workload, with some potential for a little bit of equipment or student money periodically. The website itself may “go away” after the anniversary, but the digital collections produced could be reorganized and assigned metadata for future access.
File types: Unknown
Storage Requirements: Unknown

*Disaster database*
A large database of disasters created by Walter Green. ATS is working on increasing the variety of information that can be retrieved from the site. We adjust the database as he needs us to, but the data input is all being done by him. The lack of specific funding for the project decreases its rate of growth, but we are plugging along very admirably.
Status – Unknown

**OutsideProjects:**

*Richmond Journal of Law and Technology (JOLT) Online Journal –* Online since in April 1995. It has never been published in paper. Access points for JOLT include a direct URL and a link form the Law Library’s home page. JOLT is archive in two ways: 1) the journal is included in the Lexis/Nexis and Westlaw databases, and 2) the law school server is backed up monthly and an archive tape is made. This collection has a strong commitment to archiving and preservation made it parent organization. It is not necessary, nor reasonable to pull this project within the realm of the Digital Library Collections.
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Appendix B: Digital Initiative Technologies: Hardware & Software

Software
The main software products presently being used in the creation of digital collections are database packages, file manipulation, and web development products.

Database packages:
- ENCompass by Endeavor Information Systems
- James Madison Digital Image Database (MDID)
- Embark (University Museums)
- UR-produced applications

File manipulation:
- Photoshop
- Media Cleaner 6
- iMovie
- Apple Soundtrack
- FinalCut Pro
- Apple Compressor
- FinalCut Xpress
- EyeSpy
- Adobe Audition
- Omni Page (OCR Software)

Web development:
- Dreamweaver
- Freehand
- Flash
- Fireworks
- Director

The need for additional packages to be purchased or developed will be dependent on the project.

Hardware
The University has invested in most of the hardware (workstations, scanners, peripheral drives) that is needed to complete digital projects. This includes workstations, scanners, peripheral drives, VCR/DVD player/recorders that can convert across formats (including non-US formats), and a system to convert SVHS or DV to a streaming format. The primary piece of equipment that we know is required and we do not presently own is a large format scanner to digitize oversized pieces.

However, it must be noted that none of the equipment is devoted exclusively to the creation of a digital library collection and its availability varies with time of year and project load. This equipment is shared across offices and used by faculty and students to complete academic projects.

Servers and server space are also an issue with any digitization project. The requirements will depend on the collection software being used, the size of the project, and its expected rate of growth. Presently, all digital projects that are already being worked on have their initial server requirements met, but server needs will expand as present projects expand and as new projects are approved and implemented.
Appendix C: Forms

Note: these are samples. It would the responsibility of the review board to edit and further refine these documents.


Form A, Nomination Form for Selection

X Institution

Digital Project Nomination Form

1. Materials Being Nominated for Digitization (Please indicate collection number, series, number, box number, folder number, item control number or equivalent and the creator; caption of the item or a bibliographic citation to the fullest extent possible.)

2. Reason for Nomination (Describe why the materials are important, who might want to use them in a digital form, and what usages are likely if they are digitized.)

3. Potential Assistance Sources (Please indicate if you have any special knowledge or skills that might be shared with the X repository during the selection process. For example, can you provide caption information, historical background, or are you aware of potential funding sources or digital projects that are covering similar materials to those you are nominating?)

IV. Selection of Materials for Scanning
4. Restrictions (Indicate if you are aware of any reason why the specified materials should not be digitized, such as legal, ethical, or cultural sensitivities. Please be as specific as possible citing a source, such as a law or culture group and a contact name if necessary.)

5. Your Name:

6. Your Address:

7. Tel: ____________ Fax: ____________

8. E-Mail: __________________

Note:
The Selection Committee will make all final decisions on what will or will not be included in the digital project. If you have any special information you would like to share with the committee, please write it below.
# Form C, Checklist for Evaluation

**Answer each question yes or no.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No Don't Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Statement</strong>: Does the project fall within the repository or institution mission statement? If not, don't digitize.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope of Collections Statement</strong>: Do the candidate materials fall within the repository’s Scope of Collections Statement (Collecting Policy). If not, don't digitize unless the repository will redefine the policy to include the materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders’ Deselection Requests</strong>: Has the repository received requests to select the materials for digitization from a stakeholder or reputable source? If so, are the requests challenged by equivalent requests not to digitize the materials? If so, don't digitize the materials. Note: If you have requests not to digitize that are judged frivolous or insubstantial by the Selection Committee, ignore them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donor Restrictions</strong>: Is the candidate material unrestricted? If so, digitize. Has the donor or creator of the materials placed substantial and nonnegotiable restrictions on their usage that would prevent them from being digitized? If so, don't digitize the materials. Note: On occasion donor restrictions can be renegotiated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copyrights</strong>: Is the material either in the public domain or covered by copyright protections that your organization has obtained? If so, digitize. If not, do you have reason to believe that you will be unable to obtain a license to use the materials? If yes, don't digitize until you have obtained copyrights or licenses/permissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Privacy Rights</strong>: Does the material contain images of living individuals for which you have release forms (particularly for oral and video histories, medical records, personnel records, psychiatric counseling records, or photographs in which the individual is recognizable)? If yes, digitize. If no, do you have reason to believe you can’t locate these individuals to obtain permissions or that they won’t grant permissions? If yes, don’t digitize unless and until you have the permissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Factors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicity Rights:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your state have a publicity law (e.g., California, Tennessee, New York)? If yes, does your material include images or recordings of famous individuals such as motion picture or recording stars, scientists, artists, or authors (living or dead)? If yes, do you have permissions or licenses to use the images from the individuals or their estates? If yes, digitize. If no, don't digitize until you have permission or licenses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-FOLA and State and Local Equivalents:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you required by law to digitize the candidate materials to meet the electronic Freedom of Information Act, the Paperwork Reduction Act, or similar initiatives? If so, digitize as long as there is no compelling reason why you may not digitize the items that can't be resolved at this time. If there is a compelling reason, don't digitize the materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the candidate material contain sensitive information (such as locations of sacred sites, burials, endangered species, fossils, threatened cultural resources [such as petroglyphs], or subsistence food gathering sites), or do the materials nominated present an unbalanced point of view or lack counterpoint perspectives? If so, are the project schedule and staffing adequate to seek consultations and permission-gathering activities from those groups affected and to consult with scholars of various viewpoints? If not, don't digitize the materials or digitize only materials that the committee is fully equipped to evaluate and put into context. Involve stakeholders on the Selection Committee or project staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidential Value:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the primary value of the materials evidential, or as legal or historical proof of an action or event? Does the material also have substantial informational and/or associational content of interest to a key audience? If so, digitize. If not, will translating the item from the analog realm to the digital realm so erode the value of the item that it will no longer serve its primary purpose? If so, or if the value is seriously eroded or there is no audience, don't digitize.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authenticity:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the item to be digitized authentic and not faked, forged, or altered substantially? If so, digitize. If not, will digitizing the material lend a false authenticity to an inauthentic document or object? Is it impossible to correct the misconceptions through careful contextual documentation, captioning, and metadata? If so, don't digitize. Note: If the project involves substantial altering or retouching of a visual work for purposes other than parody or satire in potential violation of the Visual Artists' Rights Act, don't digitize the materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Factors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Visual Accuracy:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposed scanning technique be able to capture the appearance of the item accurately? If so, digitize. If not, can the project move to a more sophisticated scanning technique such as color scanning to capture the information? If you can’t capture the image accurately, don’t digitize the materials.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Documentation:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the candidate materials well captioned? If so, digitize. If wrongly, poorly, or incompletely captioned, described, and labeled, are the project staffing and budget adequate to provide good documentation within the project timeline? If not, don’t digitize the materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contextualization:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the candidate material require substantial research and a sophisticated and expensive context in order to be useful? If so, can the project provide this context? If so, digitize. If not, will the ability to view the materials serially, but not side-by-side, decrease the value of the files to the audience significantly? If so, can the project provide a way to view materials side-by-side? If not, are there other items within the collection that can be selected instead on this topic? If the files are to be used, must a whole archaeological dig be reconstructed or must an archival finding aid be placed in the Encoded Archival Description (EAD) format or an equivalent effort? If so, are the project staffing and budget adequate to produce this contextualized treatment? If you can’t provide the necessary context and the context is judged essential by the Selection Committee, don’t digitize.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Added Value:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the candidate materials both valuable and available for the first time? If so, digitize. Does the project add value to candidate materials? If so, digitize. Does the project simply repeat work already in existence in an analog or paper publication (as shovelware)? If so, can the project be reworked so as to add value to the materials by improving access by creating:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ new audiences for rare or unique materials currently accessible to only a few?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ linkages to separated materials via HTML, SGML, or XML coding?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ virtual collections of materials by the same creator; in the same process, media, technique, or format; or other linkage that are otherwise physically separated in real life on a single Web site or CD-ROM?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ new indices and finding aids that are electronically searchable?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Factors:</td>
<td>Yes Digitize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• new searchability through post-scan processing via OCR or rekeying so textual files are fully searchable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• new ways to analyze the originals by techniques, such as microscopic scans, 3-D scans, or similar techniques?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• usable files for research when the originals are too stained, deteriorated, or damaged for use by retouching or other treatment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, are the project staffing, expertise, and budget currently adequate to producing this new treatment of the material? If not, don't digitize the material until the digitization provides some added value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Audience:** Is the expected new audience for the digital images the same as the existing audience for the originals? If so, will the repository consider recontextualizing the digital product to reach a broader audience? If so, digitize. Will the digital project help reach the same audience more effectively? If not, don't digitize the materials.

**Supplementary Selection Criteria:** Has the audience set up supplementary evaluation criteria that must be factored into the evaluation process, such as the Teacher Usefulness Criteria developed for the Library of Congress? (EDC) Does this selection accommodate these additional criteria? If so, digitize; if not, don't digitize.

**Technology:** Does the expected project audience require complex or sophisticated scanning techniques and viewing equipment to use the digitized images as envisioned? If so, is it likely that a sufficient percentage of the audience has this level of viewing technology? If not, replan the project. If so, will textual materials digitized require postscan processing, such as OCR processing or rekeying? Do images require retouching, very high resolution copying, color capture, or extensive coding to maintain linkages and hierarchies? If so, can the work be done within the project budget and timeline, using the project staff? If not, don't digitize.

**Condition:** Are the candidate items either in stable condition or available as duplicates or copies for use in digitization? If so, digitize. If not, are the candidate items so deteriorated or at risk that it would be difficult or damaging to originals to digitize or copy them? For example, is there a need to disbind a unique scrapbook or rare book, remove items from frames and mats, or place pressure on a cockled and brittle image? If so, is stabilizing the originals too expensive and time consuming to do within the scope of the project budget and timeline? If so, don't digitize.
### Evaluation Factors:

**Control:** Are the original items accessioned, described, and placed in secure storage? If so, digitize. If not, would digitizing them place the originals at risk by alerting potential thieves of valuable and vulnerable originals? If so, don’t digitize.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No Don’t Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Duplication of Effort:** Have you checked to see if the items have already been duplicated well elsewhere? If not well duplicated elsewhere, digitize. If digitized elsewhere, is the digital copy made of adequate quality? If so, obtain a copy from the other source and don’t digitize the materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No Don’t Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Accessibility:** Are the candidate items inaccessible, such as in cold storage? If so, digitize. If already easily accessible in multiple locations — such as through widely distributed microfilm copies or in many published exhibition catalogs — is there some special reason why digital copies are necessary? If not, don’t digitize.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No Don’t Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cooperative Project:** Are the candidate items given priority due to some thematic, cooperative, or grant funding priority? If so, do these priorities fit the institutional mission and collecting statements? If so, digitize. If not, don’t digitize.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No Don’t Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cumulation:** Is the candidate material a grouped and linked body of materials that draw additional value by being related to other materials held by the repository? Are they already digitized, already selected for digitization, or related to materials already well digitized by other organizations? If so digitize. If a single item and the effort are not for public relations alone or in response to E-FOIA, or are a request by a stakeholder, don’t digitize.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No Don’t Digitize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>