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Executive Summary

During the first few months of 2018, the Preservation Research and Consultancy (PRC) team conducted a survey of National Library staff to get feedback on the digital preservation services provided by the PRC. All National Library staff were invited to participate in the survey, and a total of 53 out of approximately 300 staff completed the survey (an 18% return rate).

Overall, the satisfaction rate with the services provided by the PRC is high: 77% are either somewhat or completely satisfied. The familiarity of staff with the digital preservation programme and strategies is also high: 81% are moderately familiar or very familiar. The interest level is also high: 87% would like to learn more about the digital preservation programme and strategies.

The survey respondents think that the PRC is especially good at providing the Library with a preservation repository, supporting staff users of the repository, providing repository reports, and supporting the Library’s pre-ingest activities and workflows. When asked how important they consider particular PRC activities, the activities related to outreach and knowledge-sharing stand out as highly valued:

- Engagement with digital preservation issues – very or fairly important to 94%
- PRC presentations at Coffee & Bytes sessions - very or fairly important to 92%
- Digital preservation pages on the National Library website - very or fairly important to 81%

Survey respondents were also asked where the PRC could improve existing services or offer new services. Three areas emerged as clear needs in the Library:

1. Additional opportunities for learning

The survey results showed that the presentations and outreach efforts made by the PRC are appreciated by Library staff, but also that the appetite for learning more about digital preservation in the Library is high. Staff would like additional opportunities to learn about digital preservation issues, strategies, and the programme.

2. More support for bulk ingest of digital collections into the NDHA

The PRC currently supports tools and workflows for collecting, processing and depositing content into the NDHA. Staff would like to see these ingest tools and efforts scaled up to support plans to collect more and larger sets of digital material.

3. Better discovery and access options for our users

Many of the survey respondents took this opportunity to ask for improved discovery and access, while acknowledging that the PRC does not solely “own” this space, as shown by these survey comments:
“I don’t think it’s the role of DPRC [SIC] to lead the digital access programme for the Library, but the voice of DPRC [SIC] would be beneficial to understanding the challenges, discussing the potential, and supporting the Library to move forward with its digital access agenda.”

“I don’t think this is just PRC, but in general the Library needs to be more cohesive in its digital activities.”

“Provision of access to digital collections via the online NDHA Viewer/Player. I realize this may be seen as somewhat peripheral to the core work of the team, but I’m not sure who else "owns" the problem.”

The PRC can independently make improvements in the access area, for example, to work towards integrating better content viewers with the Rosetta software. However, one of the key messages coming out of this survey is that Library staff are aware of the need to (1) clarify the roles and responsibilities related to discovery and access of the digital collections; and (2) design and implement a cohesive, pan-Library discovery and access strategy for the digital collections.

Conducting this survey was a good learning experience for the PRC—in terms of gaining experience in conducting useful surveys, and in what we can learn from the results to improve the programme.

The 2018 PRC Survey provides a useful snapshot of the awareness of and opinions about the digital preservation services offered by the PRC. The immediate use of the survey results will be to help inform the PRC’s roadmap of work, currently being planned. A longer-term benefit is that it establishes a baseline of data to help measure progress in the areas identified for improvement.

**Introduction**

The PRC team is responsible for managing the National Library’s digital preservation programme. The team also supports other parts of the business (e.g. the Alexander Turnbull Library, other groups within Content Services, DigitalNZ) which collect and provides access to the content in the NDHA (the Library’s digital preservation repository).

In January 2018, the PRC ran an online survey using Survey Monkey, which was open to all National Library staff. The purpose of the survey was to provide the PRC with baseline data for tracking the effectiveness of the digital preservation programme and to identify any areas where improvements are needed. It was the first time that a survey of this nature had been conducted by the PRC.

The survey ran from 23 January through 14 February 2018. A total of 53 members out of approximately 300 staff from across the Library completed the survey (18% return rate).

This report provides an overview of the survey design, findings and conclusions. There were limitations to the survey (see the ‘Conclusion’ section for a discussion) and therefore the results should be interpreted with care.
About the Survey

This section describes the survey design and the response analysis process.

Survey Questions

The survey contained 11 questions (See Appendix A). There were two main types of questions. The first type asked specifically about the team and its activities, whereas the second type asked about the overall digital preservation programme. There were five open-ended questions and six multiple choice questions including one with an option to add comments.

Response Categories

For analysis purposes, all responses from the open-ended questions were grouped into 18 categories. A list of keywords was developed to map the responses to these 18 categories. For instance, any response referring to ‘Access’ (e.g., access, delivery, and viewer) was categorized as ‘Discovery and access support’ and any inclusion of ‘Preservation system’, ‘Repository’, ‘Storing’, ‘Managing Collection’, or ‘Files Preservation’ was considered ‘Providing Preservation Repository’. All 18 categories are listed below.

1. Bulk Ingest Support
2. Change Request
3. Communication to Users
4. Discovery and Access Support
5. Documentation
6. Ingest support
7. Knowledge Sharing
8. Leadership/Expert Advice
9. Liaison to External Groups
10. Staff and Resources
11. Policy Development
12. Pre-Ingest Support
13. Providing Preservation Repository
14. Outages
15. Reports
16. Research
17. User Support
18. Website
Key Findings

This section provides a high-level summary of the key findings of the survey. A more detailed description of the findings can be found in the ‘Detailed Findings’ section of this document.

Key Findings - Strengths

The PRC team provides a range of services to staff that are appreciated as made evident by the responses. This includes having a good preservation system, providing repository user support, reports, pre-ingest support and more. User support is generally well regarded and the team has received a number of favourable comments about it. The team is also seen as an important bridge between the technology partners (Technology team/system vendors) and the Library.

Overall satisfaction is very positive with 77 percent of the respondents being either completely satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the support they receive from the team. There were no negative responses received on the satisfaction with team’s support. This gives an indication of how positively the service is viewed by the staff.

The majority of responding staff members considered themselves familiar with the Library’s digital preservation programme and digital preservation strategies. Judging from the positive comments that have been received, staff members are generally happy with the support they get when needed.

The four most mentioned categories about what the team is doing well are:

1) Providing Preservation Repository
2) Pre-Ingest Support
3) Reports
4) User Support

Key Findings - Areas for Improvement

The three most frequently mentioned areas where the PRC team needs improvement, as proposed by the respondents, are ‘Discovery and Access’, ‘Bulk-Ingest’, and ‘Knowledge Sharing’. Some other less mentioned, but also important areas for improvement suggested, include ‘Staff and Resources’, Documentation, and ‘Communication to Users’.

The Library’s ‘Discovery and Access’ systems play an important role in helping users to find and access the content held in the digital preservation system. Staff believe that researchers face a major barrier to discovery and access. This is also confirmed by the responses to the question on the most important thing that the team should offer in the future. The concerns around ‘Discover and Access’ are partly due to the design and build of the discovery and access interfaces, in addition, staff pointed out that the system viewers are not compatible. There are occasions when the viewers are not able to render or process certain type of files we have in the digital preservation system.
Although only 19% of all respondents indicated that they are not familiar with the Library’s digital preservation programme and its digital preservation strategies, ideally all Library staff should be. A number of staff members commented that the role of PRC, and the NDHA needs to be clarified and understood amongst the whole Library.

When asked to rate the team’s current informational activities, the respondents rated ‘Engagement with Digital Preservation Issues’ as the most important for them. ‘PRC Presentations at Coffee & bytes Sessions’ and ‘Digital Preservation pages on the National Library Website’ are the other most important mechanisms or activities provided by the team. Therefore it is expected that these activities are well managed and improved over time.

In summary, the following main areas were highlighted for further improvements (top categories according to the number of mentions):

- Discovery and Access Support
- Knowledge Sharing
- Bulk-ingest support
- Providing Preservation Repository
Detailed Findings

In this section, the results of all of the survey questions are provided in the order that they were asked in the survey. Note that the total number of responses per question varies because some respondents skipped some of the optional questions and because some questions permitted more than one response.

Q1. Which part of the Library do you work in?

This was a mandatory question, therefore all 53 responded to this question. As shown in the graph below, the largest number of responses came from the ATL Research Collections team (14 and 26% of the total) followed by the CS Collection Management team (8 responses) and then the ATL Research Access team (7 responses).

![Figure 1. The survey respondent’s department within the Library](image)

We learned after the survey was already underway that some Library departments chose to answer the survey as a group. In hindsight we would have asked in the survey if this was being filled out by a group or individual; and if by a group how many people it included. As it stands it is difficult to know the actual number of individuals who took part in answering the survey.
Q2. What are the things the Preservation Research & Consultancy team does well now that supports your work programme?

This was an open-ended question. The word cloud below shows the high frequency words from the responses to this question.

Figure 2. Word cloud of the responses indicating where the PRC team is doing well

In total, 49 staff responded to this question (93% of all survey respondents). More than 68% percent of all survey respondents gave positive opinions on the service that the PRC team provides. There were a few comments about not being sure about what the team does (6). These comments are not used in this analysis but they suggest that there is a need for promoting the preservation programme across the Library. Some responses (7) did not reflect what was asked in the question and were consequently not used for this analysis. The rest of the responses (36) were then placed into one of the categories mentioned earlier in this report as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Areas where the PRC team is doing well
The category ‘Providing Preservation Repository’ had the most number of mentions (those who appreciate having a good preservation system and support). ‘User Support’, ‘Reports’, and ‘Pre-Ingest Support’ were the next most popular categories and were mentioned 7 times each. Depending on the content of some responses, more than one category was assigned; for this reason, the total mentions in Figure 3 are greater than 36.

Q3. What are the things the Preservation Research & Consultancy team needs to improve most, including gaps, that could support your work programme?

46 respondents answered this question, but only 30 of them were used for this analysis. The other 16 responses were not used because they either mentioned that they do not know enough about the team’s work (5) or the responses were not direct answers to the question. Two of these were positive answers, for example, “I can’t think of anything, I’m always happy with the service!”.

The word cloud below shows the high frequency words from the responses to this question. The prevalence of the words digital and preservation in this word cloud can be misleading. Because of the nature of the work of the PRC, these words occurred frequently in the responses, but the PRC’s digital preservation work itself was not cited as needing improvement. For example, one response was “publications on the why and how of digital preservation, for general consumption”. Similarly, the word “work” was used frequently, not as the subject for improvement but as context, e.g. “my work”, “their work”, “DP work”. If we remove the words “digital”, “preservation” and “work”, Figure 5 shows the highest frequency words.

Figure 4. Word cloud of the responses indicating areas for improvement
These 30 responses were placed into the normalized categories for analysis, shown in Figure 6. Note that more than 30 responses (38) are shown as some responses had more than one category assigned to them.

Twelve responses were from respondents that are not happy with the ‘Discovery and Access’ of the NDHA content. The category ‘Discovery and Access’ includes any type of access-related issues, e.g. access to NDHA content from the National Library website to viewer functionality. Further comments from other respondents highlighted the need for more knowledge sharing and ingest support mainly when ingesting a large amount of material (categorized as Bulk Ingest Support).
Q4. What is the single most important thing that the Preservation Research & Consultancy team should offer in the future?

We received 43 responses for this question. Thirty-three responses are used in this analysis. The other 10 did not specifically answer the question so were excluded from this analysis. There were some responses with multiple suggestions that were mapped to multiple categories. This is why we have 39 total responses shown in Figure 7.

[Figure 7. What should be offered in the future]

Thirteen respondents would like the PRC team to take some action to improve ‘Discovery and Access’ (would like PRC’s involvement and leadership to make discovery and access a better experience). There were two responses about preservation policy (categorized as Policy Development), for example, “Having a policy about preservation of digitized data”.

There were other interesting comments such as “Your amazing skills and knowledge and teaming up with others to make an even bigger difference for NZers” and “Preservation service for other cultural heritage organizations in NZ” that were placed under the category ‘Liaison to External Groups’.

Q5. How important do you consider the following? (Select one for each)

This was a mandatory multiple choice question with an option to add comments at the end. As shown in Figures 8 and 9, ‘Engagement with Digital Preservation Issues’ is very important to many of the respondents. 79% indicated it as ‘Very important’ and 15% as ‘Fairly Important’. Fourteen respondents indicated that they are not aware of this offering.

The top five important activities (based on the percentage of responses rating ‘Very Important’ or ‘Fairly important’) are shown in Figure 8.
Figure 8. Importance of activities: Percentage who think it is very or fairly important for them

Figure 9 shows the responses for all of the activities that were rated by the respondents.

The 9 respondents who opted to add additional comments used this opportunity to clarify what they thought is and is not important. These comments fell under the following categories:

- Leadership/Expert advice (1)
- Bulk Ingest Support (1)
- Communication to Users (1)
- Reports (1)
- Knowledge Sharing (1)
- User Support (1)
Figure 9. Views on importance of activities provided by PRC

How important do you consider the following?

- Not at all important
- Slightly important
- Neither important nor unimportant
- Fairly important
- Very important
- (Not aware of this)
Q6. How familiar are you with the Library's digital preservation programme and its digital preservation strategies?

This was a mandatory question and the three options were:

- Not at all familiar
- Moderately familiar
- Very familiar

The majority of responding staff (81%) considered themselves moderately or very familiar with the Library’s digital preservation programme and the digital preservation strategies. About 19% of responding staff indicated that they are ‘Not at all familiar’.

Figure 10. Familiarity with the Library’s digital preservation programme
Q7. Would you like to know more about the Library's digital preservation programme and its digital preservation strategies?

As shown in Figure 11, most of the responding staff are interested in and would like to know more about the Library's digital preservation programme and its digital preservation strategies.

Figure 11. Interest in the knowing more

Q8. Are there any other ways of learning and/or support from the Preservation Research & Consultancy team that you find, or would find, useful?

Twenty-three responses were received for this question and grouped into the five categories shown in Figure 12. Overwhelmingly the majority of the respondents (15 out of 23) mentioned that they would find more knowledge sharing sessions useful.

Figure 12. Learning and support needs
Q9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Preservation Research & Consultancy team and support?

This was a mandatory question where the survey respondent had to select one of the following options:

- Completely dissatisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Completely satisfied

Fifty-three staff members completed this question. Of those, 18 (34%) are completely satisfied with the PRC team and support and 23 (43%) are somewhat satisfied making the overall satisfaction rate 77%.

The remainder (23%) selected the ‘Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied’ option. No one responded that they are ‘Completely dissatisfied’ or ‘Somewhat dissatisfied’ with the team’s support.
Q10. Are there any other comments that you would like to make?

This was an optional question and 25 responses were received. Sixteen of them were grouped into the seven categories shown in Figure 14.

![Figure 14. Other comments](image)

Some other comments (9) do not fall under any of the categories we have used for this analysis; however, some of them are worth mentioning:

“Love that you’re running this survey!”

“The main issues relate to the environment that we operate in as a whole - locked down workstations, and difficulty accessing the ever changing tools required to work with unpublished born-digital files.”

Some staff members (4 out of 25) mentioned that they are not aware of the team’s ‘new’ name ‘PRC’, see below an example:

“PRC needs publicity within the library. I don’t recall any announcements about the formation of the Preservation Research & Consultancy team, I’ve looked on 1840 and not found a page for the team. I figure it’s related somehow to the NDHA team but is it the successor or broader or narrower?”

Q11. If we need clarification or want to follow up on your responses, can we contact you?

More than half (33) of the responding staff agreed to be available for follow-up if necessary, however, only 29 provided their contact details.
Conclusion

Conducting this survey was a good learning experience for the PRC—in terms of gaining experience in conducting useful surveys, and in what we can learn from the results to improve the programme.

If we conduct a follow-up survey in the next couple years, the following lessons learned about the survey design and communication plan will be taken into consideration:

- Ask the respondents if they are answering the survey on behalf of a group, or as an individual, so that we can more accurately interpret the response rate and the departments represented
- Provide fewer open-ended questions as they have been found difficult to interpret and analyse
- Provide more contextual information about the PRC to respondents, either in the communication email advertising the survey, or in the survey introduction, to reduce the number of respondents who were not familiar with the PRC
- Publicize the survey through more avenues (e.g. 1840, blog posts, etc.) to encourage a higher response rate

The survey collected a broad range of information that gives us insight into the strengths of the current digital preservation programme as well as the gaps and needs that remain to be addressed. Taken as a whole, the responses to the survey are encouraging, both in terms of overall satisfaction rate and improvement ideas. We found through the survey that discovery and access, knowledge sharing, and bulk ingest are the main areas that need attention. In addition, there are other areas such as staffing, documentation, and communication to users that should be addressed.

The 2018 PRC Survey provides a useful snapshot of the awareness of and opinions about the digital preservation services offered by the PRC. The immediate use of the survey results will be to help inform the PRC’s roadmap of work currently being planned. A longer-term benefit is that it establishes a baseline of data to help measure progress in the areas identified for improvement.
Appendix A: Survey Questions

1. Which part of the Library do you work in?

2. What are the things the Preservation Research & Consultancy team does well now that supports your work programme?

3. What are the things the Preservation Research & Consultancy team needs to improve most, including gaps, that could support your work programme?

4. What is the single most important thing that the Preservation Research & Consultancy team should offer in the future?

5. How important do you consider the following?
   - Engagement with Digital Preservation Issues
   - Rosetta, Indigo Trainings Sessions
   - NDHA Reports Sessions
   - Computer Science 101 Course
   - PRC presentations at Coffee and Bytes Sessions
   - PRC presentations at Meetings e.g. Content Services Meetings
   - User Guides / Manuals Provided by PRC
   - NDHA Reports Provided by PRC
   - Contacting PRC Team (Email, Phone)
   - 1840 Pages Maintained by PRC
   - Digital Preservation Website Maintained by PRC
   - Digital Preservation Pages on the National Library Website
   - Other (please specify)

6. How familiar are you with the Library's digital preservation programme and its digital preservation strategies?

7. Would you like to know more about the Library's digital preservation programme and its digital preservation strategies?

8. Are there any other ways of learning and/or support from the Preservation Research & Consultancy team that you find, or would find, useful?

9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Preservation Research and Consultancy team and support?

10. Are there any other comments that you would like to make?

11. If we need clarification or want to follow up on your responses, can we contact you?