



Progress Report Template -

Project Name	<i>Kultur, University of Southampton (lead institution)</i>
Project Website	<i>http://kultur.eprints.org</i>
Report compiled by	<i>Victoria Sheppard</i>
Reporting period	<i>Oct 07 – Apr 08</i>
Section One: Summary	
<p>The project's activities over the last six months represent significant advances with the project's aims. From a cultural perspective, a thorough environmental assessment has provided the project team with a valuable understanding of potential user groups and their working practices. This understanding is informing the project's approach to advocacy, and will also help to shape policies concerning the use of the repository. Kultur has been extensively publicised to both internal and external audiences. The successful engagement with the arts research community is evidenced in the academic contribution to the project's demo repository (supplying examples of their work as well as feedback). The creation of this EPrints demo has been the most important development from a technical perspective. It currently houses over 70 examples of research outputs from across the project partners, a large proportion of which are visual and time-based media. Working with the examples in the demo has helped identify the main features that a transferable creative arts repository needs to offer, and research into the development of these is now underway. The project has also outlined a clear and manageable timescale for splitting this demo model into separate institutional repositories for the project partners before the end of the year.</p> <p>During this reporting period the project has set up a steering group which brings together a broad range of expertise in the field of visual and moving image digitisation and curation, the gallery and museums sector, practising artists and arts funding bodies. The first meeting of this group provided the project team with concrete advice at both a cultural and technical level, and was particularly important in representing the perspective of potential cross-domain users. The activity over this period has ensured that, despite the project's delayed start, the original timescale for completion remains very much achievable. A central factor in this progress has been the effective communication and shared practice between the project partners.</p>	
Section Two: Activities and Progress	
<p>Please see appendix A at the end of this document</p>	
Section Three: Institutional & Project Partner Issues	

- The consortium agreement has been signed by all of the project partners (a copy of this was delivered to JISC in November 07)
- VADS are now playing an increased role in the project: in addition to their consultancy on the preservation and curation work package, they are now more actively involved in the metadata work package, and are leading the copyright package (see section 10 for corresponding budgetary adjustments)
- The University of Southampton's closure of the Textile Conservation Centre in 2009 (unless a suitable transfer can still be made) has certain implications for the Kultur project. In particular it is likely to affect the range of research outputs that will be included in the arts repository. The loss of the TCC also calls for sensitivity when targeting promotional activities at Southampton and Winchester.
- Since the last report, the position of project manager for Open Access Leiden has been filled by Peter Verhaar, who is now the main contact for the project at Leiden University, the associate partner in Kultur. Leiden are going to share with the project team their experience of accommodating specialist art collections in their repository.

Section Four: Outputs and Deliverables

All of the following deliverables are available on our project website, on the 'documents' page:

<http://kultur.eprints.org/documents.htm>

- 1) Projects and Literature Review (Feb 08)
- 2) UCCA Institutional Profile (Apr 08)
- 3) UAL institutional Profile (Apr 08)
- 4) Advocacy Workshop Report (Nov 07)
- 5) Write up of first steering group meeting (Mar 08)

For presentation and advocacy materials, see section seven

Section Five: Outcomes and Lessons Learned

Some preliminary findings about the unique requirements of a creative and applied arts repository and its users are suggested below (these are all areas that require further research)

- The advocacy workshop, responses to the demo repository, and comments made in the survey all concur that the aesthetics and layout of the repository needs careful attention in order to get arts researchers on board.
- There is a lot of enthusiasm and support from researchers for a creative arts repository. But the most significant reservations concern the protection of the creator's copyright. In addition, where researchers do already have some of their work accessible online, this tends to appear on a personal or gallery websites, a context in which they are used to a high degree of control over how work appears. Only a small proportion of outputs are currently accessible via institutional websites
- Work with the demo has highlighted that one of the main factors distinguishing a creative arts repository from other research repositories is the number of complex objects/records with multiple documents attached. This calls for a richer set of metadata, which can describe the individual documents associated with a record, and allow these to be searched.

Section Six: Evaluation

Project evaluation has adhered to the processes outlined in the project plan. Ongoing, formative evaluation has focused on two areas – the overall implementation of the project, and outreach to stakeholders. The progress of the project has been overseen by the Project Management Group meetings, held quarterly. In between these meetings, the project manager and officers have also met to discuss work in progress at regular, monthly, intervals. The suitability of project deliverables and other documentation (such as presentation materials) have been evaluated through the use of the project discussion email list.

The project steering group also offered some very focused evaluation on different aspects of the project, particularly regarding the direction of the demo development, and the value of incorporating usability studies into the project work plan.

Section Seven: Dissemination

Kultur has been widely publicised by the project team to potential user groups across the partner institutions. There has been a great deal of personal contact with individual researchers, which has been an integral part of collecting material for the demonstrator and securing responses to the survey. The project officers and project manager have given presentations and also publicised the project through attendance at a range of meetings involving the libraries at each site, research co-ordinators and research offices, research centres, IT and web teams, the Research Policy and Development Committee at UCCA, and the CETL teaching and learning team at UAL. Kultur was also introduced at a one-day teaching and learning symposium on 'Adventures in e-Resources' at UAL.

In addition, the project has been publicised to audiences outside of the partner institutions. There has been dialogue with institutions involved in similar ventures, including University College Falmouth (The Storage Space), Goldsmiths and the Arts Institute at Bournemouth. The UAL project officer has made links with staff at Luxonline, a prominent web resource for British video and film artists. The project team gave a poster presentation at the Open Repositories 08 conference (Apr 08), and here shared experiences with international repository and digitisation projects centring on multimedia material. The project received publicity at an event organised at the British Library to discuss IRs within the creative arts, which was attended by representatives from UAL, RIN, AHRC, Goldsmiths and RCA (Mar 08). Staff from UCCA are planning a workshop based on Kultur at the forthcoming Arlis conference (Jul 08).

Some of the presentation and dissemination materials are available on the project website <http://kultur.eprints.org/documents.htm>, under the 'advocacy' section. These include the poster from the OR08 conference and accompanying handouts, and general briefing documents for academic audiences and library audiences.

Section Eight: Risks, Issues and Challenges

One challenge has been to manage the project scope, and to reconcile the aims and timescale of the project with the needs and expectations of diverse user groups (a risk identified in the project plan as 'an over-demanding agenda'). The project has uncovered areas that require further attention and further resources. These include:

- 1) Support for researchers to create digital versions of their work. For example, the return of RAE submissions at the end of the year would seem to present a good opportunity for capturing and depositing research outputs for the repository, and yet the scale of such a task is largely beyond the scope and resources of the project.
- 2) It has become clear through scoping studies that there are special collections, and collections of research data that users would like a repository to be able to store and curate. These collections lie largely outside of the project's focus on research outputs, but there is evidently a need for arts institutions to manage this kind of material as well as research. This may be the subject of future repository work in this context.
- 3) From a software development point of view, there have been lots of suggestions made for repository features that will not all be achievable within the timescale of the project.

In response to some of these expectations and ideas, a new output towards the end of the project will be a series of visionary scenarios, which outline potential directions for further development of creative arts repositories beyond the life of the project.

Section Nine: Collaboration and Support

<p>Areas of work that could usefully be discussed with other projects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dealing with time-based media in repositories – video, film and audio material• Practice-led research cultures• Uses and re-uses of digital objects: ways in which research repositories can be built upon for teaching and learning purposes
Section Ten: Financial Statement
<i>Removed from online version of report</i>
Section Eleven: Next Steps
<p>Over the next six months of the project, the main activities will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• User profiles – completion of report on survey results (May 08)• User case studies – conducting and writing up results from interviews (Apr–Jun 08)• Continuing the population of the demo with research outputs; a publicity drive at WSA to gather more material (ongoing)• Demo development – ongoing research, enhanced version of demo to be made available by July 08, at which point a second round of feedback will be invited (larger scope than first round, targeting online audience of research and teaching staff and students)• Model from the Images Application Profile applied to demo and tested (May – Jul 08)• First stage of copyright activities completed (recommendations for copyright clearing procedures – Jun 08) and second stage initiated (investigation into fair use agreements and their application in a repository setting – Aug 08)• Usability tests (Sep 08)

Checklist:

Before you return this report:

- Ensure that your project webpage on the JISC site is up to date and contains the correct information. Attach details of any required amendments to this report. Project webpages can be found from: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/projects.aspx>
- If there have been any changes to the original project plan and/or work packages, ensure that amended copies of the relevant sections of your project plan are attached to this report.

Appendix A

Section Two: Activities and Progress

Work package 1: Project management

During this reporting period, all of the project management activities have been successfully carried out according to the timescale set out in the project plan work packages. The consortium agreement was signed in October (2nd project milestone). The project website has gone live – <http://kultur.eprints.org> (3rd milestone). This provides information about the objectives, approach and institutions involved in Kultur and it is regularly updated with the project's deliverables and advocacy documentation. The project staff have liaised with JISC and with other repository projects (many of which are funded under the same programme) via email correspondence, and through attendance at a number of workshops and conferences. These include the JISC programme meeting, RSP events, workshops on eprints and web 2.0, and on preservation, final project dissemination events such as the Version Identifier Framework, and the recent Open Repositories 08 conference. The programme manager also attended Kultur's first steering group meeting in March 2008. The group provided the project with valuable advice on a range of issues, particularly usability, knowledge transfer, and the management of copyright issues. Meanwhile, the day-to-day project activity has been overseen by quarterly meetings of the Project Management Group (project officers, project manager, and Southampton IR manager). The project manager's attendance at fortnightly IR repository steering group meetings at Southampton have also enabled regular interaction between Kultur and other repository projects which Southampton has a role in.

Work package 2: Environmental assessment

The project has completed three reports (project milestone 4a): a literature and project review and scoping studies of the two partner institutions. The original work package task of creating user case studies (milestone 4b) has been expanded to allow for a broad analysis of the repository's potential user group which will complement more specific individual case studies. To this end, the project team have conducted a survey aimed at all academic staff at UAL, UCCA and WSA, in order to gain insight into practical working practices, familiarity with various digital technologies, and attitudes towards the online dissemination of research. The project employed a social surveys researcher to advise on the design, methodology and analysis of the survey. It was completed by around 200 staff in March, and a report based on the findings is currently underway and will be completed early May 2008. The project manager and project officers are also in the process of conducting a series of follow-up interviews with individual researchers in order to produce more detailed case studies of researchers' work flows, which will help us to assess where to situate the repository to ensure maximum usage.

Work package 3: Establishing pilot repositories for the partners

In order to get the broadest possible range of material and to ensure that the project adheres to its aim of creating a transferable, *über* arts repository, it was decided that rather than creating separate pilot repositories, a single, joint demonstrator model should be set up with examples of work from all three arts institutions. The EPrints team developed this in November 2007, coinciding with an advocacy workshop held at Southampton, at which strategies for encouraging arts academics and researchers to use repositories were discussed. The demo has since been populated with a range of artefacts, show and exhibition records, and film and audio work alongside examples of more traditional print-based research. At the time of this report, it has 76 full content records. The demo will be split into separate institutional repositories in December 2008, allowing time for more institution-specific branding and configuration to take place within the last three months of the project.

The interest of research staff in this project and their willingness to supply material for the developmental phase of the repository has allowed the project team to use the demo for advocacy activities earlier than anticipated. It has played an important role in various presentations publicising the project to different groups (see section 7 of this report)

Work package 4: Designing metadata structures

Work with the demo has underlined that one of the distinctive characteristics of a creative arts repository, as distinct from a text repository, are the number of items/documents that may be associated to a single record. In addition, these documents may be different media forms. Consequently, research from the software perspective is focusing on how to accommodate richer metadata, which includes fields for each individual document, and on customising eprints software to allow document-centric searching.

The precise values of the metadata fields in the repository will be influenced by the application profile for describing images within an institutional repository, which is being led by VADS. A draft of this profile was made public for comment on 10 April, comprising use cases, functional requirements, a conceptual model and attributes.

Work package 5: Software enhancement

Because it is still in an early phase of its development, requests for feedback have so far been limited to targeted groups and individuals. This first round of feedback came from the immediate project team and partners, the programme manager and the steering group. The demo has also been shown to some individual researchers at each institution, research administrators, several research centres and units (including the Research Unit for Information Environments, Fashion, the Body and Material Culture, Design Against Crime and Ligatus at UAL), and UCCA's web team. Comments and suggestions for improvement have informed a structured workplan for the software enhancements. The three main areas to be tackled in this plan are: 1) aesthetics (layout and usability), 2) functionality (including exports and searching), and 3) data model (accommodating richer metadata for documents). The technical project officer is currently working on a revised abstract page, which will incorporate video previews/thumbnails, lightbox functions, and will also tackle layout problems of records with numerous documents attached.

Work package 6: Rights Issues

Since the last reporting period, the overall responsibility for this work package has shifted to VADS, enabling the project to gain maximum benefit from VADS' considerable expertise in the area of IPR in the digital arts environment.

It is anticipated that the end date for this work package will extend beyond the end of June 2008, to ensure that the outputs can be tested, and if necessary, adapted, once the demo has been split into two separate IRs. Work on the first of these outputs, a paper and set of recommendations on procedures for checking copyright in submitted items, is currently underway. This is based on scoping existing IPR policies and procedures at each of the partner institutions, predicting the likely proportions of different types of output to be deposited in each IR, and formulating an institutional workflow for monitoring IPR in repository material.

Work packages 7 and 8: Assessing author behaviours and the response of multiple audiences

The objective of work package 7 is to ensure that the repository is responding to potential users. Many of the activities recorded already in this report have laid the ground work for this – the institutional profiles, staff survey, face-to-face interviews, and demo feedback have identified the needs and expectations of researchers along with other institutional stakeholders. A report on the survey and interview responses, to be completed in May 2008, will outline a framework for ensuring that the repository responds to these needs.

The demo feedback has also started WP 8 - assessing the responses of multiple audiences, including that of academic staff and the art gallery sector. In the light of the environmental assessment, it now appears more valuable to take a slightly different approach to this work package than that outlined in the project plan. While the plan proposed that between April and June 2008, two distinct surveys should be conducted assessing responses from HE audiences and non-HE audiences, a more fluid approach now seems likely to yield more results. Because the deadline for the researcher survey (WP 2) was extended to early March to allow for a greater response rate, it no longer seems appropriate to embark on another survey aimed at the same audience so soon after. Instead, less formalised means of gathering responses to the repository may work better – the interviews will offer one opportunity for this, and once the revised demo is released at the end of the summer, the project team can invite comments via various email lists, as well as through presentations and demonstrations to various audiences.

Work package 9: Data curation and preservation

This package is not due to start until later in the year, but some preparatory research has identified pertinent projects and studies for Kultur to engage with in a creative arts context. In addition to the EPrints PRESERV projects, these include the InSPECT project, JISC studies into the significant properties of vector images and moving images, and the DCC SCARP project, which contains useful case studies of disciplinary attitudes towards curation and preservation.

Work package 10: Publicity, evaluation and impact

As this package is focused on the latter stages of the project, and on publicising the final outcomes and outputs of the Kultur project, the activities are not scheduled to take place until the next reporting period.

However, the Kultur project has been publicised as a work in progress at a number of events, both externally and internally, as outlined in section seven of this report.