



Project Document Cover Sheet

Project Information			
Project Acronym			
Project Title	Kultur		
Start Date	31 March 2007	End Date	31 March 2009
Lead Institution	University of Southampton		
Project Director	Mark Brown, University Librarian		
Project Manager & contact details	Victoria Sheppard, Hartley Library, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton, SO17 1BJ Tel: 023 80595849 Email: vms@soton.ac.uk		
Partner Institutions	University of the Arts, London; University College for the Creative Arts at Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone and Rochester; Visual Arts Data Service		
Project Web URL	http://kultur.eprints.org		
Programme Name (and number)	<i>Repositories and Preservation Programme Strand D – Repository Start-Up and Enhancement</i>		
Programme Manager	Andrew McGregor		

Document Name			
Document Title	<i>Progress Report</i>		
Reporting Period	<i>1: Apr – Sep 2007</i>		
Author(s) & project role	Victoria Sheppard, Project Manager		
Date	26 October 2007	Filename	Progress Report 1
URL	<i>if document is posted on project web site</i>		
Access	<input type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal		<input type="checkbox"/> General dissemination

Document History		
Version	Date	Comments
1	26 Oct 2007	



Kultur Progress Report

Overview of Project

Grant Statement

Please confirm that the project is being conducted under the terms agreed with JISC in the letter of grant and the JISC Terms and Conditions attached to it.

Note any changes to the original award, including any extensions or alterations granted.

The project is being conducted under the terms agreed with JISC in the letter of grant and the JISC Terms and Conditions attached to it

2. Aims and Objectives

Explain any changes to the original aims/objectives outlined in the project plan.

List the targets set for this reporting period and explain if they have been met.

There are no changes to the original aims/objectives outlined in the project plan.

3. Overall Approach

Explain any changes to the overall approach outlined in the project plan.

There are no changes to the overall approach outlined in the project plan.

4. Project Outputs

Summarise progress during the reporting period and milestones/deliverables achieved.

Project management deliverables

- All new project staff have now been recruited.
- Project plan (milestone 1) submitted to JISC
- Kultur email discussion list set up and in use
- Project webpage up on JISC website
- The consortium agreement (2nd milestone) will be signed at the next project partners meeting on 31st October, by which time the project website (3rd milestones) will also be ready to go live.

Environmental assessment

There will be two parts to the environmental assessment, which is the 4th project milestone. The first half comprises a survey of other relevant repository and arts-based digitisation projects, written by the project manager. This will locate the aims of the Kultur project within a wider field of activity, and will identify what existing research and project findings we can draw on in developing policy and workflows, as well as identifying knowledge gaps. This report is currently underway and is on track for completion in November. The second part of the assessment will take the form of a scoping study of the partner arts institutions, incorporating case studies of potential users. It will outline the range of

disciplines and their perception of re-purposing research outputs, key barriers to participation, and success criteria. This will be the first task to engage the new project officers, and will be completed by the end of December.

This two-part environmental assessment will be targeted primarily at the project management group, but its findings may also be of interest to the broader arts community as well as other repository projects. The assessment will provide a basis for advocacy within the institutions, and will also help to determine the range of material to be included in the repository. Its scoping of the research community will also shape the project's methodology in determining metadata standards and copyright policy.

Repository development

The EPrints team at Southampton have developed an arts-based demonstrator that can be used to aid advocacy during the early stages of the project.

5. Project Outcomes

Summarise achievement against objectives, list outcomes and findings to date, and any interim conclusions.

How do you see the project developing? Has progress changed the project in any way, and are there implications for the programme?

What lessons have been learned that could be passed on to other projects or applied elsewhere?
At the early stage in the project there are no interim conclusions to report.

6. Stakeholder Analysis

Summarise the project's engagement with stakeholders including users.

Project partner engagement

All four primary project partners have worked together to recruit new staff. The Kultur discussion list is in regular use, and the partners have reviewed and offered feedback on the project plan.

User engagement

The project partners have been actively engaging with different user groups. The project has been publicised to audiences across departments within the partner institutions. At UCCA, for example, the Director of Library and Learning Centres (Rosemary Lynch) has publicised the project to management, research, teaching and library stakeholders. The UCCA Research Policy and Development Committee have received regular progress updates, and information about the project has been included in RAE submission documentation and the Research Degree student prospectus. The project has been promoted within the Library and Learning Services department via a presentation and the departmental newsletter. Informing the Teaching Learning and Assessment committee about the project has also helped to secure some Teaching, Learning and Research funds to facilitate stakeholder engagement as the project unfolds.

Some briefing document templates have also been written, which can be adapted for use with different user groups within all three HEIs. These explain the aims and outcomes of the project to different stakeholders, foregrounding information management benefits to a library audience, and stressing increased research visibility to academic end users.

As part of their ongoing work on an Images Application Profile for Repositories, the VADS has also been publicising the Kultur project to the digitisation community.

The enhancement of the research repository at Southampton takes place against a background of increasing engagement of the arts community with IR. This is clearly evidenced in recent research carried out by the EPrints team into usage patterns of the Southampton repository. As Les Carr's report shows (see Appendix B), the most downloaded output during the period of the study was a non-textual artefact from the Winchester School of Art. These findings will play a valuable role in future stakeholder engagement.

7. Risk Analysis

Summarise any problems that have occurred and any mitigating actions taken.

The late start of the project has increased the risk of the schedule overrunning. However, the timescale for individual tasks has been re-assessed and more of the workpackages will now be carried out consecutively to ensure that the original project deadline is met.

8. Standards

Note any changes in the standards to be used and the reasons.
No changes in standards at this stage.

9. Technical Development

Note any changes in the development approach or technologies to be used and the reasons.
No changes in the development approach or technologies at this stage.

10. Intellectual Property Rights

Summarise progress clearing any third-party rights.
None at this stage

Project Resources

11. Project Partners

Explain any changes to the institutional project partners or subcontractors, and any impacts this has/will have on the project or schedule.

VADS/AHDS Visual Arts

The AHDS Visual Arts (now the VADS) will undergo institutional change in the near future, due to the AHRC's decision to cease AHDS funding from April 2008. AHDS Visual Arts remain fully and positively committed to the project, but because of these environmental changes, some rethinking of the ways in which they will work with the other project partners is required.

Since the start of the project, our main contact at Leiden University, Marlon Domingus (project manager, Open Access Leiden), has left his post and has not yet been replaced. However, as an associate rather than a primary project partner, it is not expected that this will hinder the progress of the project. Remaining Leiden team members have expressed that they are happy to remain associated with the project.

What other institutions or organisations are you or do you plan to collaborate with?

The project has already made links with the Arts Institute at Bournemouth, and plans to make further links with University College, Falmouth, and Goldsmiths, University of London. The project also aims to increase the involvement of the John Hansard Gallery, based at the Southampton University Campus. These institutions will be invited to participate in the forthcoming advocacy workshop in November. The workshop will thus bring together many of the major stakeholders – IR developers, HE arts institutions, and a broader arts community – in order to agree a framework of best practice for advocacy, which will be further developed in light of the environmental assessment.

12. Project Management

Note any changes in project staff or their roles since the last report. Briefly explain any problems or gaps with staffing and the effect this has had on the project schedule.

There have been some delays with recruitment resulting in a later start for the project. The project manager has been in post since the 14th September 2007, and the EPrints technical officer has been working on the project since 1st September. The project officers at each of the Arts Institutions have now been recruited: Andrew Gray, officer at University of the Arts London, will start on the 6th November 2007 and Dominic Persad, officer at University College for the Creative Arts, starts on the 19th November 2007.

The bi-weekly repository group meetings at Southampton have played an important role in steering the work of the project manager, and in steering links with related projects, both within the University of Southampton and externally.

Now that the staff who make up the Project Management Group have all been recruited, we are in a position to make final decisions about the constitution of the Project Board, whose role is to oversee the project, to advise on potential political issues and to contribute to dissemination. Arrangements will be finalised at the partner meeting on 31st October.

13. Programme Support

Summarise contact with/influence of the programme, e.g. with the programme manager, formal or informal links with other projects, or programme-related activities.

The project manager has had regular email contact with the programme manager during this reporting period. The programme manager has offered extensive support, including detailed guidance on various aspects of the project documentation and start-up procedures.

The project manager, the UAL project officer and UAL Learning Resources Manager are attending a Repositories Support Project (RSP) Professional Briefing and Networking event series for Repository Administrators on the 1st November 2007, at UCCA, Farnham. The project manager is also attending a JISC project management training event for projects on 7th November.

What further support would you like from the programme, e.g. guidance, workshops, etc?

Do you have any suggestions for improving the programme?

14. Budget

Use the budget template to report expenditure against and attach as Appendix A. Explain the reasons for any significant overspend or underspend.

Because of the late start of the project, the expenditure for this reporting period is significantly below the budget. This underspend is due to late recruitment, and the date for the partner institutions to start their quarterly invoicing of Southampton has been put back until their project staff are in post. As a result, this budget report does not include UAL and UCCA costs to date. However, now that all the project staff have been recruited, we are on track to catch up with the original budget over the next reporting period and the following year.

If any underspent budget remains at the end of the next reporting period, the project will consider how it could be used most effectively to help realise the overall aims of the project. Options include paying for additional VADS consultancy, external evaluation, or extra staff.

Detailed Project Planning

15. Workpackages

Report progress against plan, noting key activities during the reporting period. Explain why any targets haven't been met.

The project has met the targets outlined in the workpackages of the project plan for this reporting period, and is on track to meet forthcoming targets. See also section 4 of this report.

WP - 1 Project Management

The project plan and workpackages have been approved by the partners. They were delivered to, and approved by, the JISC programme manager on the 19th October 2007. Details of the project aims, methodology and staff, for dissemination via the JISC website, were also sent to the programme manager on the 19th October. This is the first bi-annual progress report, which will be delivered to JISC on the 26th October 2007.

WP 2 – Environmental Assessment

The first half of this assessment is currently being written. The external project review and the user study will both be completed by the end of December 2007.

WP 3 – Establishing Pilot Repositories

EPrints have set up a demonstrator model. This will play an important part in the advocacy workshop to be held in November, in which all the project partners and the project management group will play a part. Members of the EPrints team are also engaged with the VADS project on developing an image application profile for repositories, and are attending the first working group meeting of the project on 29th October.

List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.

Objectives for the next reporting period (Nov 07 – Apr 08)

WP 1 - Project Management

The project website will be live – it will provide information relevant to a range of audiences and will also make available the key project documentation. The project team will have liaised with other projects in the same programme and the project manager will also have attended the JISC programme meeting. Both the Project Management Group and the Project Board will have been set up.

WP 2 - Environmental Assessment

This WP will be completed. The environmental assessment reports will be disseminated via the project website, and their findings will inform the approach taken in the remaining workpackages, particularly software, metadata, rights, preservation and publicity workpackages.

WP 3 - Establishing pilot repositories

By April 2008, two pilot repositories, populated with examples of research from the partner institutions, will have been set up. Southampton will also have increased the cultural content of their existing repository, with input from the Winchester School of Arts. The Kultur project team will also exchange experience with institutions developing repositories aimed at similar user groups – particularly Goldsmiths, University of London and University College, Falmouth, who are engaged in the 'Storage Space' project - part of the same JISC programme as Kultur.

WP 4 - Designing metadata analysis and structures

The project management group will have completed a report evaluating metadata standards for visual and multimedia digital objects, and will have started developing a relevant metadata structure for non-text based outputs. This will make significant use of others' expertise in these areas – including VADS and those working on other JISC-funded projects.

WP 5 - Software enhancement

Testing and refinement of the metadata framework established in WP4 will have started. We will have devised user surveys to gain feedback on usability and interface design, and will also have started researching appropriate cross-repository linkages.

WP 6 - Rights issues

By April 2008, we will have reviewed rights issues relating to artistic outputs and established a best practice method. As with WP 4, decisions about rights policies will be influenced by the expertise of other organisations and projects.

WP 8 - Assessing author behaviours

A stakeholder survey, investigating the perceptions of the value and problems of the pilot repositories, will have been completed. This will then help us to enhance the repository and to develop policies for promoting, managing and populating the repository.

WP10 – Publicity, Evaluation and Impact

We will have started some early scoping work on this WP, by identifying practitioner and networking events at which to publicise the project and its findings.

16. Evaluation Plan

Report progress against plan, and note any evaluation results during the reporting period.

There are no evaluation results to report during this period, as none of the workpackages have yet been completed.

List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.
The evaluation objectives for the next reporting period are as outlined in the project plan.

17. Quality Assurance Plan

Report progress against plan, describe the QA procedures put in place, and any QA results during the reporting period.

There is a clear Quality Assurance procedure in place for checking project documentation. At present, while the project is in its early stages, these outputs got to the Southampton Repository Steering Group for approval, before being submitted to JISC. In future, however, the Project Management Group will take over this QA role.

List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.
The QA objectives for the next reporting period are as outlined in the project plan.

18. Dissemination Plan

Report progress against plan, noting dissemination done, whether you feel it was successful, and any publicity the project received during the reporting period. List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.

As outlined in section 6/stakeholder analysis of this progress report, the project has been publicised to a range of audiences, and in doing so we have met the targets set out in the dissemination plan for this reporting period.

The dissemination has taken a variety of forms, including a presentation (to the Library and Learning Service at UCCA), written documentation and handouts, and more informal verbal updates and networking. The Kultur jiscmail list is also being successfully used as a means of discussing the progress of the project, exchanging information, and sharing feedback. It is expected that the UCCA project officer, once in post, will be invited to give a detailed presentation to the Research Policy and Development Committee. During the next reporting period, the project team will work on identifying relevant external events at which to publicise the project. Presentation documentation and other dissemination material will be made available on the project website.

19. Exit/Sustainability Plan

Report progress against plan, noting any issues related to archiving, preservation, maintenance, supporting documentation, etc.

The exit and sustainability plan have not yet been implemented but the objectives remain as in the project plan.

List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.

Appendixes

Appendix A. Project Budget (removed from online version of report)

Appendix B. Leslie Carr, 'IRS Evaluation for University of Southampton'. A report on the application of RS download statistics software to Southampton's research repository (October 2007).