



Kultur Progress Report

Project Name	<i>Kultur, University of Southampton</i>
Project Website	<i>http://kultur.eprints.org</i>
Report compiled by	<i>Victoria Sheppard</i>
Reporting period	<i>May – Oct 08</i>
Section One: Summary	
<p>The project has made significant progress with its development of a creative arts IR model, and a framework for its use. The demonstrator repository has undergone a substantial process of development, informed by the findings of the project’s user analysis. The user interface has been greatly improved, with enhanced previewing, viewing and browsing capacities. It is now better suited to accommodating complex objects with multiple collaborators/contributors, objects identified as characteristic of research output in this sector. The repository contains over 250 records, and the project team have been increasingly active in promoting Kultur at external events and conferences. Over the last six months, the Kultur team have completed a series of detailed interviews with researchers. These have helped assess user working habits, identify likely barriers and incentives, and have provided an opportunity to publicise the project and to test out and evaluate the demo repository.</p> <p>A new metadata schema and revised workflow for depositing art items is in place, and is in the process of being tested. Under direction from VADS, the project is making progress with clarifying a common IPR policy, and has also come up with some practical solutions which offer depositors different options for protecting the copyright of their works. Usability tests will be carried out in the coming weeks, and the results will feed back into the final round of development on the demo repository. The project is on track for its target date of splitting the repository into separate IRs for UAL and UCA by January 2009. Plans for integrating the WSA component of Kultur into the existing Southampton repository have been finalised, and have been written in to the schedule and iteration plan for the repository upgrade to eprints 3.1 in Spring 2009.</p>	
Section Two: Activities and Progress	
<p>.</p> <p>Please see appendix A</p>	
Section Three: Institutional & Project Partner Issues	
<p>During this reporting period, the University of the Creative Arts has acquired University status. Such institutional changes make the aims of the Kultur project, and the launch of UCA’s own separate IR, particularly timely. The change in status offers an ideal opportunity for promoting the role and value of an IR in supporting the institution’s research culture.</p>	
Section Four: Outputs and Deliverables	

- Kultur demonstrator <http://kultur-demo2.eprints.org>
- Survey write-up (Jul 08) (attached)
- IPR paper (Aug 08) (attached)
- Presentation materials – Arlis workshop powerpoint <http://kultur.eprints.org/docs/ARLIS%20presentation%20UCA.ppt>, Edinburgh Repositories Fringe powerpoint, <http://kultur.eprints.org/docs/repositories%20fringe%20ppt.ppt>
- Promotional materials, see <http://kultur.eprints.org/documents.htm>
- First draft of interview write-up (Oct 08) (attached)

Section Five: Outcomes and Lessons Learned

Lessons learned include:

- There is an increasing sense that the creative and applied arts community may use a repository in quite a different way to other research communities. Personal websites are commonplace in this sector as a means of representing/promoting an artist's work, and many of the researchers spoken to like the idea of being able to use the repository as an alternative to a personal website, with the University taking on responsibility for hosting and maintaining the site. This is a useful way of advocating the project to researchers, though it also requires some extra capabilities to be built in, such as space for artist-level information (eg. an artist's statement). Researchers in the creative arts are also interested in the potential of a repository as a space for storing large digital works in progress, and sharing ongoing works with collaborators.
- This research community also provides a different perspective on issues of open access – while the opportunity for increased visibility is widely welcomed, some are keen to distinguish between the visibility and reuse of their work. Consequently, there is a need for a creative arts repository to be able to offer increased visibility, without making works easily downloadable, where desired by the depositor.
- Aesthetics continue to be a major consideration in attempts to retain visitors to an arts repository. The browsing process needs to be as visual as possible, and to provide opportunities for lateral browsing.

Section Six: Evaluation

- Formative evaluation has been undertaken according to the project plan. Progress with reaching milestones, adherence to the project timescales, budgetary expenditure, the effectiveness of the project management, and the appropriate targeting of advocacy activities, have all been monitored by the quarterly project management group meetings and fortnightly meetings of the project manager and project officers. Evaluation is also provided via the Kultur discussion list at specific stages of work packages – for example when draft versions of project deliverables have been written, or when a round of development on the demo is completed.
- The interviews with researchers offered some detailed evaluation on the project's aims and strategies. They have played a central role in assessing the design and functionality of the repository, and in clarifying the value of a repository to researchers in different contexts and situations.
- The Repositories Support Project (RSP) has provided some external evaluation on the demo repository, and offered detailed recommendations on the content and methodology of the Kultur usability tests
- The project has set some additional quantitative targets to evaluate each institution's progress with populating the repository. By the time of the demo split at the end of 2008, WSA aims to have deposited 50 items in the demo, and UAL and UCA 100 each.

Section Seven: Dissemination

The work of the Kultur project has been publicised at a number of events both internally and externally, which include:

Internal

- Interviews conducted with researchers as part of the user analysis proved an effective means of disseminating the project to academic stakeholders, discussing aims and answering questions.
- Poster at UCA Research Conference
- Presentations to research committees
- Meetings with research centre administrators
- Kultur updates at staff meetings
- Meetings with teaching and learning coordinators, CLIP CETL (UAL), postgraduate course committee, and graduate school director (WSA)
- Presentations to library staff
- Informal promotion of Kultur via attendance at launches and at undergraduate/postgraduate private views
- Informal meetings with individual researchers

External

- Kultur demo at JISC Innovation Forum, Keele, July 08
- Kultur workshop at ARLIS UK and Ireland Conference, Liverpool, July 08
- Presentation with Katharine Ellis of PRIMO project, on the challenges of creating multimedia repositories, Repositories Fringe, Edinburgh, August 08
- Martin Flynn (V&A) talked about the project at the IFLA Section of Art Libraries Pre-Conference on art documentation, Montreal, August 08
- Kultur is discussed in a related article by Martin Flynn appearing in a forthcoming issue of Art Libraries Journal.
- Project promoted to external visitors – including the Executive Director of RLUK, and a representative from Queensland University of Technology ePrints. The project has shared experience with University College of Borås, Sweden, who are conducting a study of open access representation of art and design research, and Southampton is hosting a visit from them in January 09. The project has also created/sustained links with external arts organisations - the Arts Institute at Bournemouth, Goldsmiths University of London, and Glasgow School of Art.
- Kultur team have shared knowledge with other projects and repository staff through attending various workshops and training events – LIFE2 conference (British Library), JISC Repositories for Teaching & Learning workshop (Worcester), JISC Rights and Repositories event (London), ARLIS workshop - Building an Accessible Moving Image Repository.

Section Eight: Risks, Issues and Challenges

Issues and challenges faced are now mainly to do with policy, and relate to longer term strategies for embedding the separate repositories within the infrastructure of each institution at the end of the project.

Policies to be decided on include:

Inclusion policy – will there be restrictions on quantities and formats of work that can be deposited? What kind of quality control will each institution require and who will act as the repository 'gatekeepers'? What working definition of 'research' should be used in communicating an inclusion policy and what kind of scope will there be to encompass other types of output?

Staffing and resources – what kind of resources will be available to support the repository and to assist depositors? Resources will impact upon whether a self-archiving or a mediated deposit model is the best path to follow.

The notes from the project management meetings reflect the preparatory work and institutional targets required for shaping these policies.

Integration with IT systems and support

A meeting at UAL in September discussed different options for server provision and hosting for the IRs at UCA and UAL. It brought together members of the IT/IT&T teams at each institution with eprints services, and has set targets required to finalise these arrangements in advance of December 08.

Section Nine: Collaboration and Support

Some of the areas where advice would be useful relate specifically to the arts sector, and so sharing experience with arts administrators (who may be outside of the repository community) would be valuable at this stage. Advice on the uses of subject classification for categorising outputs in the creative and applied arts, and their potential application to repositories, would be particularly useful.

Section Ten: Financial Statement

Section Eleven: Next Steps

In this section you should very briefly list the activities planned and/ other information of relevance for the next stage of the project.

Planned activities for the next two months are:

- Conduct usability tests (Oct 08)
- Final round of demo repository development, based on feedback currently collecting, and on results from usability tests (Nov-Dec 08)
- Complete IPR recommendations on copyright clearing procedures, fair use, and produce IPR guidelines for depositors and repository staff (Dec 08)
- Servers in place at UAL and UCA (Nov 08)
- Demo repository split into separate IRs for UAL and UCA (Dec 08-Jan 09)
- Plan final dissemination event and launch (Dec 08, in time for end of project, Mar 09)

Appendix A: Activities and Progress

WP 1: Project management

- The Project Management Group has met every three months. As well as overseeing and evaluating the day to day activity of the project, these meetings have provided an opportunity to discuss policy issues. In addition to the project officers, project manager and Southampton repository manager (chair), these have also been attended by representatives of the partner institutions and VADS.
- An additional programme of informal fortnightly meetings has been set up, attended by the project officers, technical officer and project manager. These focus specifically on issues surrounding the demo development
- The Kultur Steering Group has been sent an update on the project, and is due to meet again in March 2009.
- Liaison with the Repository Steering Group at Southampton (fortnightly meetings) has helped to locate the project outcomes in relation to broader repository developments and other projects led by Southampton. It is also used as an opportunity to report the progress of the project to the project director.
- Project website has been maintained and updated with project deliverables
- Regular reporting to JISC

WP 2: Environmental assessment

- Institutional profiles and projects/literature reviews were completed in the last reporting period
- A report on the findings of the Kultur Project Survey, completed by 200 academics across the partner institutions, was completed in August 08. The analysis was assisted by a social surveys researcher at the University of Southampton.
- The case studies and report on findings has developed into a more substantial activity than anticipated in the project plan. This work now overlaps with WP 7 – assessing author behaviours. The project team has conducted detailed face-to-face interviews with over 15 members of research staff. A first draft of the report on these interviews, identifying themes in user working patterns and various user scenarios, has been completed (Oct 08)

WP 3: Establishing pilot repositories for partners

- As reported in the previous progress report, it was agreed that a common, joint demonstrator repository would be more effective for the project than creating individual repositories at this stage. The demo will be split into distinct institutional repositories in January 2009
- The demo now contains over 250 full-content records of art works, installations, exhibitions, performances and video works, and has played a central role in advocacy activities

WP 4: Designing metadata analysis and structures

- The metadata structure has evolved following direct advice from stakeholders – including individual researchers, research offices, the Kultur Steering Group and from VADS. It has also developed through a process of trial and error using the expanding number of items in the repository.
- Document-level metadata is now in place.
- The workflow for the depositing process has been altered for visual/multimedia items, to enable a more fluid process. It has been split into a series of short, non-mandatory stages and the process is more visual, with uploaded images visible to the depositor throughout the process.
- Formal subject classification has been removed from the depositing process for art items. In its place, depositors are given more freedom to assign multiple categories to their work, which allow them to indicate a discipline area as well as whether something is a record of an exhibition. Uncontrolled keywords have also been given a more prominent place in the depositing process. Depending on the final requirements of each institution, the subjects stage may be reintroduced to each IR at a later stage, for example, the organisational hierarchy may be used to generate subject areas according to staff IDs.
- The metadata phrases and the help text have been rewritten to suit the range of art outputs the repository is designed for.

WP 5: Software enhancement

- Obtaining feedback on the repository interface has been an ongoing process. Comments from the user interviews, advocacy activities and demonstrations have all fed back into the development of the repository

- The work undertaken by the technical officers on developing the visual presentation of objects has been far more substantial than anticipated in the project plan.
- Usability tests have now been incorporated into this work package, scheduled for the end of October. These will be conducted on an individual basis with a small number of testers (5-6), who will be videoed using the repository to carry out a series of tasks. The findings of these tests will inform the final stage of the demo development, and will provide a valuable opportunity for identifying any problems with the user interface, the metadata and the depositing process.

WP 6: Rights issues

- VADS have completed a discussion paper and a set of recommendations on the requirements for intellectual property processes and guidelines for setting up IRs at each institution (Aug 08). This recommends a common approach to IR IP management across all of the institutions, using the Southampton model of IP Management Process as a basis. Southampton policy documents will need adapting to make them relevant to the arts, and IP guidelines for users will need developing from scratch. A timescale is in place for the remaining phases and deliverables of this work package, as follows:
- Steps for clearing copyright in various scenarios and recommendations on managing paper trails (Nov 08)
- Recommendations on fair use applications for repository setting (Dec 08)
- Easy to follow guidelines for both repository staff and depositors (Dec 08)

WPs 7 and 8: Assessing author behaviours and the responses of multiple audiences

There is some overlap with the activities in the Environmental Assessment WP here (WP2)

- The Kultur survey and the follow-up interviews have investigated different institutional stakeholders' perceptions of the value and problems of the repository. The interviewees represented a broad cross section of institutional stakeholders –researchers, teaching and learning staff, research directors, and a curator.
- The project has produced two reports based on the findings of these investigations which outline the cultural barriers and incentives for institutional stakeholders and requirements for enhancing the repository.
- The project still needs to assess the responses of artistic and cultural audiences outside of HE.

WP 9: Data curation and preservation

- At Southampton, the requirements of the project have contributed to the formation and development of the Institutional Data Preservation Group. This group looks at the lifecycle of data and makes links with broader work on data curation being carried out by JISC and RIN.
- The project is also making links with preservation projects, and discussions are underway regarding a direct collaboration with PRESERV2. Kultur material will be offered as a case study for the project's investigation of distributed preservation services for repositories.
- Kultur will be demonstrated at the forthcoming 4th International Digital Curation Conference in Edinburgh (Dec 08)
- Project representatives are also attending the DPC/RSP/DCC/JISC workshop 'Tackling the Preservation Challenge: Practical Steps for Repository Managers' (Dec 08)

WP 10: Publicity, evaluation and impact

- Publicity activities are outlined in section 7 of this progress report
- Evaluation outlined in section 6