



Grant Agreement 270939

ENUMERATE

Core Survey 1 Methodology

Deliverable number	<i>D2.4</i>
Dissemination level	<i>Public</i>
Delivery date	<i>November 2011 [Revised May 2012]</i>
Status	<i>Final [Revised after Review]</i>
Author(s)	<i>Gerhard Jan Nauta, Sjoerd Bakker, and Marco de Niet (DEN)</i>



This project is funded under the
ICT Policy Support Programme part of the
Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme.

Contents

1	SUMMARY	5
2	DEFINING THE CULTURAL HERITAGE DOMAIN	5
3	OVERALL APPROACH: THE COHERENCY OF THE SURVEYS.....	6
3.1	<i>Differences between NUMERIC and ENUMERATE approach</i>	<i>6</i>
3.2	<i>Core Surveys</i>	<i>6</i>
3.3	<i>Thematic Survey</i>	<i>6</i>
4	OBJECTIVES: THE STATE OF DIGITISATION IN FOUR DOMAINS	7
4.1	<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>7</i>
4.2	<i>Digitisation activity.....</i>	<i>7</i>
4.3	<i>Access to digitised materials</i>	<i>7</i>
4.4	<i>Digitisation costs.....</i>	<i>7</i>
4.5	<i>Digital preservation</i>	<i>8</i>
5	APPROACH: STEPS TO IMPLEMENT THE CORE SURVEYS.....	8
6	THE CONTENTS OF THE CORE SURVEY (QUESTIONNAIRE)	9
6.1	<i>The NUMERIC short ‘Core’ questionnaire</i>	<i>9</i>
6.2	<i>A detailed version, based on input from SIG-STATS and ENUMERATE consortium.....</i>	<i>9</i>
6.3	<i>Reviewing.....</i>	<i>9</i>
6.4	<i>Test version of the Core Survey.....</i>	<i>9</i>
7	THE SIZE OF SAMPLES PER MEMBER STATE	10
7.1	<i>NUMERIC vs. ENUMERATE</i>	<i>10</i>
7.2	<i>Defining the ‘universe’ and determining overall sample size.....</i>	<i>11</i>
7.3	<i>Target samples per EU member state.....</i>	<i>13</i>
7.4	<i>Additional sample requirements</i>	<i>14</i>
8	THE COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE PER MEMBER STATE	15
8.1	<i>NUMERIC Approach</i>	<i>15</i>
8.2	<i>ENUMERATE Approach</i>	<i>15</i>
8.3	<i>Target sizes per heritage domain for the EU member states</i>	<i>15</i>
9	TRANSLATIONS.....	17
10	CORE SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION PHASE	18
10.1	<i>Invited institutions per member state.....</i>	<i>18</i>
10.2	<i>Reaching institutions through alternative channels</i>	<i>18</i>
10.3	<i>Announcing the Core Survey</i>	<i>18</i>
10.4	<i>Responding to questions from the institutions and other communications during the survey period</i>	<i>18</i>

10.5	<i>An overview of the Activities of the National Coordinators</i>	19
11	GUIDANCE MATERIALS	21
12	REFERENCES	21
13	ANNEXES	22
	<i>Annex 1: NUMERIC SHORT ‘CORE’ QUESTIONNAIRE (May 2009)</i>	22
	<i>Annex 2: ENUMERATE Draft ‘Core’ Questionnaire (v 27 June 2011)</i>	23
	<i>Annex 3: ENUMERATE Draft Core Questionnaire (v 1 November, 2011)</i>	26
	<i>Annex 4: Guide to Testing the ENUMERATE Core Survey (v 25 October 2011)</i>	33

1 Summary

This report summarises the ENUMERATE Core Survey 1 methodology. The aim is to document the agreement that has been reached in the ENUMERATE Thematic Network on the content and composition of the survey, and on the approach chosen to prepare and conduct the survey, in order to collect high level data on the digitisation of cultural heritage in the EU.¹

The final result is an online questionnaire and a set of guidelines, published in English. Through the national coordinators, a group of experts from all EU member states, the survey will be translated into all the major EU languages.

2 Defining the cultural heritage domain

The population of the ENUMERATE surveys consists of the European memory institutions:

- Museums;
- Libraries;
- Archives and records offices;
- Audio-visual and film archives;
- Organisations with curatorial care for monuments, sites and the historic environment;
- Hybrid types of organisations.

The criterion is here that curatorial care for, at least part of, the collections of the institution are included in its mission. Institutions that do not hold heritage collections or that have collections of heritage materials (like for example of books, films, and music) to be lent by or sold to contemporary users without the explicit task of safeguarding the collections for future generations, will not be included in the survey. This essentially leaves out both school libraries (which were not taken into consideration by NUMERIC either) and public libraries without cultural heritage collections.

¹ The methodology needs a final reviewing by experts to make sure the survey will be statistically sound, focusing on basic measures for growth, access and the costs of digitisation. The methodology will emphasise cross-domain and international portability.

3 Overall approach: The coherency of the surveys

3.1 Differences between NUMERIC and ENUMERATE approach

The main instrument of the NUMERIC survey was an extensive questionnaire, developed to measure the state of art in three areas of cultural heritage digitisation:

- The costs of digitisation;
- The growth of heritage collections;
- Access to digital heritage collections in the EU.

The size of the NUMERIC questionnaire was problematic. In the ENUMERATE Thematic Network the original NUMERIC survey will be split up into two Core Surveys (2011 and 2013) and one Thematic Survey (2012).

3.2 Core Surveys

The **Core Surveys** (implemented in the first and third year of the programme) are designed to be simple and quick to complete, to be distributed through the national coordinators to the base of cultural heritage institutions across Europe. The aim is to generate a reliable baseline from which to extrapolate a general picture of national and European activities. The surveys will be based on the 'short core questionnaire' that was recommended in the NUMERIC Study Report (see *Annex 2*), with a focus on high level information on investments, outputs and access to digitised materials.

3.3 Thematic Survey

The **Thematic Survey** is more in-depth and designed to assess digitisation, digital preservation, usage and cost in greater detail, in order to build up a more granular picture of overall activity and best practices. The thematic surveys will use the original extensive NUMERIC questionnaire as a starting point, in order to guarantee a high degree of continuity between NUMERIC and ENUMERATE. However the methodology for the thematic survey will be based on thorough evaluation in ENUMERATE expert groups in order to remove the flaws from the NUMERIC questionnaire, as advised by the SIG-STATS.²

² The SIG-STATS was a Special Interest Group, supported by the European Commission, for the collection of statistics on the digitisation of cultural materials in Europe. Refer to: http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/telearn-digicult/sig-stat_en.pdf

4 Objectives: the state of digitisation in four domains

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of the Core Surveys is to gather general information on the state of digitisation in Europe's museums, archives and libraries. The information is needed to get an understanding of the progress that has been made since the earlier NUMERIC survey was conducted, and to create a sound baseline of data aimed at monitoring digitisation in the cultural heritage field. The ultimate goal is to achieve a situation where:

- Informed decisions about national and EU policies are possible, top down;
- Enable cultural heritage organisations measure their progress in the field;
- Enable organisations make decisions of a practical nature: *Do I pay fair prices for digitisation services? Should I change my priorities concerning collection digitisation?*

In the four topics that the ENUMERATE Core Surveys will focus on we have formulated a series of questions that are important for decision making in the field of digital heritage at an institutional level, on a national scale, and internationally (in Europe). Ideally an analysis of the survey results will lead to answers to most of the questions posed below.

4.2 Digitisation activity

- How many of the cultural heritage objects in Europe have been digitised in total by the end of 2010?
- How did the digitisation of cultural heritage develop over the years? Is there an increase in activity?
- How many cultural heritage institutions have taken up the task of digitising their collections in a systematic way?
- What is the change in the numbers of institutions that digitise cultural heritage?
- What types of collections have been digitised the most?
- What is the size of born digital heritage collections in Europe?

4.3 Access to digitised materials

- How much of the cultural heritage that has been digitised is freely available to the public?
- How much of the cultural heritage that has been digitised is not available to the public?
- How do the cultural heritage institutions measure the use of their digital collections?
- Do the cultural heritage institutions apply key performance indicators based on user statistics?
- How much do the cultural heritage institutions spend on clearing copyright for their collections?
- Do the cultural heritage institutions use different quality criteria for different user groups while digitising their collections?

4.4 Digitisation costs

- How much did the digitisation of cultural heritage in Europe cost in the past year (2010)?
- How much of the regular institutional budget is used for digitisation purposes?
- What is the contribution of the EU and national governments to digitisation of cultural heritage?
- What is the investment of private parties in the digitisation of cultural heritage?
- What is the contribution in time of regular staff or volunteers to digitisation activities?
- How much investment is needed for all planned digitisation activities in the next 5 years?

4.5 Digital preservation

- How many of the digitisation activities are aimed at enhancing preservation of the cultural heritage?
- How many of the cultural heritage institutions in Europe handle digital preservation in a systematic way?
- How many of the cultural heritage institutions in Europe have outsourced the safe storage of their digital heritage collections?
- How many digital heritage repositories are there in Europe?
- How many of the cultural heritage institutions are actively collecting and managing born digital heritage?
- What institutions prefer offline storage for preservation instead of online storage?

5 Approach: steps to implement the Core Surveys

The preparation and implementation of the Core Surveys consisted of the following activities:

1. Establishing roles and responsibilities;
2. Specifying information needs;
3. Estimating the size and composition of the cultural heritage domain in the EU;
4. Developing the survey, based on the information needs;
5. Testing and refining the survey;
6. Determining the sample size and composition of samples of each member state;
7. Implementing the survey;
8. Coordinate and offer (online) support.

In the next section we will first discuss the procedure that was followed to establish the contents of the questionnaire (Section 6). The subsequent chapters focus on determining the size (Sec. 7) and composition (Sec. 8) of the sample. Translating and managing the Core Survey, and especially the role of the National Coordinators and the support that will be offered by the ENUMERATE Team is the subject of Sections 9 to 11.

6 The contents of the Core Survey (Questionnaire)

6.1 The NUMERIC short ‘Core’ questionnaire

In a review of the NUMERIC survey instruments the NUMERIC project comes to the notable conclusion that simplicity “is clearly of the essence.”³ Based on that starting point the NUMERIC team set out an indication of the form a short ‘Core’ survey might take. (See: *Annex 2*.) The main headings of the short questionnaire proposal were congruent with the main themes of the NUMERIC survey:

- Investment in digitisation;
- Outputs;
- Access to digitised materials.

The proposal was taken as a starting point for the development of the ENUMERATE Core Survey.

6.2 A detailed version, based on input from SIG-STATS and ENUMERATE consortium

The NUMERIC proposal was extensively discussed in the SIG-STATS meeting of February 2010. In the SIG-STATS group there was widespread consensus about the need to simplify the NUMERIC questionnaire, but it was generally felt that the NUMERIC proposal was actually too simple. This was most evident in the Output section, where only very broad classes of analogue materials were proposed (pages of written/image materials; hours of audio-visual materials; metres of archive material; and all other objects in collections). These classes were indeed more or less deduced from the very detailed and thus rather problematic table used to measure the number of objects in European museums, libraries and archives. However the SIG-STATS was convinced that the idea of using the seemingly more simple categories was based on the erroneous assumption that it would be feasible for heritage institutions to convert the volume of realized and planned digitisation of their rich and varied collections into these few broad output measures. Besides this there would be a considerable risk of confusion over the appropriate allocation of object types.

Another adaptation was the inclusion of the topic of digital preservation, which was not covered as such in the NUMERIC survey. Furthermore the SIG-STATS deemed it necessary to initiate researching the state of affairs in the domain of born digital heritage.

In line with these considerations a first draft of the ENUMERATE Core Survey was designed by the WP 2 leaders, DEN. Special attention was given to dealing to the maximum with the questions covered by the four headings in the preceding chapter of this report. A section on Scene-setting information (e.g. name of institution, and name of respondent) preceded this, and another section, offering the opportunity to add any free remarks, was added at the end. It was evident that a balance between the need for brevity and the need to get relevant and in depth information could not easily be met. Some of the initial questions could not be incorporated without violating the need for brevity.

6.3 Reviewing

The initial ENUMERATE Draft ‘Core’ Questionnaire (version 27 June 2011, see *Annex 2*) was extensively reviewed, both within the consortium and among external professionals. A first draft was subject of two reviewing sessions in the Member States Expert Group meeting of June 27th, 2011 and the result of this was presented to both the MSEG and the ENUMERATE consortium.

6.4 Test version of the Core Survey

On November 15th the test version was implemented and made available online by WP 3 leader DIGIBIS, using the survey software of LimeSurvey. Consortium members were asked to invite an average of 10 institutions to participate in testing. A short *Guide to Testing the ENUMERATE Core Survey* (version 25 October 2011) was used to assist the ENUMERATE partners in composing appropriate groups of testing institutions (refer to *Annex 4*).

³ “Simplicity is clearly of the essence. Therefore, the approach for future years needs to be sufficiently uncomplicated to be capable: (1) of endorsement by all ministries; and (2) of being presented in a manner which capitalises on the fact that the initial effort to establish the base provides for a less intensive approach to sustain the series.” [NUMERIC Study Report, p.78]

7 The size of samples per member state

7.1 NUMERIC vs. ENUMERATE

The respondent universe for this survey consists of the ‘memory institutions’ in all 27 EU member states. A widely accepted grouping within this universe is along museums, libraries, and archives. Within these broad classes of memory institutions the following subgroups can be discerned, which comes close to the subclasses in the NUMERIC project⁴:

- **Museums:** state-owned museums; local and or regional museums; other museums
- **Libraries:** national libraries; research libraries, higher education libraries; special libraries
- **Archives:** state archives; city archives; records offices; audio-visual archives

There are only few sources that can be used to get a grip on the actual numbers of institutions in the EU. But before we can consider the size of the universe in the ENUMERATE Core Survey, a fundamental difference between the survey methodology of NUMERIC and ENUMERATE must be clarified.

NUMERIC Approach

In the Numeric methodology the universe was defined as the **relevant institutions**⁵ (archives, AV institutes, museums, libraries, other) in each of the 27 member states.

Based on initial estimates in the so-called Foundation database, and adjusted on the basis of estimates by the national coordinators for each participating country, the NUMERIC team came to a fixed number of relevant institutions per EU member state. The number of relevant institutions in all EU member states was estimated to be 5752. (NUMERIC estimated the total number of all institutions in Europe to be about 106,000.⁶ This included public libraries, but excluded school libraries.)

The NUMERIC guideline sample consisted of 1489 institutions; which is about 25% of the potential respondent universe. Based on a specific distribution procedure the guideline sample size per member state was determined. Just to give an idea of the outcome of this procedure: for 8 EU countries the guideline sample size was about 100. The smallest sample size was 9. On average it was 57. The adopted sample was slightly different (1539 institutions in all). The response rate was 788. Please note that guideline and adopted samples in the NUMERIC approach were not intended to support producing statistically valid results on a national scale.⁷

ENUMERATE Approach

In the ENUMERATE approach, following the advice of the SIG-STATS group, the starting point is not to include qualitative assessments of cultural value (relevant institutions) in deciding on the survey sample. In the ENUMERATE methodology the universe is defined as **all memory institutions** (archives, AV institutes, museums, libraries or combinations thereof) in each of the 27 member states. SIG-STATS: “Every institution that belongs to this domain, whether publicly or privately funded, whether actively involved with digitisation or not, may contribute to the Study.”

As a consequence a much more substantial number of institutions had to be considered: ENUMERATE will start from NUMERIC’s estimate of all institutions in Europe (about 106,000). This increase in volume of the population is partly compensated for by restricting the survey to institutions with a mission for collection care and long term curation. This excludes public and school libraries as a separate category. The sum total of European memory institutions - the population for the ENUMERATE Core Survey - will be between 40,000 and 45,000.⁸ Public libraries with special collections have still been invited to participate under the category ‘other libraries’.⁹

⁴ See: Sheet A ~ Pro-forma Foundation Quota (available at <http://www.numeric.ws/>, accessed 22/10/2011).

⁵ “Relevant institutions are considered to be those where digitisation of collections will significantly enhance access to the nation’s cultural heritage. These are the main archives, film and broadcasting institutes, libraries and museums. It is a matter of judgement, based on local knowledge, which amongst the country’s institutions fall into this category. “ [NUMERIC Study Report, p.187]

⁶ NUMERIC Study Report, p.22.

⁷ Refer to Table 3 - Institutions per country in the guideline and adopted samples - of the NUMERIC Study Report (p.30) for guideline and adopted samples.

⁸ In the pre- NUMERIC Foundation database the estimate for all public libraries in Europe was 67,996. The 2008 summed up estimate of the national coordinators was 60,587. Subtracting these figures from the estimate of all institutions in Europe leaves a sum total of somewhere between 40,000 and 45,000.

⁹ NUMERIC Study Report, p.14.

Ideally all EU “memory institutions” should be invited and should be actively encouraged to participate in the survey. In that ideal scenario, depending on the response rate per EU member state, the statistical validity of results for individual countries and specific subsectors of the cultural heritage domain (e.g. state-owned museums, national libraries, regional archives, etc.) could be evaluated in the analysis phase. On pragmatic grounds - the budget for doing the survey is insufficient for a thorough invitation round, covering all memory institutions in all EU member states and the subsequent chasing of all respondents; the necessary contact lists of memory institutions are still unavailable in a substantial number of countries - the ENUMERATE methodology aims at collecting representative data for the EU as a whole - as was the ambition of the NUMERIC survey, allowing to derive statements about digitisation issues in broad sub-domains like: museums, libraries, archives and audio-visual/film institutions.¹⁰ In Section 7.2 the chosen approach for a sampling method will be explained.

The precondition is that the methodology should somehow ascertain that the sum total of responding institutions across individual countries approaches to a random sample for the sub-domain in the EU as a whole. Much will depend on how the national coordinators - appointed on the recommendation of the Member States Expert Group by their national governments - will succeed in composing appropriate samples in their respective countries. That the national coordinators have been appointed with the task to represent the full heritage domain in their countries is to some extent a guarantee that an EU wide sample will be balanced. In Chapter 8 the procedure to draw samples per member state is explained in more detail.

In the analysis phase of Core Survey 1 special attention will be given to the successfulness of the chosen methodology. A key topic will be whether it is possible to devise alternative methods of collecting data, allowing one to make statistical statements with greater specificity. The time between Core Survey 1 and Core Survey 2 will be used to refine and update the methodology.

7.2 Defining the ‘universe’ and determining overall sample size

To establish its own potential respondent universe ENUMERATE had to rely on baseline data from the NUMERIC project, since statistical information about the cultural heritage sector on international scale is scattered.¹¹ NUMERIC constructed a so-called foundation database, summarizing data from various sources, in order to have baseline estimates of the size and composition of the cultural heritage field in the EU member states.¹² The national coordinators were asked to check and correct these initial estimates. Both the estimates from the foundation database and the numbers provided by the national coordinators in the various EU member states are relevant for the procedure described below.¹³

Based on the research of NUMERIC the universe consists of about 110,000 institutions. The estimates of the NUMERIC foundation database and national coordinators for the different cultural heritage institution types from 2008 are given in rows 1 and 2 of Table 1 (below). Row 3 contains recent ENUMERATE estimates, based on averaging the earlier estimates while skipping the top outliers for all classes but the museums, where outliers were less apparent. The estimate for the class of ‘Other institutions’ is a set number. Public Libraries are left out, as was proposed in the SIG-STATS.

¹⁰ Results of the survey are intended to supplement the biannual reporting on digitisation issues on a national scale by the Member States Expert Group (MSEG) in May.

¹¹ EUROSTAT does not yet initiate cross-national research in cultural heritage statistics by itself. The data that are available through Eurostat lack the level of detail needed here.

¹² Cf. the archived NUMERIC website on: <http://www.numeric.ws/> (accessed 22/10/2011).

¹³ In preparation of the Core Survey the national coordinators will again be asked to make new estimates of the number of heritage institutions in their countries. The data thus collected may alter some of the numbers, but will not essentially change the methodology proposed here.

Table 1: The size of the cultural heritage domain.

	Archives and Record Offices	A-V / Film Inst's	National Libraries	Higher Education Libraries	Special Libraries	State-owned Museum	Local Government Museum	Other Public Museum	Other	All Institutions
Foundation estimate	766	29	107	10233	19988	2462	9616	2221	-	113418
National coordinator estimate	5194	257	1098	5915	16555	5661	7467	1725	77	104536
ENUMERATE estimate	2023	93	85	7773	17555	4062	8542	1973	1000	43106

As explained above (Section 7.1) in order to arrive at a realistic target number for the ENUMERATE survey, the decision was taken to reduce the various types of heritage collections to the parent/umbrella classes of: Libraries, Archives, AV institutes, Museums and Others (the latter including Monuments and Sites), although the institutions will be able to specify themselves according to a more detailed list of institution types in the Core Questionnaire. As a consequence of this decision data collected may be statistically valid for these broad types of institutions in the EU as a whole, provided that an accepted sampling routine is chosen and that the response rate will be such that the calculated samples sizes are met.

The next step was to determine the ENUMERATE sample sizes for the parent classes and for the EU as a whole. Please note that this sample size refers to the required response rate in a random sampling set-up, not to the amount of institutions that can be invited.

Table 2: The samples per cultural heritage domain and across the EU.

	Archives and Record Offices	A-V and Film Institutes	Libraries (all)	Museum (all)	Other	All Institutions
ENUMERATE estimate	2023	93	25413	14577	875	42981
Sample size	323	76	379	375	268	1421

In the bottom row are calculated samples for the corresponding institution types. These sample sizes are calculated according to standard statistical procedures. It was decided that a confidence interval/error margin of 5% would be acceptable. The confidence level was set to 95%. With an estimated size of the total EU population of 2023 (as in the case of Archives and Record Offices) the sample can be calculated using one of the online available sample size calculators as 323.¹⁴ The same procedure is followed for the other cultural heritage domains. Although there is uncertainty about the exactness of these estimated population data, the sum total (1421) can serve as a starting point to calculate the size of target samples for each EU member state (see below). Depending on the actual response, which may be higher than the targets set here, statistically valid results for subtypes of institutions (e.g. Museums of Art, Museums of Technology, etc.) on the EU level should be possible. If the response is lower than the target, statistically valid results may only be possible on cumulative levels (generic institution types, country level or maybe even just the European level). The reliability of the data gathered needs to be addressed by the contractor who analyses the data.

¹⁴ Refer to: <http://www.allesovermarktonderzoek.nl/Extra/steekproef.aspx> (accessed 29/11/2011) or <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm> (accessed 10/5/2012).

7.3 Target samples per EU member state

For an EU wide sample of 1421, the average sample per member state is 53 institutions. To determine the size of the sample per country a weighing mechanism is used, based on NUMERIC estimates of the number of memory institutions per member state in relation to the number of staff employed in the cultural heritage sector¹⁵. Here again the category of Public libraries has been omitted.

The sample size per member state (column 'a' in Table 3) is determined on the basis of NUMERIC estimates of all cultural heritage institutions per member state (column b) and the number of staff employed in the cultural heritage sector (column c) per member state (column d).

To avoid over- and under-sizing, we have set for the ENUMERATE sample a minimum and a maximum sample size. The minimum target value is 15. The maximum target value was set to 150. The deficit resulting from this operation was equally distributed over the remainder of the institutions (=6/member state).

Table 3: Target samples per EU member state, as compared with NUMERIC samples.

a	b	c	d	e	f
	NUM all	Employees (x1000)	% over b&c	NUM sample	ENU sample
Austria	521	9.1	1.4	49	24
Belgium	1025	13.7	2.3	93	38
Bulgaria	589	9.7	1.5	35	26
Cyprus	88	0.9	0.2	10	15
Czech Rep.	1383	21.5	3.4	102	53
Denmark	385	19.5	2.1	13	35
Estonia	209	3.4	0.5	11	15
Finland	893	10.9	1.9	29	33
France	3668	52.1	8.5	104	127
Germany	6087	77.1	13.4	105	150
Greece	1069	10.2	2.1	43	35
Hungary	1164	16.6	2.7	47	44
Ireland	306	3.9	0.7	26	15
Italy	6305	37.9	10.3	41	150
Latvia	219	7.8	0.9	24	15
Lithuania	218	10.7	1.2	14	22
Luxembourg	87		0.1	9	15
Malta	66		0.1		15

¹⁵ Based on Eurostat's Cultural Statistics

	NUM all	Employees (x1000)	% over b&c	NUM sample	ENU sample
Netherlands	1667	28.8	4.3	102	67
Poland	3033	58.8	8.4	100	125
Portugal	893	6.1	1.5	83	27
Romania	1615	12.2	2.8	105	46
Slovakia	722	7	1.4	62	25
Slovenia	296	5	0.8	16	15
Spain	3598	33	6.8	108	103
Sweden	513	20.2	2.3	55	38
UK	8074	112.9	18.6	103	150
	44693	589	100	1489	1421

a = EU member state

b = Number of all cultural institutions according to NUMERIC (“Foundation Database”)

c = Number of employees in selected cultural sectors, 2009 (1000s) (source: Eurostat Cultural Statistics 2011 p.69)

d = % calculated based on b & c

e = Guideline sample NUMERIC

f = Proposed sample ENUMERATE (based on % in column d and a sample of 1421)

7.4 Additional sample requirements

There are two complications to the methodology described above:

- The need to include the respondents from the NUMERIC survey;
- The fact that independent of the ENUMERATE methodology and guidance materials some member states will want to include specific institutions in the survey in any case, e.g. the national institutions.

A number of questions in the Core Survey were deliberately included to be able to compare the newly collected data with data from the NUMERIC study. In that respect the ENUMERATE consortium has voiced that it is desirable to invite the actual 788 responders in the NUMERIC survey in the present survey. Special efforts will be devoted to persuading these NUMERIC responders to give a follow-up to their earlier involvement. These respondents can be seen as an extension to the regular sample.

The same will apply for any special requests from the national representatives/coordinators. Survey efforts that are not reconcilable with the sampling guidelines will be supported wherever possible, but they should not replace them.

8 The composition of the sample per member state

8.1 NUMERIC Approach

In the NUMERIC methodology the concept of the ‘relevant institutions’ was a key element in the methodology. Therefore the role of the national coordinators was crucial in selecting these institutions. Apart from the estimates for the entire heritage field the national coordinators could indicate their estimates of the number of relevant institutions per heritage domain. Special attention was given to the guidance notes, intended to get at a similar approach in all countries.¹⁶ However, once the project was underway this turned out to be a problematic set-up, since there was a lack of consensus over the interpretation of the guidance materials, as was described in detail in the final *Numeric Study Report*.

8.2 ENUMERATE Approach

The survey is intended to collect high-level statistics on digitisation of cultural heritage in all 27 EU member states. For this reason target numbers of responses from memory institutions in the different countries are required.

In the ENUMERATE approach a representative sample across all cultural heritage domains is the starting point, and the weighing mechanism described above will be used to determine the sample per domain per country.

After extended deliberations it was decided to make the ENUMERATE Core Survey an *open survey*. This complicates the task of making the collected data representative. Stakeholders advised against doing a survey based on random sampling, which was the original plan, since this does assume that in all EU member states there is a full overview of all memory institutions (numbers, names and addresses) available in digital format. As was stated earlier this is as yet not the case.

Irrespective of the chosen methodology, it is essential that the Core Survey will get the largest possible response rate and for this to happen it is necessary to approach and urge as many institutions as possible. Essentially there are three ways to achieve this:

- I. In countries where full or substantial lists of museums, libraries and (audio-visual) archives are available, or where these can be compiled with relative ease, such lists should be collected and used for announcing the survey. All institutions on the list will be invited to do the survey (i.e. no preparatory sampling is needed; specific questions on the survey questionnaire are intended to classify institutions, etc.). This is the preferred mode of operation.
- II. In countries where the above-mentioned lists do not exist or are only partially available, open communication channels will be used to reach as many institutions as possible. Examples of open communication channels are: existing mailing lists, heritage forums, online communities, associations of professionals, etc.
- III. In countries where some lists are available or can be compiled with relative ease a combination of I. and II. may be chosen.

In the *Guide to Managing the ENUMERATE Core Survey*, distributed among the national coordinators, instructions will be given to

8.3 Target sizes per heritage domain for the EU member states

As was stated above the selection of institutions in the ENUMERATE Core Survey should broadly reflect the cultural heritage domain in the various EU member states. In the NUMERIC survey an intricate, complicated and rather controversial method was developed to constrain the full European heritage sphere to those institutions defined as “relevant”. An institution’s relevance, in this case, was dependent on its capacity to “significantly enhance access to the nation’s cultural heritage.” (Refer to the *Numeric Study Report*, p. 21-23)

¹⁶ “The National Coordinators are asked to assist the NUMERIC study team to identify a representative quota of relevant institutions in their country to complete the sample survey. A sampling spreadsheet is supplied with this note to help identify an appropriate quota (number in the sample). Estimates have been made of the number of institutions by domain in each country, but these need amending based on more specific information available to the National Coordinator.” [NUMERIC Study Report, p.186]

D2.4 – Core Survey 1 Methodology

In the ENUMERATE Core Survey we strive for a response of close to 1,500 institutions (see above). It is evident that the size and composition of the heritage domain in the individual countries should have some effect on the target samples per EU member state. Based on previous estimates and various data collected (e.g. from NUMERIC and EuroSTAT) the following target samples were determined

Table 4: The sample of Archives / Record Offices distributed over the EU countries according to the percentage of total EU heritage domain per country.

	ENU sample	Archives/ Record Offices	A-V / Film Institutions	Libraries	Museums	Other
Austria	24	6	1	7	6	5
Belgium	38	9	2	10	10	7
Bulgaria	26	6	1	7	7	5
Cyprus	15	3	1	4	4	3
Czech Republic	53	12	3	14	14	10
Denmark	35	8	2	9	9	7
Estonia	15	3	1	4	4	3
Finland	33	7	2	9	9	6
France	127	29	7	34	34	24
Germany	150	34	8	40	40	28
Greece	35	8	2	9	9	7
Hungary	44	10	2	12	12	8
Ireland	15	3	1	4	4	3
Italy	150	34	8	40	40	28
Latvia	15	3	1	4	4	3
Lithuania	22	5	1	6	6	4
Luxembourg	15	3	1	4	4	3
Malta	15	3	1	4	4	3
Netherlands	67	15	4	18	18	13
Poland	125	28	7	33	33	24
Portugal	27	6	1	7	7	5
Romania	46	10	2	12	12	9
Slovakia	25	6	1	7	7	5
Slovenia	15	3	1	4	4	3
Spain	103	23	5	27	27	19
Sweden	38	9	2	10	10	7
UK	150	34	8	40	40	28
	1421	323	76	379	375	268

In the second column are the target totals for the 27 EU member states. The minimum target value is set to 15. The maximum target value is set to 150. The columns on the left are *indicative* of the distribution of these target values over the separate heritage domains. Small deviations in the numbers are due to the rounding of numbers and the set minimum value of 1 for each individual cell in the table.

Please note again that the figures above are minimum target values of *actual respondents*. They do not refer to the number of invited institutions. If survey response rates are low efforts will have to be made to boost response rates. The National Coordinators are in the best position to do so.

This approach results in a distribution within the ENUMERATE universe that is not even across all sectors. Especially the domains of Audio-Visual and Film Institutes and the National Libraries are less represented. However, this is due to the fact that the overall number of such institutions is low compared to other domains. It may even happen that the sum equals 0 [zero]. In that case, 1 is considered the minimum, so at least one institution per sub-domain per country will get involved. Because of these differences, it will be useful to make clear distinctions between the results across the entire heritage domain and the results within a specific sub-domain in the reporting of the outcomes of the ENUMERATE surveys.

9 Translations

The survey questionnaire - originally developed in English - has been made available in an online survey environment (using *LimeSurvey*), maintained by the Spanish company DIGIBIS, one of the ENUMERATE Thematic Network core partners. The ENUMERATE website (<http://www.enumerate.eu>) provides an up-to-date link to the online questionnaire.

Many countries indicated that a translation in their native language would boost survey response rates. A translation process was started in December 2011. Translated survey questionnaires are published as part of the multilingual ENUMERATE survey platform.

10 Core Survey implementation phase

10.1 Invited institutions per member state

As the ENUMERATE Core Survey will not be based on random sampling, it is important that the lists of invitations to participate in the survey cover as much of the heritage domain as possible, both in terms of geographical distribution and size. Proportional numbers of large, medium-sized and small institutions should be included. Furthermore, among the selected institutions both digitising and non-digitising institutions should be represented. **This survey is not about the *digitising* institutions alone.**

Ideally, the invitations are sent directly to a known staff member who is capable of and prepared to answer the questions of the survey. Since the size and organisational structure of memory institutions across EU member states may vary considerably definite procedures cannot be provided by ENUMERATE. To support the National Coordinators, ENUMERATE phrased a draft version of the e-mail invitations.

In order to make valid statements in the final analysis and report of the survey about the response rate and representativeness of the respondents, the ENUMERATE team collects the lists compiled by the National Coordinators.

10.2 Reaching institutions through alternative channels

If for parts of the heritage domain in specific countries substantial lists of institutions are not easily available, the alternative way to reach institutions is through the channels that are locally available. In many countries national types of council of museums, libraries and archives do exist, and these usually have professional communication channels in place. Other options are the use of mailing lists of professional organisations, newsletters, and social media (i.e. LinkedIn, Twitter, and Facebook).

During the survey period the ENUMERATE Team collects examples of reaching the national heritage domain through these alternative communication channels. Examples will be published on the ENUMERATE website: <http://www.enumerate.eu/en/guidance>

In order to avoid a situation where in one and the same institution different individuals will be approached, with the associated risk of a duplication of work, in both the example invitation letter for directly addressing individuals in institutions and the open invitation, the National Coordinators will be advised to always stress the recommendation that each institution should appoint one contact person.

10.3 Announcing the Core Survey

The National Coordinators were requested to write to the institutions on the list to introduce the survey or to ensure that such a letter is sent by the lead Cultural Ministry / Central Statistical Office / ENUMERATE Team. A draft of such a letter was distributed by the ENUMERATE Team to provide the appropriate information about accessing the questionnaire from the ENUMERATE website. This template can be adapted, suitably translated and amended to reflect national protocols.

10.4 Responding to questions from the institutions and other communications during the survey period

During the survey period the National Coordinators are expected to be available to answer queries about the questionnaire via e-mail and to refer to the ENUMERATE Team (included the contractor who will do the analysis of the collected data). The covering letter sent to the institutions settles the details of this process.

Survey responses need to be scrutinised and any queries brought up with the institution. E-mails raising such queries will be copied to the National Coordinator if the ENUMERATE Team needs help with translation / interpretation.

Throughout the survey duration, the ENUMERATE Team will periodically send to each National Coordinator the data received to that date from their countries' institutions in Excel format, so that they can inspect which institutions have already responded and send reminders to those that have not.

Mailings are done weekly and the National Coordinators will receive the full package of submitted data for their country after the survey ends.

The full survey will run until March 15, 2012.

10.5 An overview of the Activities of the National Coordinators

The activities and timings of activities described below are indicative due to national circumstances. For example, some countries will not have to translate the survey.

Activity	Start date	Due date	Actor
Survey Preparation			
Deciding the need to translate the questionnaire	06/12/2011	23/12/2011	National Coordinators
Translating the questionnaire	24/12/2011	23/01/2012	National Coordinators, ENUMERATE Team
Determining the size and composition of the heritage domain in each country	10/01/2012	31/01/2012	National Coordinators
Preparing the Invitations			
Drawing up lists of institutions per EU member state	13/01/2012	30/01/2012	National Coordinators
Checking contact details on these lists	20/01/2012	30/01/2012	National Coordinators
Where possible, providing the ENUMERATE Team with copies of the lists of invited institutions	-	31/01/2012	National Coordinators
Drafting a covering letter and additional announcement texts	20/01/2012	31/01/2012	National Coordinators, ENUMERATE Team
Managing the Survey			
Announcing the Core Survey and referring to the online questionnaire	01/02/2012	-	ENUMERATE Team (DIGIBIS), National Coordinators
Reaching institutions through alternative channels	01/02/2012	15/03/2012	National Coordinators, ENUMERATE Team
Responding to queries from the institutions and other communications	01/02/2012	15/03/2012	National Coordinators, Data Partner (Contractor), ENUMERATE Team
Boosting response rate / urging institutions to respond	22/02/2012	15/03/2012	National Coordinators, Contractor, ENUMERATE Team
Expiration of time to respond	-	15/03/2012	(Respondents)
Possible extension of time to respond	15/03/2012	31/03/2012	(Respondents)
Analysis and Reporting			
Collecting and checking returned questionnaires / translating answers to “open” questions	31/03/2012	07/04/2012	ENUMERATE Team (DIGIBIS), Contractor, National Coordinators

D2.4 – Core Survey 1 Methodology

Analysing returned questionnaires / Core Survey 1 Report	31/03/2012	30/03/2012	ENUMERATE Team (DIGIBIS), Contractor
---	------------	------------	--------------------------------------

11 Guidance materials

This document describes the methodology of the ENUMERATE Core Survey 1 with a focus on two processes:

- The creation of the questionnaire;
- The determination of the potential respondent universe across Europe.

In addition to this document, several guidance materials have been created in ENUMERATE to assist the national coordinators, the external contractor that will run the survey and the project partners. These documents are all available from the ENUMERATE website. They are:

- Overall Core Survey Schedule;
- Guide to Managing the ENUMERATE Core Survey;
- Question specific guidance;
- Overview of national and international initiatives;
- Overview of harmonisation and validation tools on terminology, costs, collection type analysis, and web statistics.

In addition, each national coordinator will receive a list of institutions that took part in the NUMERIC study in their country.

12 References

[Manzuch, 2009] Manzuch, Zinaida. "Monitoring digitisation: lessons from previous experiences." *Journal of Documentation* 65: 768–796.

[NUMERIC Study Report, 2009] NUMERIC Study Report: Developing a statistical framework for measuring progress made in the digitisation of cultural materials and content. Technical report, May 2009.

[SIG-STATS, 2010] Follow-up to the Numeric survey on cultural heritage digitisation statistics, Recommendations from the Special Interest Group on Cultural Heritage Digitisation Statistics, April 2010.

13 Annexes

Annex 1: NUMERIC SHORT 'CORE' QUESTIONNAIRE (May 2009)¹⁷

Investment in digitization

1 Total expenditure on digitisation: (and the period to which it relates)

[i] Last year: ... Period: [e.g. 2008/09]

[ii] Current year: ... Period: [e.g. 2009/10]

2 Full-time equivalent staff engaged on digitisation projects:

Current year: ... Period: [e.g. 2010]

3 Cost of planned digitisation projects:

Project spend: ... Period: [e.g. to 2011]

Outputs

4 Percentage of the collection that has **already** been digitised [=reproduced]: ...

5 Volume of analogue material digitised in the last year:

[i] Pages: ... of written/image material

[ii] Hours: ... of audio-visual materials

[iii] Metres: ... of archive material not included at [i]

[iv] Number: ... of all other objects in collections

6 Volume of analogue material to be digitised in plans described at question 3:

[i] Pages: ... of written/image material

[ii] Hours: ... of audio-visual materials

[iii] Metres: ... of archive material not included at [i]

[iv] Number: ... of all other objects in collections

Access to digitised material

7 Number of user visits to access digitised materials last year:

[i] 'Free' online: ...

[ii] Off-line (any): ...

===

¹⁷ "The example is a draft for further consideration, and particularly in the light of the difficulty we have experienced in gaining reliable responses to the measure of user visits/accesses to digitised materials, the final form could be quite different. However, there are several advantages to such a form: its brevity presents the survey objectives clearly, and as a consequence it is less daunting than the previous questionnaire. Furthermore, the questionnaire employed in the study just completed was sufficiently extensive and broad ranging that it required extensive research within the organisation, often requiring the input from persons engaged in different departments of the same institution; inevitably leading to delays and mistakes in its completion. **A shorter survey such as this could be more easily administered online**, and so extended to a larger sample, or all relevant institutions." [NUMERIC Study Report, p.88]

Annex 2: ENUMERATE Draft ‘Core’ Questionnaire (v 27 June 2011)

Scene-setting information

0 Name and address of institution

0 Name/E-mail/Function of respondent

0 URL of homepage

0 Type / Domain of institution

[options: Archives/records office; Audio-visual, broadcasting or film institute; Museum of art, archaeology, history; Museum of science, technology, ethnology; Other type of museum; National library; Higher education library; Special or other type of library; Institution for Monument Care; Other type of institution]

0 Overall annual budget of institution

0 Overall # of fte's employed in institution

0 Overall # of volunteers in institution

Input / Output

0 Does the institution have a written digitisation plan? [y/n/don't know]

0 How large is your collection p/object type?

[Every object type and unit below will be explained in added definitions, incl. tools to convert to the required units (e.g. meters to pages).]

	Object type	Units	Analogue numbers	Est. % digitised (metadata)	Est. % digitised (reproduced)
a	Archival records	Pages			
b	Rare books	Volumes			
c	Other books	Volumes			
d	Newspapers	Pages			
e	Serials	Volumes			
f	Manuscripts	Number			
g	Sheet music	Number			
h	Microforms / Microfilms	Number			
i	Maps	Number			
j	Photographs	Number			
k	Engravings / Prints	Number			
l	Drawings	Number			
m	Posters	Number			
n	Postcards	Number			

D2.4 – Core Survey 1 Methodology

o	Paintings	Number			
p	Other 2 dimensional objects	Number			
q	3 dimensional works of Art	Objects			
r	Man-made artefacts	Objects			
s	Natural world specimens	Objects			
t	Other objects or 3 dimensional works	Objects			
u	Monuments [Supplementary form here]	Number			
v	Film	Hours			
w	Video recordings	Hours			
x	Audio (music and other recorded sound)	Hours			
y	Other items not classified above	Number			

0 Does the institution collect born digital heritage? [y/n/don't know]

if yes: what types of born digital heritage?

Access to digitised material

0 Does the institution have an explicit (written) policy to regulate access to digital collections? [y/n/don't know]

0 Does the institution measure use of digital metadata and/or digital objects? [y/n/don't know]

If yes, how? (web statistics, user studies, etc.)

0 What percentage of the collection metadata is digitally accessible?

[i] Online: ...

[ii] Offline: ...

0 What percentage of the digitally reproduced collection is accessible?

[i] Online: ...

[ii] Offline: ...

0 Does the institution offer access through Europeana?

[i] Yes

[ii] Not yet, but we're in the process of realizing this

[iii] Not yet. We're interested in doing so but are hesitant to tackle the topic

[iv] No

Investment in digitisation

0 Total expenditure on digitisation (and the period to which it relates):

D2.4 – Core Survey 1 Methodology

[i] Last [closed] budget: €... / [budget period, e.g. 2010]

0 What is included in the budget specified above?

[] staffing [] physical space [] hardware (incl. storage) [] training [] software

[] rights clearance [] format-shifting [] management

0 Full-time equivalent local staff engaged in digitisation activities:

[i] Current year: ... fte / [period, e.g. 2011]

0 Number of volunteers engaged in digitisation activities:

[i] Current year: ... fte / [period, e.g. 2011]

0 [Estimated] Cost of planned digitisation activities next year:

€ (staff and equipment)

Digital preservation

0 Does the institution have a written strategy for digital preservation? [y/n/don't know]

Any remarks

0 ...

Annex 3: ENUMERATE Draft Core Questionnaire (v 1 November, 2011)

To both memory institutions such as your own and policy makers it is a matter of mutual importance to measure the progress being made towards the digitisation of cultural heritage assets. Information about this can help to inform both your own institutional policies, as well as policies on a national and European level.

Early next year the EU-funded ENUMERATE network, a community of practice in the field of digital cultural heritage, led by Collections Trust in the UK, will initiate an EU-wide survey in order to gather data about digitisation, access to digital heritage collections, and the preservation of digital heritage materials in the memory institutions of Europe. On behalf of the community of archives, libraries and museums we ask for your help.

The questionnaire below is a blueprint of the questionnaire we are going to use in 2012. It is distributed among a representative selection of institutions in the European Union and we hope it will generate useful information for the design of the final survey, which will be sent to several thousands of institutions. It would be of great help if you are willing and able to test our core questionnaire and help us with any remarks that might improve the current set of questions. For this purpose two questions on a meta-level are included.

The information you contribute will not be published in a manner traceable to your own institution, but it may be used to establish a statistical measure of the progress of digitisation in your country and the EU.

The questionnaire consists of 32 questions. The time needed to answer them will depend highly on the availability of management information about your digitisation activities. If this information is in place, we estimate that answering the questions will take about 30 minutes of your time. We hope you will be able to complete the questionnaire by December 15th. Please do not hesitate to contact us through the e-mail address listed below if you have any queries concerning the questions being asked or any other matter relating to this survey.

In anticipation of your kind attention and support, may we thank you in advance.

Best Regards, the ENUMERATE Team

enumerate@digibis.com

You can get a downloadable copy of the questionnaire [here].

SECTION 1. Organisational Information

1. Name of institution / organisation

[input box]

2. Type /Domain of institution / organisation

[drop-down list: Archives/records office; Audio-visual, broadcasting or film institute; Museum of art; Museum of archaeology, history; Museum of science, technology; Museum of anthropology and ethnology; Other type of museum; National library; Higher education library; Special or other type of library; Institution for Monument Care; Other type of institution, Please specify: ...]

3. Country in which your institution is located

[input box]

4. Website of your institution

[input box]

5. Your department

[input box]

6. Your name

D2.4 – Core Survey 1 Methodology

[input box]

7. Your role in the institution

[input box]

8. Your e-mail address

[input box]

9. Your telephone number or Skype contact details

[input box]

10. What is your institution's annual revenue budget?

[] < 10,000 EURO

[] 10,000-50,000 EURO

[] 50,000-100,000 EURO

[] 100,000-500,000 EURO

[] 500,000-1M EURO

[] 1 - 10M EURO

[] > 10M EURO

11. Number of paid staff

[input box]

SECTION 2. Digitisation Activity

12. Does your organisation have collections of digital materials or is it currently involved in activities to digitise cultural heritage?

Yes

No (Please continue to **Section 6.**) [After having answered Q13...]

13. Please indicate the size of your collections per object type and assess the need to digitise

	Object type	Units	Estimated number of analogue items	Estimated % catalogued in digital (textual) metadata records	Estimated % digitally reproduced	Estimated % of the entire collection that still needs to be digitally reproduced	Estimated % of the entire collection with no need to be digitally reproduced
<u>a</u>	Archival records	<i>Metres</i>					
<u>b</u>	Rare books	<i>Volumes</i>					
<u>c</u>	Other books	<i>Volumes</i>					
<u>d</u>	Newspapers	<i>Titles</i>					
<u>e</u>	Serials	<i>Volumes</i>					
<u>f</u>	Manuscripts	<i>Number</i>					
<u>g</u>	Sheet music	<i>Number</i>					
<u>h</u>	Microforms / Microfilms	<i>Number</i>					
<u>i</u>	Maps	<i>Number</i>					
<u>j</u>	Photographs	<i>Number</i>					
<u>k</u>	Engravings / Prints	<i>Number</i>					
<u>l</u>	Drawings	<i>Number</i>					
<u>m</u>	Posters	<i>Number</i>					
<u>n</u>	Postcards	<i>Number</i>					
<u>o</u>	Paintings	<i>Number</i>					
<u>p</u>	Other 2 dimensional objects	<i>Number</i>					
<u>q</u>	3 dimensional works of art	<i>Objects</i>					
<u>r</u>	Other 3 dimensional man-made objects	<i>Objects</i>					
<u>s</u>	Other 3 dimensional objects (incl. natural world specimens)	<i>Objects</i>					
<u>t</u>	Monuments and sites	<i>Number</i>					
<u>u</u>	Film	<i>Hours</i>					
<u>v</u>	Video recordings	<i>Hours</i>					
<u>w</u>	Audio (music & other recorded sound)	<i>Hours</i>					
<u>x</u>	Other items not classified above[, viz...]	<i>Number</i>					

14. Does your organisation collect born digital heritage?

Yes

No

Do not know

15. If yes: what types of born digital heritage?

[free text field]

16. Does your organisation have a written digitisation strategy?

Yes

No

Do not know

17. Is your organisation included in a national digitisation strategy?

Yes

No

There is no such strategy

Do not know

SECTION 3. Digital Access.

18. Does your organisation have an explicit (written) policy regarding accessing the digital collections?

Yes

No

Do not know

19. Does your organisation measure the number of times digital metadata and/or digital objects are being accessed?

Yes

No

Do not know

20. If yes, how?

Web analytics

User studies

Other, viz. [input box]

[Here all these answers can apply. So instead of radio buttons we need checkboxes here.]

21. Please indicate estimated percentage of your digital collections that is and/or will be accessible through the mentioned access options:

Access channel	% Currently accessible	% Accessible 2 years from now
Offline		
Institutional website		
National aggregator		
Thematic aggregator		
Europeana		
Memory of the World		
Wikipedia		
Institutional API		
3 rd party API		
Other, viz...		

SECTION 4. Digital Preservation

22. Does your organisation have a written Digital Preservation Strategy?

Yes

No

Do not know

23. Is your organisation included in a National Digital Preservation Strategy?

Yes

No

There is no such strategy

Do not know

24. Does your organisation have access to a Digital Preservation Infrastructure?

Yes

No

Do not know

SECTION 5. Digitisation Expenditure

25. Please estimate your expenditure on digitisation:

Last (*closed*) budget year: €... [input box] Year: [drop-down list: 2009, 2010, 2011]

Next budget year: €... [input box] Year: [drop-down list: 2011, 2012, 2013]

26. What is included in the budgets specified in the previous question?

- Staff costs
- Taxes
- Capital costs
- Equipment costs
- Selection costs
- Digital conversion costs
- Metadata enhancement
- Metadata creation
- Professional fees
- Rights clearance
- Digital preservation costs
- Other, viz. [input box]

27. What is the total number of local staff engaged in the digitisation activities of your institution?

Last (closed) budget year: [input box] (full-time equivalent)

Please specify the year concerned: [drop-down list: 2009, 2010, 2011]

28. What is the total number of volunteers (in full-time equivalent) engaged in the digitisation activities of your institution?

Last (closed) budget year: [input box] full-time equivalent

Please specify the year concerned: [drop-down list: 2009, 2010, 2011]

29. From what sources are your digitisation activities funded?

- Internal budgets
- Commercial trading
- Public grant/subsidy
- Private investment
- Public/private partnership
- Other; please describe: [input box]

SECTION 6. General Notes

30. Please include any other information which would help us understand the nature of your digitisation activities.

[free text field]

SECTION 7. Test questionnaire evaluation

31. Please include any other information which would help us to improve this questionnaire

[free text field]

32. How much time did you need to complete this questionnaire?

[input box]

Annex 4: Guide to Testing the ENUMERATE Core Survey (v 25 October 2011)

Dear ENUMERATE partners,

Before the ENUMERATE Core Survey can be rolled out, in early 2012, the questionnaire will have to be tested. To this end, the 10 consortium members (acting as national coordinators) are requested to select and invite institutions in their own countries to participate in the test.

The consortium members can - from their own positions and perspectives - address various aspects of the ENUMERATE survey to form a representative group. The European Library and its members may review the core survey from the perspective of national libraries. Other consortium members may approach it from a government perspective (e.g. by selecting specific institutions of national importance) or based on involvement in digitisation (e.g. by selection of both institutions that are innovative and institutions that are not really active yet with digitisation). These different perspectives help to anticipate the possible (positive or negative) responses from European memory institutions.

Broadly speaking the composition of the testing group in terms of types of memory institutions should be representative for the EU as a whole. In that respect this testing phase is a full try-out of the ENUMERATE framework.

For testing purposes work package leader and test coordinator DIGIBIS has prepared an online questionnaire, which (for now) will be available in English and Spanish. Participating institutions will be directed to the online questionnaire of which, if needed, a print-out can be produced.

This guide presents the time schedule, and offers concise instructions on how to contribute to the testing phase and how to select and involve a representative sample of institutions.

1. Time schedule:

- 14/11/2011 selected institutions communicated with ENUMERATE test coordinator (DIGIBIS)
- 15/11/2011 test environment finalized; invitations sent
- 30/11/2011 expiration of time to respond (reminders are sent shortly before 30/11)
- 15/12/2011 results testing phase are analysed

2. Choosing a way to conduct the survey

In principle the test coordinator (DIGIBIS) dispatches covering letters and refers to the online questionnaire by e-mail, but if needed consortium members could take over this job and might even arrange for a translation of the questionnaire so that it can be more conveniently understood by the target institutions selected. Please seek contact with the test coordinator to arrange for this.

3. Choosing the testing sample (types of institutions / individuals to approach)

Following the advice of the SIG-STATS, the population in the ENUMERATE surveys will be restricted to European *memory institutions*. This leaves out both school libraries (which were not taken into consideration by Numeric either) and public libraries.

Overall we strive for a selection of institutions in this testing phase which broadly reflects the cultural heritage domain in the EU member states (cf. NUMERIC Study Report, p.36), but there may be differences in the composition of the test groups per member state.

As an indication, per ENUMERATE consortium member the test group composition could be like:

Type of institution	
Archive/records office	2
Audio-visual or film institute	1
Broadcasting institute	-
Museum of art, archaeology, history	1
Museum of science, technology, ethnology	1
Other type of museum	1
National library	-
Higher education library	2
Public library	-
Special or other type of library	2
Other type of organisation	-
<i>Total test bed institutions</i>	10

Please note the total of 10 relates to the number of *actual* respondents, not to the number of *invited* institutions. Consortium members are free to canvass more than 10 respondents if they wish to do so.

It is important that among the selected institutions both digitising and non-digitising institutions are represented. In order to ascertain this we suggest each country to include about 3 “less advanced” memory institutions in the sample. The other dimension along which to vary the test selection is size of institution. We suggest including proportional numbers of large, medium-sized and small institutions. In case of doubt please send the composition of your test sample to DEN (see below).

4. Reporting contact lists back to the ENUMERATE test coordinator (DIGIBIS)

Within the selected institutions an individual must be determined to whom we can send an e-mail invitation and details about the online questionnaire. To be sure, this must be someone capable of and prepared to answer the questions of the survey. Since the size and organisational structure of memory institutions may vary considerably it is difficult to establish definite guidelines at this point. In large institutions he/she could be the chief information officer and/or director of museum information systems. In small institutions it might be the general director, or the head of collections. The contact list to be sent to the test coordinator should cover the following details:

Institution type; Name of contact person; E-mail address; Telephone number

5. Monitoring responses and urging non-responders to respond

During the two weeks of the survey testing period the consortium members are expected to be available to answer queries about the questionnaire and to refer to the test coordinator (DIGIBIS) if necessary. The online survey environment allows consortium members to login and check survey results. In case of implausible data the consortium members might seek contact with the responding institution.

The period in which the test questionnaire will be online is: 15 November - 1 December 2011

If you have any questions about the time schedule or details of this *Guide to Testing*, please contact:

DIGIBIS (enumerate-admin@digibis.com) or DEN (gerhard.jan.nauta@den.nl)