

OKFest 2014 Session, Berlin, 17 July 2014

Getting ready for the OpenGLAM Benchmark Survey

OpenGLAM Benchmark Survey - project portal:

https://outreach.wikimedia.org/wiki/GLAM/OpenGLAM_Benchmark_Survey

Contact: beat.ester mann@bfh.ch

For everyone interested in joining the survey, please send an email to beat.ester mann@bfh.ch

This workshop is about the OpenGLAM Benchmark survey, an online survey that will be conducted among heritage institutions throughout the world in the second half of 2014. The purpose of the study is to measure the state of advancement in OpenGLAM (digitization, inter-organisational cooperation involving the exchange of metadata, open data, crowdsourcing, linked data) in a given country, and to identify the main challenges and obstacles with regard to the promotion of open cultural data and free access to knowledge.

In addition, the international benchmark study provides international comparisons, allowing each country to see where it stands compared to other countries.

All in all, this survey will provide the international OpenGLAM community with a tool that helps it to better understand the particularities of each country, to put insights gained in a country into a broader perspective, and to better adapt strategies and best practices to the specific situation of each country.

Session hashtag: #OKfestGLAM

PRESENTATION SLIDES

<http://de.slideshare.net/beatester mann/ok-fest2014-glamsurveyworkshop20140717>

NOTES

Introduction to the OpenGLAM benchmark survey (Beat Ester mann)

New countries are welcome to join the survey!

Main tasks for local teams:

- translate the questionnaire into your local language
- gather email contacts of cultural heritage institutions
- answer the questions during administration of the questionnaire

In addition (optional):

- promotion of the survey results in your country
- country-specific analysis of the results
- promotion of OpenGLAM

Country updates

[The Netherlands \(Joris Pikel\)](#)

OpenGLAM in the Netherlands:

- Opencultuurdata.nl
- Paid GLAMwiki coordinator
- Largest provider of open images to Europeana
- Number of key players such as Rijksmuseum, Institute for Sound & Vision, National Library
- Some funding from Ministry of Culture
- Often one department of such an institution very active, others not so much

Goals of the survey:

- Data
- Mapping the sector
- Encourage institutions to think beyond their digital strategy
- Go beyond the usual suspects

What we did so far:

- Help develop the survey questions
- Pre-test with a number of institutions
- People contacted very enthusiastic
- Difficulty with getting contact details. Mostly our own networks

Finland (Laura Sillanpää)

Finnish context:

- Digitisation of cultural objects increased after 2008 because of Ministry of Education and Culture funding
- Finland still behind other European countries in terms of open cultural data
- Open cultural data master course in 2014 by OK Finland

Local objectives for the survey:

- Help spread awareness of open culture and cultural data in general
- Map actual situation in relation to open cultural data & learn what is needed
- Compare Finnish situation with other countries and learn from good practices

India (Subhashish Panigrahi)

Situation in India:

- Wikimedia India chapter and WMF's India program working on first India GLAM project
- Good traction of image contribution through Wiki Loves Monuments photo contest
- Mass communication and other media institutes slowly taking interest in open audio library
- Digitization is a priority across government departments, with funding available
- Majority of GLAMs lack knowledge about open culture, need for outreach
- Relicensing and book digitization have gained public interest

Goals of the survey:

- Data
- Mapping the sector
- Encourage institutions to think beyond their digital strategy

- Show institutions what is there for them

What we have done so far:

- Started filing Right to Information (RT) asking state government departments for lists of institutions
- Reached out to WMIN (Wikimedia India chapter) for help in creating a list
- Difficulty with getting people and contact details

Discussion

- Right to Information - how did you come to the decision to go for that option? For the Netherlands we have not yet decided to do this
- This is the only option to get it. Most data is not available online, or not as machine-readable data. In this way you can get the data on paper and then retype it.
- What to do if the museum associations etc. are not willing to share their contacts/the survey?
- What to do if people say they are not allowed to share email addresses?
- In Switzerland, it was possible for people to share their details only for research purposes. Beat Estermann can provide agreements on this as a research institution.
- Could we do data scraping?
- Only if the information is already there in a structured way (machine readable), but the information on institutions' websites tends to be randomly organised.
- Will there be an open call to ask for input, or, will we send an email message?
- Preferably we will contact people by email directly (through the survey tool), instead of an open call, because you get better responses.
- We can send out reminder emails, and we can track if people have responded or not.
- For India, the survey will also be sent by post, because many people do not access their email
- How useful is it then to do a survey on digital data? It could be one of the things to filter on, whether people reply to email or to regular mail
- This is a good idea. The first approach is to send email, if people do not respond we will send the survey by post.
- What would be a minimum number of respondents to make it useful?
- A minimum of 500 responses would be good - probably a minimum of 1500 institutions to contact, based on the response rate for Switzerland.
- Will we have anonymous responses, or do we need institutions to fill in their details?
- Responses will be anonymous in spite of the tracking system that allows us to see whether a given institution has responded to the survey or not. We will split the contact details from the results. We will keep the contact details in a safe place, so we could use them for a follow-up survey. There is a question at the end of the survey about whether they want to receive follow-up information or want to be contacted in the future. If they want to be contacted, they need to provide the contact address. Again, this contact information will be stored separately from the rest of the survey data.

- What is the procedure exactly for the results?
- We will gather the data centrally and produce one report in English. There could be separate reports for countries or areas (like a Spanish report for Latin America), but this is up to the national teams.

- What is the next step for the survey? Will it be a recurring effort or like an index?
- This hasn't been decided yet; there is an idea to run it every 2 years, but it depends on how the OpenGLAM situation will evolve as well.

- What is the deadline for new countries to join?
- The pretest will be over by summer, so that we have a finalised version of the English questionnaire at the end of the summer. Then the translation into the local languages starts. The earliest possible start for the administration of the questionnaire is October. It takes 2 months to run the survey and send out reminders. A first slot would be October - November, then January - March. The final deadline to be through with everything would be the end of March 2015.

- How much time did it take to gather contact details?
- This can take long, because umbrella organisations usually need to decide on this in a board meeting, which does not happen often. So starting soon is essential.

- It could be interesting to get Canada on board, because their situation is similar to the US, but they are much smaller.