Selection Criteria

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Ask-A-Librarian | **View Your Account**

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

| FIND | SEARCH | SERVICES | ABOUT US | NEW & NOTABLE |

Project Evaluation Criteria

As stated in its charge, the Digital Program Advisory Committee will evaluate all proposals. To submit a proposal, please complete and submit the Project Recommendation Form (**http://www.lib.ua.edu/forms/dpac-recomm.htm**). More information about the University of Alabama Libraries' digital program is available at Digital Projects at The University of Alabama Libraries (**http://www.lib.ua.edu/dpac/**).

Proposals will be evaluated on value, sustainability, viability, and scalability. The following criteria are designed to assess strengths and weaknesses and to provide an analytical approach to this evaluation

Required Criteria (9)

- The project will provide significant support for UA's mission of teaching, learning, research, and service.
- The project will increase the research value of materials by providing new forms of intellectual access.
- The project's intrinsic value will ensure continuing use by a significant audience(s) within and /or beyond the UA community.
- The project will meet recognized standards for digital capture, metadata, and data storage.
- The materials are in public domain, a copyright clearance has been obtained, written permission for open access on the World Wide Web has been obtained, or the items are "orphan works".
- The project will be completed with available funding.
- The project will have the potential to generate funding through grants, gifts, or other fund sources.
- The project will foster a partnership(s) which may include campus departments or initiatives at the state, regional, national, or international levels.
- The project will be completed in a timely manner and without adversely affecting other projects or other library priorities.

Preferred Criteria (4)

- The project will unite via the Web disparate collections.
- The project will extend the life of materials at risk by providing access to digital surrogates.
- The project will be of interest and value to various publics.
- The project will expand our expertise or technical infrastructure.

Approved by Libraries Management Council and Dean's Council July 12, 2005

Digital Program
Digital Projects Overview
Project Recommendation Form
Master List of Digital Projects

W3C XHTML 1.0

UA Libraries Home | Campus Libraries | Contact Us | Search This Site |

center for digital initiatives

brown university library

DIGITAL PROJECTS SELECTION CHECKLIST

As you begin discussing your potential project with a member of the Scholarly Resources Department, we ask that you review this document and place check marks next to the appropriate statements.

Rights
The Library prefers permission to distribute the digitized material to all users, but if necessary can limit access to a specific class.

___ source materials are in public domain, or
___ owned by Brown University, or
___ copyright holder is willing to confer distribution rights, or
___ co-creators of this project are Brown University members and are willing to transfer rights to the Brown University Library, or
___ use of the material for my class can be justified under Fair Use Guidelines

Non-Duplication
The Library will not digitize an object for which a digital surrogate already exists and can be reasonably obtained.

___ there is no identical or similar digital product that can reasonably meet the expressed needs

Please note: If the first two areas (Rights and Non-Duplication) cannot be checked, the proposed project probably cannot go forward. Please consult with your department's librarian if you not sure.

Value
Does the intellectual quality of the source material warrant the level of access made possible by providing digital access? Many factors contribute, but certainly they include intellectual content, historic, and physical value:

___ project would have significance to other Brown University areas of excellence
___ materials would compliment existing collection strengths
___ rareness or uniqueness of source materials or content
___ source materials or content have high artifactual or associational value
___ important for the understanding of the relevant subject area
___ broad or deep coverage of the relevant subject area
___ potential for enduring value in digital form
___ have potential to develop into larger grant opportunities
___ have sufficient subject or discipline knowledge and expertise for project development

Enhancement of intellectual access
Will digital access enhance the intellectual value of the material and add significantly to its potential to enlighten?

__ enhancement of intellectual control through creation of new finding aids, links to bibliographic records, and development of indices and other tools

__ ability to search widely, manipulate images and text, and study disparate images in new contexts

__ improved quality of image, e.g., through improved legibility of faded or stained documents

Demand

Are scholars now consulting the proposed source materials? Are the materials being used as much as they might be? Or is current access to the proposed materials so difficult that digitization will create a new audience, more active scholarship, or new kinds of teaching?

To justify the effort and expense, there should be a reasonable expectation that the product will have immediate utility for members of the academic community and/or other appropriate audiences:

__ would provide support for current high priority activities or areas of interest

__ likely to be of long term use within the academic community

__ there is an active, current, good-sized audience for the materials

__ there is advocacy for the project from the University community

__ likely to generate new types of use or significantly increased use of existing resources

Collaborative across collections

Will the combination or aggregation of original sources greatly increase their value? Are related materials so widely dispersed that they cannot be studied in context?

__ part of a collection split among a number of institutions that could be united online as a virtual collection

__ contribution to development of a "critical mass" of digital materials in a subject area

__ flexible integration and synthesis of a variety of formats, or of related materials scattered among many locations

__ strengthen or enhance an existing resource

Preservation aspects

Is the long-term preservation of deteriorated materials a project goal? While digitization does not in itself constitute preservation, there are preservation aspects to be considered, both in terms of the original materials and in terms of the files which will be created.

Providing surrogates

__ significant reduction in handling of fragile materials

__ access to materials that cannot otherwise be easily used

__ protection of materials at high risk of theft or mutilation

Safe digitization

__ condition of originals allows them to be digitized safely

__ condition of originals requires conservation/rehousing for safe digitization; funding must be secured for this work

__ possibility of scanning photographic intermediaries instead of the originals

Intellectual access

Potential projects should be evaluated as to whether appropriate intellectual control can be provided for the original materials and the digital versions:

___ degree to which the materials are organized/arranged in a way suited to online use

___ cataloging, processing and related organizational work already accomplished or to be accomplished as part of the project

___ staff and resources to support creation of appropriate metadata relating to document identification, technical capture information, provenance, and easy navigation within the information resource

Adapted from the University of Arizona's Digital Library Initiatives Group Digital Project Development Checklist
(http://digital.library.arizona.edu/documents/development/checklist.rtf)

UB*digit*

Digital Collections at the University at Buffalo

search

UB*digit* home | browse UB*digit* | advanced search UB*digit* | my preferences | my favorites | help | login

Keyword search UB*digit*

go

Use an asterisk * for truncation when searching. Example: `music*` will get music, musical, musician, etc.

Propose a new UB*digit* **collection**

UB*digit* **People**

Select   Go

UB*digit* **Policies**

Select   Go

UB*digit* **Contributor Tools**

Select   Go

UB*digit* **Presentations**

Select

Browse UB*digit* **by subject**

UB*digit* Collection Development Statement

Contributor proposals are solicited, vetted and prioritized for production by the UB*digit* Review Board. UB*digit* collections are provided primarily to support the research and instructional needs of the UB community. UB*digit* collections are built from UB's diverse inventory of legacy and teaching collections for purposes of instruction, scholarship, and archival preservation. UB*digit* collections are accessible over the Web and are intended solely for educational uses.

UB*digit* Review Board review criteria elements:

- Proposed collection meets the research or teaching needs of the University
- Proposed collection meets the research or teaching needs of the scholarly community at large
- Proposed collection responds to a demand for needed resources
- Proposed collection provides expanded access and preservation for fragile or valuable legacy collections
- Proposed collection represents a unique contribution/addition/augmentation to digital materials available to the University and scholarly community through proprietary resources or the Internet
- Proposed collection extends the multidisciplinary scope of UB*digit*
- Size of proposed collection can be accommodated in the UB*digit* infrastructure
- Collection contributor demonstrates lawful right to expose proposed collection via UB*digit*
- Collection contributor demonstrates authorization to allocate resources to the development of metadata and digital assets for the purposes of description and access through UB*digit*
- Collection contributor demonstrates readiness to prepare metadata records for each item in the collection in compliance with UB*digit* metadata standards
- Collection contributor demonstrates readiness to prepare digital assets in compliance with UB*digit* digitization standards

Proposal requirements:

- UB*digit* Contributor Collection Proposal form
- UB*digit* Contributor authorization form
- UB*digit* Contributor copyright release statement

Proposals are considered by the UB*digit* Review Board when all contributor forms have been received.

Last Update: 10/13/2005

University Libraries
©2004-2005 University at Buffalo | about |conditions of use |contact us | ^ to top ^
UB*digit* home | browse UB*digit* | advanced search UB*digit* | my preferences | my favorites | help | login

"Idea Sheet" & "Selection Worksheet" for Library Staff
UConn Libraries' Digital Collections Program

Drafted by the Digital Collections Facilitation Team (DCFT)   Last Revised: October 2004

Background

This document is intended to serve as the basis for a newly devised, streamlined approach to developing local digital collections at the University of Connecticut Libraries. In Part I, the "Idea Sheet," staff members (also known as PIs or Principal Investigators) are encouraged to briefly identify ideas for a digital collection and begin initial conversations with their area head for administrative support. Once completed, this form should be submitted to the DCFT for initial review. Part II, the "Selection Worksheet," should be completed by the DCFT working in conjunction with each PI. This section of the project proposal document addresses the specific costs, funding sources, and administrative endorsement of the project. Once both parts are completed, the DCFT will work with staff to fully develop a detailed project proposal, including technology specifications, detailed costs, and if applicable, a project management plan with timetable and evaluation plans.

Part I: "Idea Sheet" (To Be Completed by PI)

1. **Project Goals & Audience:** What new resource do you want to develop and why? Who are the primary and secondary audiences for this resource?

2. **Significance of the Proposed Digital Collection (Please check all that apply):**
    - ☐ Facilitates access to new, unique, and/or rare research materials/information/data
    - ☐ Meets demonstrated faculty and student information needs, or the needs of other identified user communities and constituencies, and will be utilized by a user population significant enough to justify its creation or migration into a digital format
    - ☐ Supports the University of Connecticut's education and/or research programs
    - ☐ Supports the University of Connecticut's mission to the citizens of the state of Connecticut
    - ☐ Establishes an educational partnership between the University Libraries and other organizations

3. **Brief Description of the Collection: What will the resource contain, such as formats, the number and size of objects, etc.?**

4. **Intellectual Property Rights & Risk Management:** Who owns the materials in the resource? Are they in the public domain and owned by the University of Connecticut Libraries? If the University of Connecticut does not own the materials, can they be licensed? Will the project require a formal partnership with the University Libraries?

5. **Submitted By:** **(Name of Staff Member)**
   (Job Title)
   AS **(Library Area)**

6. **Date Submitted to the DCFT for Initial Review: 8/4/06**

....

DCFT Comments & Next Steps

Comments On Part I:

Additional Meetings with PI Needed for Clarification?	☐ Yes	☐ No
Project Proposal Approved for Further Investigation?	☐ Yes	☐ No
Project To Be Incorporated into ENCompass?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Maybe

Proposal To Be Further Investigated: ☐ Spring ☐ Summer ☐ Fall

If proposal is not approved for further investigation and development, provide details below:

Part II: "Selection Worksheet" (To Be Jointly Completed by PI and DCFT)

1. **Project Name:**

2. **Intellectual Property Rights & Risk Management Documentation (Please check all that apply):**
   - ☐ Partnership Proposal and Agreement with the University Libraries
   - ☐ License Agreement with the University of Connecticut and Licensor
   - ☐ Memorandum of Understanding between Parties
   - ☐ Materials are in the public domain

3. **Internal & External Estimated Development Costs (Please check all that apply):**

Internal Resources Needed (Total Hours for Project)	Additional Comments
☐ Liaison's Time _____ hrs.	_____
☐ DCFT's Time _____ hrs.	_____
☐ ITS Staff Time _____ hrs.	_____
Total Estimated Resource Hours: _____	_____
	_____
External Resources Needed (Estimated Costs for Project)	_____
☐ Digital Photography or Scanning $_____	_____
☐ OCR or Encoding $_____	_____
☐ Data/format Migration $_____	_____
☐ Other IT Development $_____	_____
Specify Type _____	_____
☐ Strategies for Preservation $_____	_____
☐ Hardware $_____	_____
☐ Software $_____	_____
Total Estimated Costs for External Resources: $_____	_____
	_____
List of Potential Vendors for Outsourcing (If Applicable)	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	

4. **Estimated Funding Sources (Please check all that apply):**
   - ☐ Liaison budget(s) in the amount of $_____
   - ☐ Discretionary fund from bibliographer _____ in the amount of $_____
   - ☐ DCFT fiscal year funding in the amount of $_____
   - ☐ External grant from _____ in the amount of $ _____
   - ☐ Strategic funds from Leadership Council in the amount of $_____
   - ☐ Other funding source _____ in the amount of $ _____

5. **Administrative Support & Endorsement (Please check all that apply).**
   - ☐ Area Head for _____. Date: _____ Signature: _____
   - ☐ Area Head for _____. Date: _____ Signature: _____
   - ☐ Bibliographer for _____. Date: _____ Signature: _____

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

☐ Faculty/Staff in the _____ Department/School/College/Institute. Date: _____
Name: _____ Signature: _____
☐ Other (Please specify): _____.

Cornell University
Library

Cornell University Library

- Search Cornell

Selecting Traditional Library Materials for Digitization

Report of the CUL Task Force on Digitization

I. Introduction

In April 2004 a Task Force on Digitization was charged to recommend a policy for selecting traditional library materials for digitization. Providing increased access to digital information resources has occupied a prominent place in Library planning documents for some time. The Task Force approached its charge as part of this ongoing program (see, for example, CUL Goals and Objectives 2002-2007 I.3B, "select materials for digitization" and the Selection and Content section of the Report of the Digital Preservation Policy Working Group www.library.cornell.edu/preservation/IMLS/image_deposit_guidelines.pdf). This report offers rationale and strategies for deciding which materials the Library should digitize, and in what order it should digitize them.

II. Charge

The Task Force on Digitization was asked to:

- Create a set of guidelines for evaluating the content of "traditional" (defined as ink-on-paper) materials as candidates for digitization, holding copyright in abeyance.
- Consider whether the essence of these guidelines could be encapsulated in a form that would allow their application without significant (professional) selector intervention.
- Consider the fate of the paper originals. Are there categories of documents that may safely be withdrawn from library shelves after they are digitized?
- Make recommendations, in the form of a prioritized list, as to which criteria CUL should make a conscious and coordinated effort to emphasize.

III. Assumptions

The following assumptions and definitions guided our work:

- *What is content*? Content is information in context. It includes all of what is intrinsic in a document—its ideas, organization, and physical presentation.
- *Why digitize*? For the purpose of this report, digitization is a tool for increasing access to information; we do not address the important issues of digital preservation.
- *Why select*? In addition to the inevitably finite nature of resources, which dictates setting priorities, some print materials may be unsuitable for digitization because of their format, condition, or other characteristics.
- *Why preserve originals*? Library digitization must not sacrifice historically significant materials nor deny researchers the ability to study ways in which information was originally presented.
- *What technologies will be used to digitize*? Digitization will be accomplished with the use of multiple scanning and photographic technologies. These evolving technologies will minimize, but not necessarily eliminate, destruction of originals.
- *Why exclude copyright?* The focus of this report is digitization based upon content. Legal (and technical) issues can then be considered as a second step in the selection process.

IV. Selection Criteria

Selection for digitization requires many of the same evaluative deliberations that guide traditional collection development decisions. The selection of published materials for the stacks, or of paper materials for preservation microfilming, for example, require an assessment of value, utility, demand, condition, and collection relevance. The Task Force concluded that these same criteria should drive selection of traditional materials for digitization at Cornell. These values are well reflected in Cornell University Library's Goals and Objectives 2002-2007 I.3B: "select materials for digitization on the basis of their potential for broad utility, unique value of materials converted, reflection of core strengths of Cornell's holdings, and opportunities for building distinctive aggregations through national and international collaborations…"

At the same time, however, we were charged to develop guidelines for implementing digitization without this deliberative process in place, *i.e.* without professional selector intervention. Hence our selection criteria recommendations are presented below in two different sections:

A. <u>Project Criteria</u>. Criteria to help determine how to prioritize collections or intellectual groupings of materials for targeted digitization, applied by library staff, consulting subject experts.

B. <u>Production Criteria</u>. Procedures governing automated, or production digitization that would proceed systematically by non-selector driven criteria, such as by library shelf location, or upon demand by faculty or researcher request.

In establishing both sets of selection criteria, we drew extensively on the work of other research institutions and policy groups (see Appendix 1 for a bibliography).

IV.A. Selection Criteria for Project Digitization

Cornell Library's experiences with a variety of digital projects over the past decade—*e.g.* math books, Southeast Asian traveler's accounts, 19th century American books and serials, core agricultural literature—are that selection for digitization is driven by a program whose purpose is to widely distribute materials that enhance scholarship and learning. The Task Force found it difficult to conceive of digitization, even mass digitization, of traditional materials without first establishing programmatic parameters that take value and utility into account. We also agreed that such programmatic parameters would need to be developed by collaborative teams of professionals, project by project, even though project implementation might be delegated to non-professional staff.

The following list represents the Task Force's recommended criteria for project-based digitization:

1   Value

· Collections of unique materials or subjects of supreme strength at Cornell

· Materials that provide exceptionally broad or deep coverage of a subject or theme

· Materials not well represented in other digital collections or projects

· Collections that provide potential for generating revenue for CUL (per Goal I.3B)

· Collections that offer potential to attract development opportunities

2   Utility

· Demonstrated or potential demand

· Responsive to Cornell research and teaching needs

· Responsive to regional, national, or global research and teaching needs

3   Access

· Provides value-added enhancements such as search capabilities, text manipulation, interpretive commentary, or bibliographic apparatus

· Offers synthesized virtual collection, linking geographically dispersed originals

· Provides surrogate access to fragile originals for preservation purposes

4   Innovation

· Provides opportunity for building innovative relationships among institutions

· Provides opportunity to forge new delivery models, metadata standards, technological advantages, entrepreneurial models, or modes of scholarly communication

5   Continuity

· Considers the inventory of Cornell's current digital holdings and projects in preparation and builds on them, where possible

Prioritization:

We concluded that all targeted digitization projects should demonstrate at least some elements of items 1 & 2: Value and Utility. But that of the hundreds of possible projects that would meet this test, the strongest projects—and those deserving highest priority—will also feature elements of 3 and/or 4: Access & Innovation.

IV B. Production Criteria for Systematic Digitization

The Task Force struggled to conceptualize how production digitization could take place safely and logically without professional or curatorial participation. We imagined two scenarios under which this kind of digitization might take place: on-demand by faculty or researchers; or systematic, mass digitization of the stacks. The Task Force concluded that production digitization without significant selector intervention might be undertaken under the following production parameters:

- Assumes digitization of non-unique, or non-rare stack materials only

- Assumes no destruction of originals without special collections review

- Requires professional staff to outline "negative" criteria in advance (*e.g.* item incomplete, illegible, too fragile, copyright restricted)

- Production must include training program in the safe handling and preservation of library materials

V. Withdrawal of Paper Originals

The Task Force was charged to consider whether there are categories of materials that may be justifiably withdrawn after digitization. Once again, we determined that answers would generally require definition on a project basis. Some collections, such as newspapers from Third World area collections, may require little more scrutiny than identifying their location in the stacks. Other topics, such as American history for example, are comprised of volumes of historic artifactual importance and would require careful, item level inspection.

Circumstances that may warrant withdraw of paper originals are:

1. Duplicate Copies: more than one original held by Cornell Library
2. Loss of content imminent (*e.g.* brittle paper)
3. Items that survive in large numbers and that carry no demonstrable evidential, aesthetic, associative, or other physical value (Appendix no. 6-7)

VI. Appendix: Bibliography

Digitization Policies and Guidelines

1. Columbia University Libraries Criteria for Digital Imaging http://www.columbia.edu/cu/libraries/digital/criteria.html

2. University of California Selection Criteria for Digitization http://www.library.ucsb.edu/ucpag/digselec.html

3. The Library of Congress. Selection Criteria for Preservation Digital Reformatting
   http://lcweb.loc.gov/preserv/prd/presdig/presselection.html

4. National Library of Australia. Digitisation Policy http://www.nla.gov.au/policy/digitisation.html

5. Dan Hazen, Jeffrey Horrell, and Jan Merrill-Oldham. Selecting Research Collections for Digitization.
   http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/hazen/pub74.html

6. Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR). Task Force on the Artifact in Library Collections:
   http://www.clir.org/activities/details/task.html

7. Cornell University Library Department of Preservation and Conservation. Conservation Treatment: Library Materials to be Retained in the Collection in Original Format. http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub103/appendix3.html

Task Force Membership:

David Block (chair)
Mihoko Hosoi
Terry Kristensen
Katherine Reagan
Steve Rockey
Linda Stewart

Back to Collection Development Policies Page

---

http://www.library.cornell.edu/colldev/digitalselection.html

Revised and updated, 2/23/05
Send changes to Fred Muratori

Selection Criteria

Materials proposed for digitization will be considered by the Digital Collections Council using the following criteria.

I. INTELLECTUAL VALUE

1. **Research value.** What is the subject focus of the material? Will the collections be used for research by Duke faculty and students, or by researchers outside Duke, or both? Is there research interest in the material across the disciplines? Is there a particular undergraduate research interest in the material? What value is added by providing this material in digital form?

2. **Pedagogical value.** What use will the material receive in digitized form? Will it be used in the undergraduate classroom? For K-12/community use?

3. **Relationship to other collections.** Does the material add to areas of historical strength in digital or traditional collections at Duke? Is the material unique to Duke? How does it relate to digital and traditional resources available elsewhere, particularly in TRLN? How does it relate to possible future digitization projects? Does digitization of the material have the potential to attract new collections to Duke?

II. FEASIBILITY

1. **Copyright issues.** Is the material under copyright? Does Duke hold copyright, or can permissions be obtained with reasonable effort?

2. **Scope of the project.** How much labor is required (scanning, creating metadata, etc.) to complete the project? Is the material heavily text- or image-based? Are appropriate equipment and staffing currently available in the DPC?

3. **Preservation issues.** What is the condition of the original? How many conservator hours would be required to prepare it for digitization? Do originals require special handling due to fragility or other issues? Would digitization require modification of the object (disbinding, separating, encapsulating)? Once digitized, could access to fragile source materials be closed, thus further protecting them?

4. **Urgency/time factor.** Why digitize now? Is there an immediate curricular need for the material? Is grant funding currently available? Is the original material in heavy demand, and/or in danger of disintegrating?

5. **Additional/outside funding opportunities.** Is there possible grant funding available to digitize the material, or is there another potential funding source?

III. ACCESS

1. **Metadata.** Is existing metadata adequate for making the material useful in digitized form? If not, what is the plan to create metadata? What is the sponsor's commitment to creating metadata? Is special expertise required (foreign language, for example)? Has the sponsor extensively reviewed the proposed material on an item-by-item level?

2. **Supporting Material.** Is faculty expertise or documentation available to support access? Will there be other access points for the materials, in addition to the DOC?

3. **Equipment and technical requirements.** Does the library have the means to deliver the digital objects in the most effective way for users and in a way that is most appropriate for the content? Does the library have adequate technical resources to troubleshoot, test, maintain, and otherwise support the tools and infrastructure that make the digital collection available?

The DCC should consider the criteria in Category I first and foremost, before addressing issues of feasibility and access. Materials which score well on intellectual value will be placed on a list of DCC desirable projects. Because some of the most intellectually valuable materials may not be digitized immediately because of access or feasibility problems, the DCC should then make recommendations for equipment purchases, temporary hires, or pursuing of grant funding, for example, in order to make digitization possible.

13 April 2006

DIGITAL
LIBRARY of GEORGIA
SHARING GEORGIA'S HISTORY AND CULTURE ONLINE

GALILEO

Home » About the Digital Library of Georgia » Collection Development Policy

Collection Development Policy

Digitized Collections

The Digital Library of Georgia, working together with Georgia's libraries, archives, museums, and other institutions of cultural heritage, provides access to the cultural and historical resources of the state of Georgia through ongoing development, maintenance, and preservation of online digital collections and resources. Original formats included may be text-based, including manuscripts, letters, diaries, and published works such as books and pamphlets, photographs, maps, art, artifacts, audio and video, graphic materials including architectural plans and drawings, and microfilm.

The Audience of the Digital Library of Georgia consists of five segments: Casual User, Student/K-12/Lifelong Learner, Information Seeker/Hobbyist, Scholar/Researcher, Government/Business Community.

Collections, materials, or items may be nominated for digitization by any interested party using the Digital Library of Georgia Digitization Nomination Form.

Collections nominated for digitization and/or inclusion in the Digital Library of Georgia will be judged based on the following criteria.

- **Mission**. Proposed materials or collections must conform to the mission of the Digital Library of Georgia and be related to the culture and history of the state of Georgia.

- **Restrictions**. Materials that are restricted by the donor or other owner will not be digitized unless permission can be obtained.

- **Copyright**. Materials that are clearly in the public domain will be given priority for digitization. Where public domain status is questionable, a decision will be made on a case by case basis. When materials are under copyright restrictions, they will not be digitized unless permission is obtained.

- **Documentation/Description**. Materials or collections that are completely or partially described, captioned, labeled, processed, or cataloged will be given priority for digitization. Other instances will be handled on a case by case basis depending on factors such as the type and depth of description required, need for research, etc.

- **Accessibility**. Materials that are hard to access due to preservation concerns or are only available to a limited audience due to security restrictions will be given priority for digitization.

- **Use**. Materials that are heavily used by researchers, other patrons, or staff will be given greater priority for digitization.

- **Diversity**. Materials that represent the cultural, political, social, geographic, and/or economic diversity of the state of Georgia will be given priority.

- **Value**. Materials that have high research, artifactual, or evidential value and/or are of particular interest to a key audience will have high priority for digitization.

- **Potential for Added Value**. Materials for which access will be substantially improved by digitization and which have a high potential for added value in the digital environment will be given priority. Examples of added value that the materials may lend themselves to include:
    - Creation and/or addition of supplemental resources to allow users to better understand, navigate, and use the collection
    - Linkages between materials
    - Virtual collections of materials based around a creator, topic, subject, or similar theme
    - New metadata, description, and finding aids in electronic form
    - The ability to search through the creation of electronic text
    - New ways to use or analyze the originals

- **Duplication of Effort**. Materials that are publicly available in digital form elsewhere at a level of quality that meets the needs of the audience of the Digital Library of Georgia will not be digitized. Note that the DLG Portal Service may link to items related to the mission of the Digital Library of Georgia.

- **Cooperative Potential**. If the materials have the potential to be related to others held by different repositories or organizations, including materials already digitized or being considered for digitization, the priority for digitization is higher if it is likely that a cooperative or multi-collection digitization initiative may result.

- **Availability of Local or Additional Resources**. Following on cooperative potential, if a repository or other organization can provide support in the form of staff time, equipment, or funding - especially at a local basis - to digitize materials to the standards required by the Digital Library of Georgia those collections may be given greater priority to take advantage of these opportunities.

- **Technology**. Materials for which appropriate technology, processes, and best practices already exist for digitization will generally have priority. Projects that explore or require implementation of new technologies will be considered depending on the availability of resources and funding.

top

DLG Portal Service

The DLG Portal Service links historical and cultural collections digitized by the DLG and held locally in GALILEO with digital collections, materials, sites, items or similar resources held by cultural and/or other non-profit organizations throughout the state and elsewhere by means of a selective portal service. The core of the portal service is a metadata catalog containing descriptive information about each resource.

The DLG Portal Service will record metadata about and link to sites meeting the following criteria:

- Provides digitized resources for collections representing Georgia's history and culture
- Makes the resource available at no cost
- Has a plan for ongoing sustainability and maintenance
- Respects copyright by ensuring that materials are in the public domain or cleared for public distribution
- Priority will be given to sites containing cultural materials digitized in accordance with standard best practices for digital imaging recommended by the Digital Library of Georgia

Ownership

The Digital Library of Georgia does not claim ownership of digital objects linked to from the DLG Portal Service. Ownership remains with the originating site. Note that collections digitized and mounted by the Digital Library of Georgia and GALILEO are linked to from the DLG Portal Service in the same way as other participating sites. Metadata created by the Digital Library of Georgia and included in the DLG Portal Service remains the property of the Digital Library of Georgia, but may be freely copied and shared as long as credit is given.

Accuracy

Responsibility for accuracy of data, facts, and information presented rests with the institution providing the digital resource. The Digital Library of Georgia does not warrant any information on the sites linked to by the portal. The Digital Library of Georgia recommends that all sites have a means of collection information regarding the content accuracy and a policy for site review and revision.

Accessibility

The DLG Portal Service strives to comply with accessibility standards developed as part of the Web Access Initiative of the World Wide Web Consortium available at http://www.w3.org/WAI/. However, the Digital Library of Georgia does not guarantee that sites linked to by the DLG Portal will comply with these accessibility standards.

Removal Policy

A site may be removed from the DLG Portal at the discretion of the Digital Library of Georgia for one or more of the following:

- Site is not consistently available and reliable
- Inaccurate data, facts, or information
- Proven violation of copyright
- Site or content is no longer available for free to the public

July, 2001
Revised Sept. 2004

top

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA **LIBRARIES**

Digital Library Services

Project Selection Criteria

Projects and other digital initiatives are evaluated for how well they help to fulfill the University's mission of teaching, research, and service. Consideration must be given to current curriculum needs, faculty research interests, research trends in the various subject areas, and the strengths and weaknesses of the University Libraries' overall collections. In addition, the inherently shared nature of digital library collections requires consideration of larger constituencies including scholars at other institutions and the general public and acknowledgement of existing and prospective projects already being undertaken by other institutions, consortia, and commercial publishers.

The following criteria will be considered when evaluating potential projects:

1. Does the resource enhance existing **library collections**?
2. Will the availability of the resource meet a need for increased **access** to the material?
3. Does the project meet a **preservation** need?
4. Are the materials already digitized and in need of classification and **bibliographic control**?
5. Does the content have **intellectual value** as a scholarly resource?
6. Are the materials **unique** in scope or coverage?
7. Is the project **distinct** from other projects likely to be undertaken by commercial publishers or other institutions?
8. Does the project take advantage of the **expertise** of specific faculty or library staff?

Contact: lib-digital@uiowa.edu

Syracuse University Library
Digital Library Project Proposal – Step 1
Criteria Checklist

Name _____ Date _____

Department_____ Email _____ Phone_____

Project title (suggested)_____

The following criteria will assist SUL staff in developing and evaluating digital library project proposals, help in prioritizing DL activities, and establish a strong rationale when requesting support from internal or external sources. The criteria, organized by broad category, will help document the merits of project proposals and promote an analytical approach to project selection. Criteria are not listed in order of importance; depending on the project, some will be more important and others may not apply.

Instructions: please check all statements that apply to your project proposal and submit a completed checklist with the DL Project Proposal form.

Mission:
- ☐ The project addresses one or more of the Library's strategic goals.
- ☐ The project provides measurable support for SU's teaching and research efforts.
- ☐ The project will promote SU Library in a manner that may generate further digital library projects and funding.
- ☐ The project has local or regional importance
- ☐ The project represents an effort that is unique to SU.
- ☐ The project moves library services in a direction consistent with the Library's strategic directions.

Rights:
- ☐ Source materials are in the public domain.
- ☐ SU owns or has intellectual property rights to the content.
- ☐ Copyright holder will transfer applicable rights to SUL.
- ☐ Use of material can be justified under fair use and SUL can control access.

Collaboration/Relationships:
- ☐ The project has library, faculty, CMS, or other advocates.
- ☐ The project creates or enhances a collaborative partnership.

Value:
- ☐ The project will compliment existing collection strengths, become part of an existing virtual collection, or contribute to the development of a critical mass of digital materials in a subject area.
- ☐ Current use of source material indicates potential of enduring value in digital form.
- ☐ Source materials have value as artifacts.
- ☐ The project addresses material that is unique or rare.
- ☐ The project addresses material that is deteriorating.
- ☐ The project provides integration of a variety of formats or related material scattered among a number of locations.
- ☐ The project is likely to generate new or increased use of the material.

☐ Digitization will create new or expanded modes of teaching.

Use/Demand:
☐ The project will receive sustained use by an identifiable audience.
☐ The project has the potential to increase the usefulness of and/or enhance access to the material, e.g., through new search capabilities, links to other materials, the ability to manipulate images and text, or study material in new ways.
☐ The project will provide support for high priority activities or areas of interest.
☐ Source materials are being used in their current form.
☐ The project is likely to generate new or increased use of the material.
☐ Digitization will create new modes of teaching.

Intellectual access:
☐ Source material has a coherent organizational scheme.
☐ Cataloging and/or descriptive metadata work is complete.
☐ Project will require descriptive cataloging/metadata work.

Resources/funding:
☐ The project can be completed with available funding resources.
☐ The project can be completed using existing staff resources.
☐ The Library has sufficient staff and resources to support programming, user interface design, or other technology intensive tasks.
☐ The project has the potential to generate funding through grants, donors, or other external fund sources.
☐ The project has the potential to save money over the long term, e.g., by eliminating the need to acquire resources, freeing up staff time, etc.

Technical feasibility:
☐ The digital version can sufficiently represent the full content of the original.
☐ Access and authentication can be provided using current institutionally supported technologies.
☐ The Library has sufficient knowledge and expertise required for project development and ongoing maintenance.
☐ The project will capitalize on existing technical infrastructure and capabilities.
☐ The project will adhere to or contribute to the development of national digital library standards.
☐ The project has potential to expand our technical knowledge and expertise.

Preservation:
☐ Project will result in a reduction in handling of fragile material.
☐ Project provides access to materials that cannot otherwise be easily used.
☐ Project protects materials at high risk of theft or mutilation.
☐ Condition of materials allows them to be safely digitized.
☐ Condition of originals requires conservation.
☐ Possibility of scanning photographic intermediaries rather than originals.

| Home | ▶ General Info | ▶ Services | ▶ Research & Development | ▶ Metadata | ▶ Reports | Questions? | Virgo |

UNIVERSITY *of* VIRGINIA LIBRARY

Digital Initiatives: Reports

Framework for Digitization

Guidelines for digital collection building at the University of Virginia Library

This document outlines a framework within which Digital Library Production Services (DLPS) will digitize items in the University Library collection. The Collections Group has been involved in the development of this framework.

Assumptions:

- This framework applies to all types of digital objects (currently: texts, images; eventually: video, audio, etc.), though the emphasis may be different for different types of materials.
- DLPS is developing multiple tiers of digitization. For example, the text workflow may include texts which are keyboarded (double-typed and marked-up in TEI/XML by a vendor; highly accurate for searching, but expensive and time-consuming to process); text with OCR (texts with minimal mark-up; not as accurate for searching, but relatively inexpensive and quick to do); and page-images (digital photocopies of each book page for viewing but not searching).
- Limited resources (staffing, equipment, etc.) put constraints on the amount of work that can be accomplished, as well as the speed, but as workflows are reviewed and become more efficient, and technology is updated, volume and speed will increase.
- Project proposals or grant opportunities will be assessed against these guidelines, and current library priorities.

Three Categories (not ranked):

- **Special collections and other materials unique to UVa**
  This category includes UVa historical documents: the Catalog, the Cavalier Daily, BOV minutes, Cork & Curls, etc., as well as pre-1923 items about UVa (classed in LD 5660-LD 5689). Additionally, unique and rare items in the Small Special Collections Library would be digitized. Decisions will be driven by user requests to Rare Materials Digital Services (RMDS), items chosen by selectors, items which have been exhibited, and circulation history.

- **User-driven digitization**
  This category includes items needed for curricular use (e.g. Art & Architectures images); pre-1923 items with high circulation; and possibly reserves or Toolkit scanning requests (pre-1923 or public domain).

- **Preservation**
  This category includes items for which the physical object requires preservation, and which also have had recent circulation. Digital reformatting may be the primary preservation method, or it may be a by-product of physical preservation. Examples: A brittle book may be replaced by a preservation photocopy, which also results in page images; audio and video tapes may be reformatted onto newer media (DVD) and the digital files added to the repository. Preservation texts in English with modern fonts would be digitized using OCR.

May 20, 2005

Digital Initiatives
University of Virginia
PO Box 400112
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4112