	ENUMERATE Specialist Meeting 3 **Measuring the Use and Impact of Digital Cultural Heritage**

Place and Date
6 June 2012, Madrid
Venue
Historic Library of the Complutense University
Biblioteca Histórica Marqués de Valdecilla

Participants:

Name	Organisation (Country)
Almudena Caballos Villar	Historic Library Marqués de Valdecilla of the Complutense University of Madrid,ES
Jane Finnis	Culture24,UK
Alastair Dunning	TEL (The European Library), UK
Rand Eppich	ICOMOS, ES
Rafael Roset	Institut Cartogràfic de Catalunya,ES
Julio Cordal	Ministry of Culture of Spain,ES
Alejandro Nuevo	Ministry of Culture of Spain,ES
Rui Guerra	Museum Analytics,NL
Paquita Navarro	National Library of Catalunya,ES
Elena Sanchez Nogales	National Library of Spain,ES
Elisa Giaccardi	Universidad Carlos III de Madrid,ES
Frank Huysmans	University of Amsterdam,NL
Marta Torres (Host)	Complutense University of Madrid Library,ES
Marco de Niet	DEN,NL
Gerhard Jan Nauta	DEN,NL
Jesús Dominguez	DIGIBIS,ES
Maribel Campillejo	DIGIBIS,ES
Katie Smith	CollectionsTrust,UK
Inés Matres	SPK,DE
Natasha Stroeker	Panteia,NL

Background to the meeting:

The third ENUMERATE meeting was in Madrid on 6 June 2012. The focus was on *measuring the use and impact of digital culture heritage.*

The main issues were the following:

- Usefulness of measuring use and impact of digital cultural heritage,
- Feasibility of a common methodology to monitor access and use of digital heritage resources,
- Methods and tools to monitor the actual use of digital heritage collections,
- Recommendations for the ENUMERATE Thematic Survey.

Agenda and Minutes

Agenda item	Minute
Welcome and Introductions	MDN gave a short welcome and all participants introduced themselves.
The ENUMERATE thematic network	MDN gave a presentation about the overview of the ENUMERATE thematic network. In this he outlined the motivation behind the project and the aims of ENUMERATE according to the *Description of Work*.
Introduction to work done so far on measuring use and impact of digital heritage	GJN discussed the groundwork for the NUMERIC project, which ENUMERATE has continued on from. GJN discussed Zinaida Manzuch's 2007 paper, '*An Analysis of the state-of-the-art in measuring the progress of digitisation of cultural materials'*, and the different approaches institutions can adopt to look at how they understand the use and impact of digital cultural heritage.
Discussion on the usefulness of this type of research	After the presentation by GJN, various topics were discussed about the usefulness of this type of research: • MDN asked the meeting how they felt this research was relevant. • JF stated that they have previously done work on this through their 'Let's Get Real' project which looked at this issue through adopting a pragmatic process and benchmarking. The starting point for Let's Get Real was new digital modes of communication and how institutions do/can measure that. JF highlighted that it is crucial that awareness of an organisations online presence is embedded and integrated throughout an institution. • RG stated that there are two current trends of collecting data, the multiple organisational approach or collecting data with a focus on individual institutions. RG also expressed that it is crucial that cultural organisations change the way they are working, ensuring they are transparent about the use and impact of their digital heritage, and ENUMERATE should adopt this approach to present data in a very clear way online. It is important to collect the data, analyse it, retrieve information from it and then, finally get to the point of new knowledge. • Analytics can be a useful tool for internal leverage within an organisation e.g. to persuade investment within departments, comparing how your organisation competes with its peers etc. • Benchmarking tools are useful, but the group had different opinions on if

institutions should be able to see the results of all the other institutions, or if they should be able to see their own results compared against the results of the total or selected reference group.

- RG stated that ENUMERATE should move towards persuading institutions to present their information/data online in a transparent way, once it is online this then becomes a motivator, also for other organisations.
- Discussion found that there was no consistency in implementations of e.g. Google Analytics.
- AD stated that The European Library is currently opening up a lot of data and they are not always in charge of what happens to it, and it is important to try and understand what the impact of your 'stuff' is having outside of own websites etc.
- ESN stated Nat. Library of Spain (NLS) at first wanted to put everything online. They realise now that it is important to know how people are interacting with their content and the NLS are searching for indicators of user preferences. The NLS information professionals are now looking at questions such as how do our users get at our databases? How do users get to our content? Are they finding what they are searching for? How do they search?
- JF makes the point that not enough time is spent on search engine optimisation (SEO), 60% of all requests for data comes through these channels. The most important factor is understanding how your content moves people. JF stated that there is a change in that the interface to an organisations website is actually the aggregated Google search results, not the navigational guidance offered at the website itself.
- RE stated that a lot of monument and site professionals are not willing to spend a lot of time on searching for information and highlights that it is important to pay attention to needs which are below the institutional level.
- RR demonstrated that it is important to understand that different statistics have different usefulness/meanings for people, for example, use of content versus number of visitors. There is a change within his institution, the Cartographic Institute of Catalonia, away from finding maps, to enabling the user to experience the collection; this is reflected in the way the catalogue is (not) being used.
- JD stated that in Spain over the past two years there has been an increase in requests from people wanting to monitor the use of their content and it is important that this ENUMERATE research demonstrates the usefulness of this analysis.
- ENUMERATE could look at the relevancy of use and impact statistics at three levels: the institution, the national heritage domain, and the supra-national (EU) domain.

Summary:

- The key drivers for doing this type of research are:
  - Understanding use;
  - Understanding the value of your collections;
  - Accountability;
  - Raising the relevancy of (new) digitisation work;
  - Making more value from investments already made;
  - Direct future research.
- It is important to have information at various levels, as the need or use of information varies per person or institution.
- Detailed reports should ideally be made for each person in an organisation and should relate to their role and what these statistics means to them, this

	stimulates involvement in the data and making better use of it.
	• It is important to bring together both quantitative and qualitative research for this project as ENUMERATE is serving individual institutions and the European Union as a whole.
	• Much of the discussion focussed on the use of (Google) Analytics, however there are many other possibilities, such as using log files, for instance where API's are involved, etc. As AD noted: "It's not about the use of your platform, it's about the use of your content."
Discussing feasibility of a common methodology	MDN introduced two main topics, cross-domain methodology and methods and tools.
	Question: Is there reason to assume that the use of digital collections from museums is different from libraries, archives or other heritage institutions? What are the overlaps, what are the differences?
	• FH expressed that libraries use statistics in various ways. Research libraries are likely to measure statistics on downloads/views of material whereas public libraries are less likely to. He stated that it is important to know what is being done with the content, for example researchers use content within their daily work whereas the general public use it as more of a leisure activity.
	• Google Analytics can be used as a common methodology in certain specific ways as there are some universal indicators, however, the tool does not cover everything related to the use of collections.
	• Some time was spent on discussing user profiles. FH did research in the Netherlands on experiencing heritage collections. Different types of users were considered: All-rounders; Art lovers; Association members; Collectors; Browsers; Cultural family outings/Day trippers; Readers; Not active/Not interested..
	• But can we discern specific types of users across different domains in the heritage sector? More nuance is needed here. For example: is it a user who only wants to know the entrance fee? (then: spending a short time on the website is good) ...or does he want to browse etc. (then: a short time spent is bad). Etc.
	• Discussion demonstrated that it is not necessarily about discovering a common cross domain methodology to analyse statistics, but about understanding different types of use of an institutions cultural content. MDN agrees with this view, putting forward the idea that we should not classify types of *users*, but rather types of *use*.
	• The role of funders needs to be considered hereas well: different funders will push the institution to focus on different types of use.
	Question: **Is there reason to assume that measuring of use and impact of digital cultural heritage is so specific that a dedicated methodology is needed? Or can we implement methodologies from other domains?**
	• Cultural institutions are deemed 'trustworthy', valued by their transparency and legitimacy of information. It seems plausible that cultural institutions should relate this somehow to the types of use of their content.
	• Cultural Institutions should look at key performance indicators from other institutions.
	• Google Analytics could be used to collect specific parameters across different institutions. The idea would be to develop a minimal configuration of Google Analytics and incorporate that within the Thematic Survey.

	• Google Analytics is most often used without fine tuned installation and thus raises the issue of its ability to measure impact and value if not properly configured.
	• Google Analytics measures the usage of the institutional website and does not cover the use of the digital collections of an institution on other platforms. This raises the issue of if this is advisable when the number of sites where an institution's digital collection can be offered to the public is rapidly growing?
	• AD pointed out the restricted scope of Google Analytics and that there should be an emphasis towards creating "a family of methodologies" such as in the TIDSR: http://microsites.oii.ox.ac.uk/tidsr/welcome
	Question: Will there be so many differences between the target groups of digital services that a common methodology will not be possible to identify within a single survey? (e.g. research, general public, education)
	• NS stated that the project needs to identify what it is looking for with regards to the added value of ENUMERATE.
	• RE stated that ENUMERATE will be able to generate more specialised results, Google Analytics can be very broad or very specific but you must know what you are looking for. He also expressed the view that it could be dangerous to rely on commercial organisations to provide a free service.
	• AD emphasised his point that Google Analytics should be used only as a baseline for institutions to start analysing their data.
	• Opinion was expressed that ENUMERATE could create very basic rules that demonstrate segmentation techniques within Google Analytics to the community. This should include when to use it and what to do to get the results needed. An example of this would be to include 5 common grounds, best practices, how to implement and use it, and what kinds of reports are needed.
	• JF pointed out that ENUMERATE figures could also be potentially dangerous to institutions if it highlights that their content is not being used.
Discussing methods and tools	MDN introduced the topic of methods and tools for measuring use and impact.
	Question: Is there a preference to separate the measuring of use and impact of digital heritage from the measuring of the use and impact of 'physical' services?
	• RG expressed his opinion that in the future the approach to the physical and digital will become more alike.
	• AD demonstrated that the focus of ENUMERATE should be on measuring the use and impact of digital heritage, but that the project shouldn't forget where this meets the physical.
	• Other options for measuring use and impact mentioned were Piwik, Log Files or TIDSR JISC Toolkit. National Library of Spain experimented with Piwik but the outcome of this was not very successful.
	• There is a hesitation in certain countries to use Google Analytics as it gets access to the data being processed.
	• JF also pointed out that there are tools for social media analysis, these include Facebook Insights, and MailChimp for analysing email statistics. Facebook Insights could be useful when trying to analyse user generated content.
	• Discussion highlighted that it would be useful to make a distinction between interactions with the institution and interactions with the collections.
	• Statistics from aggregators are left out of ENUMERATE because the focus is on organisations having memory collections and to ensure that content is not

	counted twice. However there is an argument for counting the use of content on aggregators that is not hosted elsewhere. As the channels through which content can be published get more and more diverse it may become impracticable to retain clear distinctions. • The Balanced Scorecard is performance management framework. Using the Balanced Scorecard approach would enable institutions to see a framework of ideas that could be implemented within an organisation. This would also force management to think about digitisation activities.
Suggestions for the next ENUMERATE survey	A number of questions that are relevant for the next survey were presented to the group. These were: 1. What are the high-level priorities for ENUMERATE to get a better understanding of use and impact across the European heritage sector? 2. Should the survey be broken down along specific subdivisions (e.g. target groups, types of digital heritage collections) 3. Who would be the appropriate member(s) of staff to approach? 4. Looking at the current ENUMERATE questions, what questions can be maintained and what questions should be altered? • AD suggested that in order to gain a good understanding of the survey results, a set of the same core questions should be asked in 12 months time to be able to analyse any changes that have occurred. • AD also claimed that people should be enthusiastic about this as they like statistics, which can be very useful within institutions. • FH demonstrated that it is important for the project to focus on how to boost participation in the survey. A way of doing this is through national coordinators and social involvement. • The survey should include a question similar to 'Do you use Google Analytics or something else? If not, then why not?' • The survey should be directed towards the policy officer at an institution. • It is also important to consider what success looks like when creating the survey, will the questions you are asking give the results that will enable this success? • It was highlighted that it may be difficult to ask institutions for usage stats at a certain point in time. Instead a better approach would be to educate institutions in collecting the relevant data and to do this over a large time period. This approach has been adopted through Culture24's "Let's Get Real" project which organised sessions with a selected group of institutions. • JF wondered whether it would be easier to consult institutional websites and find out what is accessible there as opposed to asking an individual from and institution to answer questions. This would remove the issue of identifying the correct person to complete the survey, encouraging people to complete it and any issues surrounding differences in interpretation, first figuring out what can be done automatically. • The survey should also look at questions relating to mobile access and social media use (and how this is measured). • The survey should add in a subject which relates to the classification of types of use (not users). • The survey should look at what institutions should do after digitisation and how they can bring their information to the public in the most effective way. • If the survey wants to find out information from monuments or heritage sites it may be difficult as their data is generally aimed for a specific audience and there tends to be little reuse of the specific information collected within the

	databases.
	• GJN stated that ENUMERATE should find a way to combine the approaches of Let's Get Real/Museum Analytics (i.e. a prolonged working together with memory institutions during a longer time span) and the more conventional framework where a questionnaire is used - at one point in time - to query memory institutions (shorter time span).
Any other business	• Participants to email DEN with any further ideas for survey questions.
	• Expenses form sent to KS.