Digital Scriptorium
Institutional Survey Results
About the survey

- Written by Emma Thomson and the DS 2.0 Steering Committee
- Survey open from September 8-September 30, 2020
- Distributed on DS mailing list, DCRM-L
  - Aimed at institutional collection managers rather than entire manuscript community
- 35 total responses
  - Limited to 1 response per institution
  - US institutions only
- 3 question sections:
  - DS Membership Questions
  - Institutional Questions
  - DS 2.0 Questions
DS Membership Questions
Is your institution currently a member of Digital Scriptorium?

- Yes: 45.7%
- No: 54.3%
Location of Respondents by State
Summary of responses: “What are or would be the benefits in maintaining a DS membership for your institution?”

Accessibility (10 responses)
- “Collaborating with colleagues”

Visibility (8 responses)
- “Finding connections in other collections”

Discoverability (6 responses)
- “Learning from other libraries working on manuscript description and digitization”

Exposure (3 responses)
- “Potential assistance in cataloging manuscripts and fragments in languages for which we lack expertise”
Summary of responses: “What are or would be the challenges in maintaining a DS membership for your institution?”

- Financial concerns (16 responses)
- Staff resources (7 responses)
- Difficult to update records (5 responses)
- Proprietary concerns (2 responses)
Institutional Questions
What is the total materials budget at your institution?

- < $1 million: 37.1%
- $1-8 million: 34.3%
- $8-14 million: 8.6%
- >$25 million: 8.6%
- $14-25 million: 11.4%
What is the size of the student body at your institution?

- 20,000-30,000: 14.3%
- 5,000-10,000: 5.7%
- Not applicable: 22.9%
- >30,000: 22.9%
- 10,000-20,000: 22.9%
- <5,000: 11.4%
How many pre-modern manuscript objects does your institution own?

- **300-600**: 8.6%
- **100-300**: 8.6%
- **< 5**: 11.4%
- **50-100**: 8.6%
- **5-50**: 25.7%
- **> 600**: 37.1%
Estimated percentage of pre-modern manuscript holdings produced in Africa
Estimated percentage of pre-modern manuscript holdings produced in America
Estimated percentage of pre-modern manuscript holdings produced in Asia

Number of respondents

Percentage of manuscript holdings

0%  1-20%  21-40%  41-60%  61-80%  81-99%  100%
Estimated percentage of pre-modern manuscript holdings produced in Australasia

- 0%: 30 respondents
- 1-20%: 1 respondent

Number of respondents

Percentage of manuscript holdings
Estimated percentage of pre-modern manuscript holdings produced in Europe

Number of respondents

Percentage of manuscript holdings

1-20%  41-60%  61-80%  81-99%  100%
Estimated percentage of pre-modern manuscript holdings produced in the Middle East

- 0%: 5 respondents
- 1-20%: 25 respondents
- 21-40%: 1 respondent
- 61-80%: 1 respondent
Does your institution have an existing online catalog for its manuscripts?

- Yes: 45.7%
- Other: 40.0%
- No: 14.3%
Summary of other responses: “Does your institution have an existing online catalog for its manuscripts?”

Out of 14 total responses:

- Manuscripts are in institution’s general OPAC (9 responses)
- Not all manuscripts are catalogued (3 responses)
- DS is our online catalog (2 responses)
What percentage of the manuscripts at your institution are catalogued?

- 0-25%: 11.4%
- 25-50%: 14.3%
- 50-75%: 11.4%
- 75-100%: 62.9%
What percentage of the manuscripts at your institution are digitized?

- 0-25%: 34.3%
- 25-50%: 20.0%
- 50-75%: 11.4%
- 75-100%: 22.9%
- 100-125%: 0%
Does your institution have equipment and personnel in place for the digitization of special collections?

- Yes: 77.1%
- No: 17.1%
- Uncertain: 5.7%
In what data format(s) does your institution publish manuscript descriptions? Check all that apply:

- MARC
- MARCXML
- XML
- BIBFRAME
- TEI
- RDF
- EAD
- Finding Aid (PDF)
- Spreadsheet
- None of our
- Other

Number of respondents
Summary of other responses: In what data format(s) does your institution publish manuscript descriptions?

- MODS (3 responses)
- ContentDM (1 response)
- DACS (1 response)
- JSON (1 response)
Does your institution employ at least one staff member whose primary role involves your manuscript collection(s)?

Yes 51.4%  
No 48.6%
What controlled vocabularies does your institution include or link to in its manuscript descriptions? Check all that apply.

- VIAF
- Getty Vocabularies (AAT, TGN, etc.)
- GeoNames
- LCSH/LCGFT
- Other

**Number of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlled Vocabularies</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIAF</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getty Vocabularies (AAT, TGN, etc.)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeoNames</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSH/LCGFT</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of other responses: “What controlled vocabularies does your institution include or link to in its manuscript descriptions?”

- RBMS (6 responses)
- Ligatus's Language of Bindings (2 responses)
- FAST (2 responses)
- DCRM Controlled Vocabularies (1 response)
Does your institution expose its manuscript descriptions as linked open data?

- Yes: 5.7%
- Partially: 5.7%
- Uncertain: 28.6%
- No: 60.0%
Does your institution have the ability to store its own IIIF-compliant images?

- Yes: 51.4%
- No: 14.3%
- Uncertain: 34.3%
Does your institution have the ability to publish its own IIIF-compliant images?

- Yes: 54.3%
- No: 8.6%
- Uncertain: 37.1%
If your institution has a digital repository for manuscript data, is it OAI-PMH compliant?

- Yes: 22.9%
- No: 20.0%
- Uncertain: 40.0%
- N/A: 17.1%
Is your institution willing to make your manuscript metadata and images open access and freely available to the public?

- Yes: 80.0%
- No: 2.9%
- Uncertain: 17.1%
Summary of responses: “Please explain the level of open access your institution would be willing to support (for example, all metadata and images available for download and personal use, metadata and images available but with restrictions, etc.)”

- No restrictions (19 responses)
- Some restrictions (9 responses)
- Uncertain (7 responses)
DS 2.0 Questions
What level of metadata would be sufficient for a DS 2.0 manuscript entry for your collections?

- **Full description**: 69.4%
- **Brief identifying**: 22.2%
- **Other**: 8.3%
3 other responses: “What level of metadata would be sufficient for a DS 2.0 manuscript entry for your collections?”

- “We are interested in contributing as much of our metadata as possible without raising the bar too high for small institutions with in-scope collections to participate.”
- “A rich range of fields within the description that are searchable seems ideal to me, since we can link to a fuller description but the *searchability* of various metadata is of enormous benefit”
- “Brief is preferable as it decreases the need to update multiple repositories when new information is learned”
What level of digitization would be sufficient for a DS 2.0 manuscript entry for your collections?

- Single images: 8.6%
- Cover-to-cover: 28.6%
- None: 22.9%
- Sample: 40.0%
How important is DS 2.0's ability to collaborate with international partners and projects?

34 responses

- 1 (2.9%)
- 3 (8.8%)
- 7 (20.6%)
- 11 (32.4%)
- 12 (35.3%)
How important is DS 2.0's ability to utilize linked open data resources, technologies, and strategies?

34 responses

![Bar chart showing responses to the question.]

- 2 responses (5.9%)
- 1 response (2.9%)
- 7 responses (20.6%)
- 12 responses (35.3%)
- 12 responses (35.3%)
Summary of responses: “What other features and functions would you like to see in DS 2.0?”

- Authority control (6 responses)
- No cost to participate (3 responses)
- Easier ways to contribute (3 responses)
- Be more like e-codices (2 responses)
- Link to/integrate SDBM data (2 responses)
- LOD (2 responses)
- Better documentation for new users/contributors (2 responses)