



McMenemy, D. and Poulter, A. and Chowdhury, G. and Tomeny, A. (2005) Evaluation of SCRAN subscription to Scottish public libraries. Project Report. Scottish Library and Information Council (SLIC), Glasgow, United Kingdom.

<http://eprints.cdlr.strath.ac.uk/2738/>

Strathprints is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in Strathprints to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the url (<http://eprints.cdlr.strath.ac.uk>) of the Strathprints website.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to The Strathprints Administrator: eprints@cis.strath.ac.uk

Evaluation of SCRAN subscription to Scottish Public Libraries



**Report Produced for the
Scottish Library and Information Council**

Authors:

David McMenemy
Alan Poulter
Gobinda Chowdhury
Alex Tomeny

Libraries, Information and Communities Research Group
Department of Computer and Information Sciences
University of Strathclyde



August 2005

Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Scope of Project.....	7
1.1. Background to Project	7
1.2. Project Aims and Objectives.....	7
1.3. Terms of Reference of Evaluation	9
1.4. Methodologies Agreed.....	9
2.1. Access Issues (passwords/availability)	11
2.1.1. Issues of Licensing/Copyright	13
2.2. Site content/services.....	15
2.3. Training.....	16
3. Statistical Evaluation – Usage Figures and Survey Findings	18
3.1. Usage figures	18
3.2. Staff survey findings	21
3.3. User Survey Responses	28
3.4. Case studies (from SCRAN website).....	33
3.5. Pricing Models.....	35
4. Staff Interviews	37
5. Findings	41
Appendix B – Staff Survey Results to 26th August.....	50
Appendix C – User Survey Results to 26th August	71
Appendix D – Case Study Form.....	81
Appendix E – Usage Statistics – January to May 2005	82

Executive Summary

This report commissioned by the Scottish Library and Information Council evaluates the year-long Scottish Executive-funded project to give all public libraries in Scotland access to the SCRAN service. The implementation of the project was supported by a Project Steering Group with both SLIC and SCRAN representation, and a wider steering group with membership from Heads of Service, Scottish Executive, and SCRAN and chaired by Elaine Fulton of SLIC.

Methodology

A multi-stage methodology was decided upon which included:

- Visits to SCRAN headquarters to interview key personnel
- Extensive analysis of web logs and other usage statistics supplied by SCRAN
- A survey of staff to gauge satisfaction and usage patterns
- A survey of users to gauge satisfaction, usage patterns and value for money
- Qualitative interviews with a representative sample of library staff
- An analysis of the case study materials promoted by SCRAN as examples of best practice
- Analysis of minutes from Steering Group and Project Group, and relevant documentation from SLIC.

Findings

1. Users and Usage

- Over the five month period January to May 2005, the average number of sessions per branch on SCRAN for all Scottish public library authorities was 15. This equates to an average of 3 sessions per month for each branch in Scotland over the period
- Usage figures showed that staff training accounted for a significant portion of the usage for each authority. While some library authorities were keen users of the service others were not, suggesting that one of the critical success factors for the project was a member(s) of staff who was proactive in promoting service use within their institution.
- The user survey indicated that 51% of respondents had not used the SCRAN service.
- Evidence from the user survey suggests that 41% of users had difficulty in finding material on SCRAN using the simple search. As specialists in our field we believe this may be contributed to by the lack of generic vocabularies or taxonomies.
- The user survey showed enthusiasm for online materials and the kind of services provided by SCRAN. The public were very much of the opinion, however, that such materials should be provided free of charge.
- The issues of 24 hours per day 7 day a week access to the service, one of the main objectives of the project, was found to be problematic given that no access was available to SCRAN unless the patron was within the library building.

- We believe that authentication of remote users could have led to a far higher uptake of the service, as other databases such as NewsUK and Kompas enable this through library bar code and password.
- The marketing of the service was not as successful as it could have been. Material sent to local authorities, and emails encouraging distribution and promotion, appear to have been acted on in a piecemeal fashion. SCRAN's focus on PowerPoint files as a major marketing exercise misunderstood the ICT issues within authorities, i.e. available machinery, and support to reconfigure desktops.

2. Staff and Training

- The staff survey findings show a very positive attitude towards the SCRAN service, although the service is seen as a non-essential, albeit a welcome one. This may reflect the fact that the majority of the respondents were paraprofessional, and not necessarily aware of the cost to the authority of the service.
- Staff recognise that the training was of good quality and useful, however the evidence suggests that this has not been translated into sustained purposeful use by/or with the public. From the evaluation several factors could contribute to this, namely lack of staff time/numbers, lack of public demand, lack of targeted marketing, lack of product knowledge, or alternative solutions freely available on the web.
- While being broadly warmly receptive to SCRAN, 50% of staff respondents to the survey did not believe the library service would be adversely affected if the service was no longer available.
- Evidence from the staff survey suggests that 33% of users had difficulty in finding material on SCRAN using the simple search. This is despite the fact that 99% of the respondents categorized their ICT skills as being average or above.
- The SCRAN service represents a small part of the public library function, and from the evaluation it is clear that the staff found problems in terms of allocating time to promote this above other services. This is reinforced by the lack of staff numbers in smaller branches, and the usage figures.
- SCRAN featured case studies on their web site highlighting best practice. While the idea is an admirable one, the implementation of the case studies lacked both focus and quality, and a more robust mechanism for both selection and dissemination needs to be adopted for the future.
- The timescale for this project seriously influenced the ability for enough staff to become knowledgeable about the product.

3. Wider Implications and Options

- There are discrepancies in the costings models applied to different sectors across Scotland. As an example, for one year of access for all Scottish Higher Education Institutions, the cost would be £12,100.
- Part of the current subscription (£60,000) funded one post plus travel to public libraries. This would not appear to offer value for money given the usage of the service that resulted from the training.
- Public Library services have alternative access to Scottish digital resources. The Resources for Learning for Scotland Project (RLS) used NOF funding to draw together contributors from across the public sector with the intention of the

digital assets being freely available. On examination, material held on RLS is a combination of SCRAN and RLS data, but crucially access to the full image requires SCRAN subscription, except for those which are text-based documents. Other Scottish projects such as Am-Baile, Springburn Museum, and Virtual Mitchell provide full access to all images and not just thumbnails.

- One note of caution to highlight in terms of the survey was an email newsletter sent to all SCRAN subscribers in June that signposted the evaluation of the service and asked subscribers to send in examples of how useful SCRAN was and how it was being utilised. While this is perfectly acceptable, it was written from the point of view of suggesting that funding for the service was under review, and there is a concern among the evaluation team that such an email might run a danger of influencing the subsequent survey work undertaken for this evaluation study. This potential should be borne in mind when discussing the data.
- It is possible that a lack of local authority involvement in the procurement process, unlike other national procurements, led to a lack of ownership of the project, despite steering group and project management activity.
- There are tensions between constant development of value-added services which reuse the SCRAN content, and the obvious need to improve metadata standards and retrieval.

Issues for Consideration

1. It is crucial that in such roll-outs, that services provided meet the needs of the customer and not solely the business model of the supplier. Any proposed new service should therefore be required to produce a roll-out strategy in consultation with Heads of Service and SLIC. If training is proposed along the 'cascade' model, the actual cascading of training must be formally tracked and evaluated. A beta-testing phase with a representative group of authorities, prior to a training roll-out would also be beneficial, to enable fine-tuning a new service to the public library environment. This model has been previously successful in other service areas.
2. Training in any new electronic service needs to ensure that staff have adequate product knowledge and skills to both use the service with the public, and to cascade training among their colleagues.
3. Access to SCRAN and logging usage raise issues. 24/7 access is possible to SCRAN but only using the default generic access mode. Authentication issues need to be fully explored for the future and development of a uniform solution for public libraries like ATHENS in HE/FE or the forthcoming SSDN solution for schools. It is likely for the future that local authority smartcards would serve well here.
4. Generic training accounts should be created and used whenever any training initiative is undertaken. This would enable cascade training to be excluded from logging, and make real usage (or non-usage) much more apparent.
5. Decisions need to be left to library authorities to choose whether to continue funding at SCRAN's normal rates. At the very least a model of subscription needs to be developed that reflects the fact that public libraries in Scotland have a great deal of content invested in SCRAN, and as such should be able to access it for a minimum fee.
6. SCRAN should provide public libraries with a clear breakdown of costs for SCRAN services, including access to content (their own or other), digital-curation, IPR management services, or any other value-added services. This

would enable local authorities to make informed budgetary decisions based on the level of services they require.

7. Any new service should have a clear target in terms of how it will enhance the public library 'offering'. Collaboration with authorities and SLIC should provide a cohesive approach to service development and implementation in public libraries.
8. A wider discussion needs to take place among all stakeholders to decide on a pathway for creation, management and delivery of Scottish cultural/historical materials in digital formats. The main question to be addressed is whether such materials should be provided free, or whether a commercial model such as SCRAN is the way forward. The Scottish Executive is currently researching the development of a digital media strategy and this evaluation should provide valuable input to that process.
9. A distributed environment incorporating the forthcoming Creative Commons license for Scotland will offer an opportunity to present digital material outwith a centralised database structure. The improvements in ICT processing power, connectivity, and skills development mean that ownership of digital media can be harnessed more effectively locally.

1. Scope of Project

This report will discuss the findings of an evaluation study into the Scottish Executive funded Scottish Public Libraries license to SCRAN. The evaluation was funded by the Scottish Library and Information Council (SLIC), and was undertaken by a team from the Department of Computer and Information Sciences at the University of Strathclyde.

1.1. Background to Project

The Scottish Executive funded access to SCRAN for all Scottish public libraries for one year, with the total cost of the project amounting to £123,900.

The main rationale was to support several of the Scottish Executive's Cultural priorities:

Libraries and Information

- Promoting access to culture, heritage and sport resources (electronic and multimedia materials)
- Contributing to life long learning (flexible and open learning, e-literacy and training)
- Providing Information for active citizenship

Arts

- Promotion of the arts, literature, community arts, cultural traditions e.g. through projects and information
- Audience development
- Support for artistic organisations (including national and local providers)

Heritage and Museums

- Promoting interest, awareness and understanding of national and local heritage including access to collections, education, outreach and the use of information technology
- Promotion of cultural heritage and community identity
- Local history and local studies

1.2. Project Aims and Objectives

The project had several agreed aims and objectives. The aims of the project were:

- To provide SCRAN licensed access for all Scottish local authority libraries
- All libraries would have multi user rights to SCRAN Albums, CD-ROMs and resources
- All libraries and lifelong learners would reap the benefits of cleared high quality cultural resources
- Delivering a programme of training users in developing their own use of the resources and in assembling learning objects
- Encouraging dissemination of good practice and sharing of resources – the universal licence allows sharing of prepared resources under the IPR clearance

And the subsequent objectives included:

- **Licence to give unrestricted access, free at the point of use to staff and library users in any local authority library premises**
 - Access to over 1,300,000 records with 300,000 containing multimedia resources
- **Service Provision**
 - Provision of 24 hours per day, 7 day per week online resource service on 10Mb connection
 - Provision of User Names and Passwords to all participating libraries
 - Provision of Authentication System including IP authentication where required
 - IPR management of all resources
 - Distribution of Guides and application software toolset to all schools
 - Regular email with lifelong learning hints directly to subscribed teachers
 - Provide Albums functionality with captioning and local output to personal mini-website
- **Development**
 - Investigate and provide IP authentication for compliant systems
- **Training**
 - Training to a maximum of 2 days per authority

- Support of Connecting Communities initiative
- **Presentations/Editorial**
 - Present at conferences, local authority events and author journal articles

1.3. Terms of Reference of Evaluation

This report will focus on the main criteria specified by the client, as laid out below:

1. The report should detail the aims and objectives of the project and methods employed in working towards their achievement. In addition it should critically appraise the success of the pilot in terms of its relevance to enhancing the quality of service delivery.
2. The focus of the evaluation is value for money to enable the Heads of Public Library Service and/or the Scottish Executive assess whether to continue with the SCRAN subscription service
3. Particular attention should be paid to the effectiveness of the training programme, auditing of web log statistics, relationship between training and use patterns, including sustainable use post training.

1.4. Methodologies Agreed

In order to carry out the evaluation, a multi-stage methodology was agreed with SLIC.

The study would consist of:

1. Visits to SCRAN headquarters to interview key personnel
2. Extensive analysis of web logs and other usage statistics supplied by SCRAN
3. A survey of staff to gauge satisfaction and usage patterns
4. A survey of users to gauge satisfaction, usage patterns and value for money
5. Qualitative interviews with a representative sample of library staff
6. An analysis of the case study materials promoted by SCRAN as examples of best practice.
7. Analysis of minutes from Steering group and Project Group and relevant documentation from SLIC.

2. Background to the SCRAN service

SCRAN see everybody as their target audience. Users can be school children doing homework, students at all levels, community groups in public libraries and anyone who wants to 'reminisce' (their term) about their lives or their locality. Training is about giving ideas on reaching these groups.

SCRAN see their selling point as the depth and volume of digitised material they offer. They have local resources for everywhere in Scotland. These resources can have personal resonance for individuals, a service SCRAN label quite succinctly as 'reminiscence'. To get this depth SCRAN aggregates resources from other sources. Over their history, SCRAN have accumulated a unique set of skills in digitisation and digital preservation. All of SCRAN's resources had copyright clearance for general use but with specific privileges for subscribers. SCRAN was considered to be a unique service, with no competitors.

Resources had been acquired through three stages of growth. The first batch came from Millennium funding in conjunction with the National Museums Service/National Library of Scotland. Digitisation of resources was done by others. The second batch had come from NOF funding for Resources for Learning in Scotland. Currently SCRAN negotiate for resources with other organisations (for example the V&A). These organisations provide resources, SCRAN digitised and mounted them and stored them for fast external access. SCRAN was essentially a federated database of resources from a variety of sources. SCRAN are currently working with the British Museum and the Scottish Motor Museum to acquire resources.

Individual records are in Dublin Core format. Place names are provided by contributing institutions and can be variable as different institutions use different rules. SCRAN have tagged about 170,000 records in the past year with Ordnance Survey co-ordinates. Geographic search allows linkages between areas and their sub-areas. Names of people and organisations are as they style them. SCRAN add known variants for names. For dating old objects, it is unusual to have an exact date and so SCRAN use earliest and latest date. There is no generic vocabulary or taxonomy for the vast range of subjects in SCRAN and contributing institutions themselves have no agreed system, which has the

potential to influence the ability to efficiently search the resource. SCRAN are working with RCAHMS and the National Museums of Scotland on a joint thesaurus for Scottish cultural institutions. SCRAN employ the UK Learner Object Model [LOM} with Pathfinder packs and they have a full hierarchy of curriculum terms for the English and Scottish curricula. SCRAN have three staff working full time on metadata, two checking, correcting and adding to records and a data officer managing quality and carrying out global updates. SCRAN's three educational officers look after LOM information.

Having originated as a research project, SCRAN are now a commercial operation. Their current pricing can be seen at:

<http://shop.scran.ac.uk/>

The costs of the project covered the salary of the library officer, travel costs for the post to visits public libraries for training purposes, and training/promotional materials used. Other staff costs related to marketing, systems/web development and project management. System costs covered hardware, software and net bandwidth. A contingency budget was included and this went entirely on travel costs (visits to the islands etc). A breakdown follows:

Item	Cost (inc. direct & indirect costs for salaries)
Library Officer	49,000
Promotion Materials	6,000
Training Materials	1,000
Travel & Subsistence	7,000
Marketing	13,000
Systems & Web Development	18,000
Project Management	8,000
System/Infrastructure	18,000
Contingency	4,000
TOTAL	124,000

2.1. Access Issues (passwords/availability)

One of the main objectives of the project was 24 hours per day, and 7 day a week (24/7) access to SCRAN within public libraries. On further analysis, however, rather than an objective for access, this is something that should be a standard and expected service level given such availability to all other subscribers, be they higher or further education, or home subscribers. As will be seen, given the access model used for public libraries, 24/7 access was never a likely scenario.

Managing access and logging usage raised issues for SCRAN. The ATHENS approach was their preferred access model, whereby unique IP addresses were recognised and tied to authorised users, but the implementation cost for this would be prohibitive for local authorities to implement. The differing usage of IP addresses in public libraries posed problems for the project, as while some used fixed IPs, some did not use them at all (North Ayrshire, Argyle and Bute plus parts of Highlands). A subsequent problem was that several IT departments within councils changed the IP addresses of the computers in their authority, causing authentication issues beyond the control of SCRAN. Access, then, was by menu and password authentication. Choosing the default authority level rather than a particular public library would hide access from that library. Remote access to SCRAN (i.e. by a public library user from home) would be possible with the right authentication system. A potential solution to the problems of password access could have been the solution adopted by NewsUK and other databases, whereby access was provided using a customer's library barcode number.

24/7 access cannot ever be an achievable goal within the public library system unless individual passwords are allocated to users to allow them to access the service from their home computer or another venue outwith the library building. In addition, the nature of library opening hours varies considerably across the country, meaning that 24/7 access may in fact equate to only a handful of hours of access per day for many members of the public. For instance, Western Isles council libraries have several community libraries, one being Sgoil Shiaboist. The opening hours for this library amount to 15 and a half hours per week, which is less than ten percent of the entire week, meaning in terms of value for money the residents in this area have extremely limited access to SCRAN via the current access arrangements. Rural areas are especially hit given opening hours and lack of access to alternative venues. Even libraries with extensive opening hours are not able to take up even half of the possible potential access hours of those who have

passwords allowing 24/7 access. Glasgow's Mitchell Library is open from 9am-8pm Monday-Thursday, and 9-5pm on Friday and Saturday, a total of 60 hours a week from a possible 168.

It is suggested, then, that in the context of the project 24/7 access was never possible, as in reality most public libraries will only be able to take advantage of guaranteed access for the duration of library opening hours. This should be borne in mind for any further negotiations on licensing of the product that may take place in the future and should be a consideration from the point of view of pricing. Indications from the Steering Group meetings suggest that SCRAN have no problem in principle to staff accessing the service from home, and the extension of this to the public should not be seen as a problem if SCRAN can negotiate new access agreements with rightsholders.

2.1.1. Issues of Licensing/Copyright

Because of the licensing requirements on SCRAN from contributors, each user must be identifiable so that should a resource be discovered being used illegally, SCRAN can tell the user to desist. A number of SCRAN's commercial and non-commercial contributors regularly trawl Google to see if their resources are being used illegally and let SCRAN know of any illegal uses they find. Whilst this is relevant for organisations like Scotsman, Herald and RCAHMS, it is not the case for public libraries and museums who are trying to increase access to their digital content.

It is believed that within the project remit could have been a plan to pilot home access in one local authority to allow investigation into the issues. Negotiations with content providers should have been undertaken to allow this to run as part of the project.

As an illustration, access for public library members to other databases such as NewsUK and Encyclopaedia Britannica has been negotiated, allowing library card holders to access the databases 24/7 from their home computers using only their library card number. This is true universal access and offers excellent value for money, taking pressure off library premises and allowing members of the public to access library services even when the building is closed.

The issue of licensing of a library's own materials is also of concern. At the moment, without a SCRAN subscription, library authorities who have contributed vast amounts to the database have to pay for access to their own materials. What is also of concern is that a library authority cannot even view the list of contributors to the SCRAN site without a subscription. This means, in essence, that staff in public libraries throughout Scotland have to have a list at hand of the material they have provided, but more worryingly members of the public are blocked from accessing more than mere thumbnails of material that rightly belongs to them through their authority's ownership of the material. This is most unwelcome for images that should be public domain and freely available to the general public and needs further examination and negotiation.

The ethos behind the forthcoming Creative Commons licensing encourages the sharing of digital resources with the owner retaining IPR but allowing pre-agreed use of the resource. A distributed environment incorporating the Creative Commons license for Scotland will offer an opportunity to present digital material outwith a centralised database structure. The improvements in ICT processing power, connectivity, and skills development mean that ownership of digital media can be harnessed more effectively locally.

SCRAN argue that subscription to the service is about more than mere access to the resources, it includes IPR management and digital curation, yet the price charged for access includes these services whether they are wanted by the subscriber or not. It might be better, if a broader understanding of SCRAN is to be achieved, for the subscription to be broken down into categories of what is being subscribed to. This potentially opens up the opportunity for the subscriber to choose services from a potential list.

In terms of accessing their material local authorities have the option of using Resources for Learning Scotland service. SCRAN was also a major partner RLS Project, again funded by the national lottery through the New Opportunities Fund (NOF). The aim of this project was to provide full access to learning materials, but the site acts as little more than an advertisement for SCRAN subscription, offering extremely limited access to materials. Running a search provides access to only thumbnails of images, regardless of whether you are accessing material you have supplied or not.

2.2. Site content/services

The SCRAN service offers an extensive range of materials with a mainly, although not exclusively, Scottish focus. A database consisting of over 1.3 million records, with over 300,000 multimedia resources, reflects this.

Although SCRAN had created many 'Pathfinder' packs of resources by topic, the SCRAN interface had been extended to allow users to develop a range of resource applications for themselves by means of personalisation/customisation. Such user-created information was stored on SCRAN's servers so it would work anywhere and not just on a local machine. 'My Stuff' offers a basic level of personalisation, like bookmarking. 'Albums' are more sophisticated, allowing user editing features (e.g. the addition of captions). Public libraries could create 'Collections' which contained Albums so that they could deliver a range of SCRAN applications for their users.

The original focus of the SCRAN service was and continues to be educational, and there is certainly an argument for suggesting that the site displays an age profile bias. Some of the terminology used could be confusing to adults who have not undertaken training, and there may be issues for the casual adult browser who is drawn to the service via marketing material only to be faced with terminology such as:

- "Homework",
- "My Stuff",
- "Lucky Dip"
- "Monkeying Around"
- "Fun and Games"
- "Sticky Pics"

Each of these features in their own right are creative and enhance the user experience of the site greatly. Their use in a database aimed at a wider market than schools does need to be rethought, however. A more intuitive homepage for public libraries needs to be developed, aimed at the wider range of ages and interests that this client market represents.

The actual service provided by the “My Stuff” link is a value-added one, allowing a personalisation to take place. The user needs to register within the site to create a folder where they can then store images and customise their interface colour and design. This is a useful feature and offers a good level of customer service.




Figure 1 - My Stuff service within SCRAN

Other value-added services include the ability to create calendars using the images available on SCRAN, as well as posters. These are potentially attractive options for library customers, but need to be more easily accessible to users who are not being aided by staff when using the service. It would be possible to explore alternative ways to deliver this functionality at a local level.

2.3. Training

SCRAN training was performed in two rounds (November-December and March-April) by a dedicated member of SCRAN staff. All 32 authorities were visited. The aim was to train the most relevant staff who would then cascade down training. Training was usually done in small groups of 8-10: the biggest single group trained at once was 18 people for West Lothian. Time was spent training smaller groups in remoter areas, so that access to training was uniform. Two levels of training were provided: an overview of the basic

facilities of SCRAN, then hands-on usage to reinforce the overview and to develop skills. SCRAN could provide examples of successful use of SCRAN in public libraries, for example Fife's Scavenger Hunt, developed both locally and in consultation with SCRAN. However many authorities were absent from SCRAN's list of committed users.

The initial block of training in public libraries from existing SCRAN subscribers was used to develop ideas for SCRAN interface improvements and demonstrate implementation of the best of these ideas. The authorities were Aberdeen, Glasgow and the Borders. The outcomes were new facilities like 'Show me How'. Despite these attempts to customise for public library use, this did not translate into use.

3. Statistical Evaluation – Usage Figures and Survey Findings

For the purposes of this evaluation study, two separate surveys were undertaken and usage figures supplied by SCRAN were examined. Both a staff survey and a user survey were conducted between the 27th July 2005 and the 26th August 2005. The staff survey was a web-based questionnaire, while the user survey was paper based. Response levels to both were high, with some useful feedback fed into the evaluation process.

One note of caution to highlight in terms of the survey was an email newsletter sent to all SCRAN subscribers in June that signposted the evaluation of the service and asked subscribers to send in examples of how useful SCRAN was and how it was being utilised. While this is perfectly acceptable, it was written from the point of view of suggesting that funding for the service was under review, and there is a concern among the evaluation team that such an email may have influenced the subsequent survey work undertaken for this evaluation study. This potential should be borne in mind when discussing the data.

3.1. Usage figures

SCRAN changed the logging method when they changed their system in December 2004. Previously logging was done per file, so a page access might generate multiple page view hits for each element (e.g. graphic) of a page. The current logging system gives a page view per page. New activity would set up a logging 'session' and any use within a following period (one hour) was counted as that one session. A session thus could conceal multiple uses. Caching will have no effect on usage as all pages are dynamically generated. The only static materials served are images and PDF.

Each resource has a unique identifier. This means that listing single instances of resource access will create enormous reports. Resource (and function) usage is shown by totalling access to PHP scripts which underlie basic functions in SCRAN. This information is not available prior to the new system's installation in 2004.

The graph below illustrates the number of sessions over the January to May period of 2005 by local authority:




Figure 2 - Number of Sessions by Authority

Figure 3 illustrates a breakdown of the number of sessions divided by total branch numbers in each authority, here branch being defined as individual branch passwords supplied to the authority by SCRAN:




Figure 3 - Number of Sessions Divided by Number of Branches

The expectation may be that the larger authorities are responsible for the higher usage because of the number of branches. This is certainly the case for some, however it is not true for all, and it is clear that some authorities are using SCRAN a lot more than others. Over the five month period illustrated above, the average number of sessions per branch on SCRAN for all Scottish public library authorities was 15. This equates to an average of 3 sessions per month for each branch in Scotland over the period.

The issue of training and sustained use post-training is highlighted in the graph below which shows the number of resources accessed in the month training took place, one month following training, and two months following training:




Figure 4 - Training and post-training statistics

The rubric for inclusion in this chart was:

- At least one month of statistics available pre-training month
- At least two months of statistics available post-training month

This covered 16 authorities in total, and it is clearly evident that a dramatic increase in usage occurs in the month of training, followed by some sustained use in the following month, and a drop in usage in the second month following training. In the graph, 0% represents (although not literally) the level of access in the month pre-training; therefore

anything which falls below this level represents a drop in access below the level before training commenced.

The logical expectation would be that access would be sustained at this level or better, increasing as training is cascaded to other staff and users. The data available for the period January to May suggests that this is not happening for the majority of authorities, with only 6 of the 16 illustrated seeing an improvement in usage, and only 3 seeing improvement worthy of note.

The other conclusion that can be made from the above is that much of the data from months when training occurred must be treated with caution, as this cannot be classed as normal usage, but instead as necessary staff training.

For future initiatives of this nature statistics for training should be clearly separated from those of standard use if statistical information is not to be seen as misleading. Generic training accounts should be created and used whenever any training initiative is undertaken.

To summarise, after removing peaks caused by training sessions, usage figures reveal a bifurcation between a group of 'using' authorities and another group of 'non-using' authorities. In this latter group usage is either very low or non-existent. It is also apparent that usage generally in branch libraries is very low, but this may be attributable to many factors, including small staff numbers, and the inability to create time to promote the SCRAN service and indeed take part in cascaded training. The interviews of staff indicated that they felt stretched, and while being appreciative of the SCRAN service were often not in a position to promote it. One interviewee also stated that she felt the service was only now beginning to be used by more staff as they were finding time to pass on the skills.

3.2. Staff survey findings

The staff survey commenced on the 27th July 2005 and all responses received up to the 26th August are incorporated in the discussion below. The survey was conducted via the Internet, with the URL of the survey emailed to Heads of Service and SCRAN training

contacts within each local authority with the request that it be passed on to staff for completion. A total of 419 responses were received up to this date, although not all respondents answered all questions.

Graphs for all questions are available in the Appendix.

Figure 5 quite clearly shows peaks in respondent numbers from authorities known as committed to using SCRAN. These peaks are well out of proportion to the number expected based on relative staff numbers.




Figure 5 - Respondents by Local Authority

The responses highlighted in Figure 6 are somewhat worrying because of the lack of the small number of professionals responding. This becomes an issue from the point of view of value for money. If staff are unaware of the potential cost of a service like SCRAN it may well lead to them being more positive about the service than they would be if they know subscription was a competitor with other services when it came round to budgeting for library services.

This may have to be borne in mind when considering many of the responses.




Figure 6 - Professional status of respondent




Figure 7 - Usefulness of SCRAN training

The responses on training (Figure 7) seem very positive but usage figures show small usage of SCRAN, outside of certain authorities. If the training was good, why has it not been used to produce tangible results? Figure 8 reflects good ratings for coverage but again, where is the use (apart from in training sessions) that will ascertain its coverage?

Of course, the positive results for SCRAN from this survey could well come from the preponderance of respondents from the few authorities where SCRAN usage was high.




Figure 8 - Coverage of local history for own area

There is no doubt that the staff survey suggests SCRAN has been generally warmly received amongst the staff who responded, and the big question remains why this enthusiasm was not turned into much heavier use. Figure 9 shows the number of times respondents had accessed SCRAN, outside of training:




Figure 9 - Usage of SCRAN over past year

49% claim reasonably heavy (6-10) or very heavy (10+) usage, but again this is not reflected in the usage statistics. The evaluation team incorporated a question asking the types of usage respondents had been involved in with regards to SCRAN with selectable categories being, 1. Promoting use at a library event; 2. My own personal use; 3. Supporting customer use in the library. These categories were defined by the evaluators, and it is conceivable that library staff may have chosen other categories, or had a longer list. The categories chosen are, then arbitrary.

The types of usage are highlighted in Figure 10:




Figure 10 - Purpose of Using SCRAN

An interesting statistic is the 24% who used SCRAN for their own personal use, but 49% supporting use by the public is a healthy percentage, with a further 20% marketing the service at library events.

The issue of marketing, vital to any new service, is highlighted in Figure 11:




Figure 11 - How is SCRAN Marketed

All options were able to be selected, and it is clear from the above that the most popular method of marketing was word of mouth, making cascading of training to as many staff as possible an absolutely crucial issue for success. Only a fraction of respondents (20) indicated that newspapers were used to spread the word on SCRAN.

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate how much of an effect losing access to SCRAN would have on the library service:




Figure 12 - Effect of losing SCRAN

While being broadly warmly receptive to SCRAN the opinion of the largest group (37%) of respondents was that the effect of losing SCRAN would be limited, although a high percentage of respondents felt that the effect would be reasonable(29%), with a smaller number thinking the effect would be significant.(21%)

Below is summarised a selection of the comments received from staff:

- Money could have been better spent on subscriptions of our choice
- If SCRAN is allowed more time to develop (i.e. amass more material) its resources it will become an increasingly useful tool for public library online services.

- Not many people have used it. I think that it is a good site but with so many other sites on the Internet it is easy to find the images you're looking for elsewhere.
- I think advertising of this tool is woefully inadequate, and it's not available on enough of our PCs.
- Easy access and detailed information make this an invaluable tool for public use.
- Excellent service that will grow in usefulness.

All graphs from the staff survey are available in the Appendix, but broadly the results indicate staff were very positive about the SCRAN service.

3.3. User Survey Responses

A total of 351 responses to the user survey was received by the deadline. The breakdown of authorities is as follows:




Figure 13 - Responses to Public Survey by Authority

29 of the responses had no identifying data to enable allocation to a specific local authority; however were included as being complete responses and therefore valid. One

of the questions in this survey asked whether the public was interested in accessing online materials. Figure 14 indicates the response:




Figure 14 - Would you be interested in online services

Clearly there is a wide interest for electronic materials such as SCRAN, and this is also the case across genders and age groups, as can be seen in the appendix. Large numbers of respondents also indicated interest in many of the types of material available via SCRAN:




Figure 15 - What types of resources would you like to access

Clearly materials that are unique to their locality, their country, or their family were the most popular choices.

Awareness of the SCRAN service within the library was high, although less than 50% of respondents had actually used it, even given the high response rates from authorities with the highest SCRAN use:




Figure 15 - Awareness of SCRAN

Of those who used SCRAN there was positive feedback on the quality of information available:




Figure 16 - Quality of Information

This suggests a high level of satisfaction with the types of resources available. Ease of searching, while being broadly well scored, also showed some users had difficulty:




Figure 17 - Ease of Searching

Comments received on this question included the following:

- “I find retrieval of results most problematic on SCRAN, there seems to be no consistency in what terms, names or subjects are used for indexing and retrieval”
- “Once search found lots of searching through subject for information although keyword given”
- “In the past I have noted inaccuracies of information stored”
- “Sometimes filtering of results could be better. I tend to get lots of irrelevant material along with my search results”
- “I Used Scran for the first time today and found it very easy to use and full of interesting information”

Some of the comments from users suggest that retrieval of results is an issue for many, and this reinforces the need for robust metadata.

To gauge value for money and willingness to pay, a question was asked that requested users to give a cost per session they would be willing to pay to access a service providing the types of material available on SCRAN:




Figure 18 - How much would you be willing to pay

Over 58% of respondents indicated they felt such a service should be free, with a further 15% not wishing to put a figure on it. This suggests that libraries would struggle if they wished to recoup from their users some of the outlay of a SCRAN subscription.

Overall the users responded well to the concept of a SCRAN-like service, although more than half of the respondents had not used SCRAN itself. The interest in a site providing access to Scottish historical material, local history and family history, was very high and something that should be built on for the future.

3.4. Case studies (from SCRAN website)

One of the main aims for the SCRAN project was, “encouraging dissemination of good practice.” To this end the SCRAN site contains a series of case studies provided by public libraries. The case studies can be accessed via subject, or via library authority. The categorisation of case studies is displayed in Figure 19 below. Please note that case studies can be classified under more than one heading:




Figure 19 - Case studies by subject

The case studies themselves are a useful way of sharing best practice, and the form designed for recording each case study (Appendix D) is well-designed. The completion of the form in many cases lets the initiative down, however. For example one of the questions on the form asks:

“Was this successful and would you do it again?”

Too many of the responses state answers like “Yes” and “Yes,” with no clear indication of a proper evaluation structure in place for the event. For the case study system to work efficiently there needs to be a higher level of quality control for the case studies if they are to become meaningful and repeatable. A suggestion could be, for instance, that any activities allied with learning should have clearly stated learning outcomes. In addition, there is no follow up information on any of the case studies, so it is impossible to know what uses customers put the information they retrieved.

While the idea is an admirable one, the implementation of the case studies lacked both focus and quality, and a more robust mechanism for both selection and dissemination

needs to be adopted for the future. The case studies appear on the surface to be serendipitous, and it would have been useful for the case studies to be chosen from well planned, executed and evaluated uses of the SCRAN service that could have formed a library of best practice.

3.5. Pricing Models

To gauge value for money in terms of pricing for future subscription for public libraries, it is useful to examine the cost for another sector. Prices for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are publicly available via the Joint Information Systems Committee website:

http://www.jisc.ac.uk/coll_scran.html

Under a national-subscription model, all HEIs in the UK can subscribe to SCRAN at the following rates for the years 2005-2008:

JISC Charging Band	Annual Subscription Fee Year 1	Annual Subscription Fee Year 2	Annual Subscription Fee Year 3
A – B	£1100	£1350	£1350
C – D	£700	£900	£900
E – F	£500	£700	£700
G – H	£300	£350	£350
I – J	£200	£250	£250

For charging purposes, all HEIs are banded based on total funding provided to the HEI, rather than student population. To put the costings in context, the table below illustrates the costs for all HEIs in Scotland to subscribe to SCRAN using the JISC subscription rates:

Institution	Charge Band	Year 1	Total Cost of 3 Years Access (2005-2008)
1. Bell College	H	£300	£1,000
2. Edinburgh College of Art	H	£300	£1,000
3. Glasgow Caledonian University	D	£700	£2,500
4. Glasgow School of Art	H	£300	£1,000
5. Heriot-Watt University	D	£700	£2,500
6. Napier University	D	£700	£2,500
7. Queen Margaret University College	F	£500	£1,900

8. Robert Gordon University	E	£500	£1,900
9. Royal Scottish Academy of Music and Drama	I	£200	£700
10. Scottish Agricultural College	H	£300	£1,000
11. UHI Millennium Institute	D	£700	£2,500
12. University of Aberdeen	C	£700	£2,500
13. University of Abertay Dundee	F	£500	£1,900
14. University of Dundee	C	£700	£2,500
15. University of Edinburgh	A	£1100	£3,800
16. University of Glasgow	A	£1100	£3,800
17. University of Paisley	E	£500	£1,900
18. University of St Andrews	D	£700	£2,500
19. University of Stirling	E	£500	£1,900
20. University of Strathclyde	B	£1100	£3,800
Total		£12,100	£43,100

A subscription covering ALL HEIs in Scotland for the academic year 2005-2006 would cost £12,100. The total bill for all three years of the agreement would come to £43,100. The subscription bands above have been confirmed as accurate by Liam Earney, JISC Collections Manager, who added that the HE license, “is all inclusive...It allows all authorised users of an institution (staff and students) unlimited access 24/7 with no additional charges for high usage.”

Prices quoted for cultural institutions on the SCRAN site include the following prices for libraries/museums/archives:

Central Libraries - £2000

Large Libraries - £1000

Small Libraries - £250

Obviously when an entire local authority subscribes they receive a large discount, but the costs above seem high without the 24/7 access akin to that provided by HE via the ATHENS authentication system. This offers a much higher level of value for money for the subscription price.

4. Staff Interviews

User interviews were undertaken with a range of authorities, both from the group identified by SCRAN, usage statistics, and staff survey responses, as committed users and also those not in this group. The intention was to try to elucidate how staff viewed the effectiveness of training, the utility of new services delivered and value for money of the project. All staff approached initially were on a contact list provided by SCRAN (see appendix A).

17 individuals from five authorities were interviewed. Most were seasoned library staff, with lengths of services ranging from 15 years up to 40. 11 were professional grade, 6 para-professional. Their areas of responsibility ran across responsibility for managing one or more libraries, a facet of service management (e.g. ICT, specifically PN and LMS services, children's services, or local history) or customer-facing roles. All had engaged with ECDL and felt that they had the requisite IT skills for the job; although they recognised that they were continually being stretched. They also admitted to being stretched generally, because of shrinking staff numbers and an unchanging set of core tasks which were being added to by new tasks – “Staff are being hit by new initiative after new initiative, with no time to bed one down before the next arrives.” However all interviewees appeared well motivated and keen to do the best they could for their users.

All had had experience of KnowUK and NewsUK and some knowledge of Kompass. All were engaged in making provision of local digitised services, in the areas of Scottish history, local history and family history. All agreed that genealogy and reminiscence especially were popular services. Most were using bookmarks to point to web resources or locally-mounted CD-ROMs. Digitisation for local history collections was being attempted by some but costs and other difficulties meant that it was sometimes easier to ask users to go to a central library to consult originals. The drawback to this approach was that “some materials would sit in vaults forever”. It was remarked that some popular sites (e.g. Statistical Accounts of Scotland online) were moving to ‘for pay’ access which meant that users could not be directed to them anymore. SAS online still is a free service. It is the value added elements which is moving to a subscription service.

All reported the same format for the SCRAN training sessions they had received, an initial round of familiarisation and then a second round focussing on hands-on use and creating applications. The first round was acknowledged as the weaker of the two. None seemed to have received any promotional materials from SCRAN, although some produced examples of leaflets and posters they had designed and printed locally. All used links on computers to promote SCRAN. A general issue was that local computer technical support was often overstretched or “tyrannical”. One group commented that just getting bookmarks changed and icons placed on screens was next to near impossible as rights to do these tasks were maintained centrally.

One issue with promotion that was raised suggested that SCRAN’s name gave no indication of what it was. Also its name was easy to confuse with those of other services e.g. SCAN.

No one reported problems in using SCRAN and most praised the suite of tools which enabled customisation to be done. Most interviewees made only light use of SCRAN. The biggest driver of usage was SCRAN’s newsletters which prompted a check of SCRAN for new features or materials. Some staff wanted access to SCRAN from home as there they would have had time to explore, a facility which is now open to school teachers.

Examples given of SCRAN in use, as a source for local enquiries included:

- a picture of a destroyed railway station in response to a query from a modeller
- a picture of one persons great grandfather
- a quiz for use in after school homework clubs in which children worked competitively in pairs to answer questions
- pictures to make into local calendars
- packaged information on the Vikings for school projects
- information on co-op tokens for a research project

In particular a number mentioned that in their experience an aging population might not be computer literate but showed a liking for reminiscence services. There was however a general awareness that SCRAN usage was very low, and lower in some authorities than

others. Fife was known to be a high user but then “Fife always was keen on online services”.

There was recognition of the value of SCRAN to library staff. Local history services in particular would be hit if SCRAN was removed. Most positive comments were:

- “Major effect, devastated, only major Scottish website”
- “Majority of staff use SCRAN. They would be disappointed if we lost it. It is unique.”

However recognition of the value of SCRAN did not translate into a willingness to pay for it. “They should pay us as they are using our materials!” was a common complaint, even from the one authority that was a keen SCRAN user and had licensed it prior to the project. As a new service it was felt that it should be free or else it would never accrue usage. The most negative comment was:

- “SCRAN is a product whose time has gone”.

A counter example of the British Library’s website was cited as a free site which offered much the same facilities as SCRAN. It was felt that the National Library of Scotland should do something similar and that it was the responsibility of the whole cultural sector in Scotland to co-operatively digitise and share resources. Interestingly there seemed to be little awareness of the Resources for Learning in Scotland (RLS) project which offers limited access to much of the material available on SCRAN.

It was universally agreed that users would not pay for SCRAN if asked to in a library. This was because SCRAN held a large part of the nation’s heritage and so should be free to all.

Overall, one of the critical success factors for SCRAN was the existence of an individual or individuals within the organisation who acted as an evangelist for the service. The nature of training meant that cascading would only be successful if the subsequent trainer believed in the service and sold it successfully to the staff. It was acknowledged that finding time to undertake proper cascading of training was difficult and one respondent

felt that it was really only after one year that she felt staff were beginning to become comfortable with the service.

5. Findings

5.1 Aim: attention should be paid to the effectiveness of the training programme, auditing of web log statistics, relationship between training and use patterns, including sustainable use post training.

SCRAN's comments regarding the success of their training, the pattern of respondents to the staff survey, and usage figures reveal a bifurcation of authorities into two groups: a group who are committed SCRAN users and another group who either do not use it or use it a little. There appears so far to be no obvious factor or factors which were responsible for this bifurcation, apart from the serendipitous enthusiasm of a member of staff who became a local 'champion' for SCRAN and who spread its usage. Over £60,000 of the project funding was allocated to training via the training officer's salary, travel and materials. While feedback from those who attended training was very good, the fact that cascading of training was left to the local authorities themselves is something that meant success in this area was dependent on enthusiasm of individual staff members when they returned to their service points. Notwithstanding supply of PowerPoint files and other promotional materials to allow staff to promote SCRAN within their institutions, the fact remains that management of training in the project did not provide the widening of interest and expertise that would have been desirable for the project to reach its potential.

RECOMMENDATION: It is crucial that in such roll-outs, that services provided meet the needs of the customer and not solely the business model of the supplier. Any proposed new service should therefore be required to produce a roll-out strategy in consultation with Heads of Service and SLIC. If training is proposed along the 'cascade' model, the actual cascading of training must be formally tracked and evaluated. A beta-testing phase with a representative group of authorities, prior to a training roll-out would also be beneficial, to enable fine-tuning a new service to the public library environment. This model has been previously successful in other service areas.

Access to SCRAN and logging usage raise issues. 24/7 access is possible to SCRAN but only using the default generic access mode. Authentication issues need to be fully explored for the future and development of a uniform solution for public libraries like

ATHENS in HE/FE or the forthcoming SSDN solution for schools. It is likely for the future that local authority smartcards would serve well here.

RECOMMENDATION: Authentication issues need to be fully explored for the future and development of a uniform solution for public libraries like ATHENS in HE/FE or the forthcoming SSDN solution for schools. It is likely for the future that local authority smartcards would serve well here.

RECOMMENDATION: Generic training accounts should be created and used whenever any training initiative is undertaken. This would enable cascade training to be excluded from logging. And make real usage (or non-usage) much more apparent.

5.2 Aim: to critically appraise the success of the pilot in terms of its relevance to enhancing the quality of service delivery

When SCRAN began, it had a clear focus as an online archive of Scottish cultural materials. Now SCRAN offers a much wider range of services, and is downplaying its Scottish focus. Rather than being the sole provider in a focussed market, SCRAN is trying to push into other markets. The problem here is that these other markets have plenty of competitors for SCRAN. For example, the BBC, long the target of the UK commercial Internet sector for its dominance, is a direct competitor with SCRAN offering free materials in areas like education and reminiscence. Companies from the commercial information sector (e.g. Refer plus) also compete with SCRAN. Projects such as Am-Baile, Springburn Museum, and Virtual Mitchell, all free to access Scottish digitisation projects, offer competition also. Although it has to be said that SCRAN's major strength as a service is in its Scottishness and its collection of Scottish material.

It is clear from comments quoted above that SCRAN has been the source of many moments of deep satisfaction for library users and staff who found its material of local and personal relevance. However SCRAN only achieved minimal usage within public libraries and that usage is dangerously lacking in breadth and depth. Neither has SCRAN impacted on the public as a strong brand associated with Scottish culture. For marketing purposes in Scottish public libraries it would seem better to have used SCRAN's old full title, Scottish Cultural Resource Network, rather than the more gnomic 'SCRAN'. Public

libraries have been accused recently of not developing their image beyond being mere lenders of books, and the success of a new online service based around reminiscence would have been a great triumph.

RECOMMENDATION: any new service should have a clear target in terms of how it will enhance the public library 'offering'. In SCRAN's case that should have been Scottish local history. Marketing should concentrate on this message; in this case posters and rolling screen saver demos showing SCRAN resources for a locality, tailored for each public library in that locality, to better expose the depth of SCRAN's Scottish resource base. Behind the marketing should be a range of new services that would engage users (for example picture 'tours' of a locality as it looked in the past, opportunities for individuals to contribute their personal resources to their public library, etc).

5.3 Aim: A focus of the evaluation is value for money to enable the Heads of Public Library Service and/or the Scottish Executive assess whether to continue with the SCRAN subscription service

That there is value in SCRAN is fully supported by anecdotal evidence but that value is highly personal and transitory and not embedded as an expected feature of library services. There is also a generally supported wish for a publicly funded archive of freely available digital resources commemorating and celebrating Scottish culture. This creates tension between SCRAN as a commercial entity and the publicly funded library service which supplies it with free content only to be charged later to access that same content.

The earlier discussion of subscription rates for HEIs in Scotland also needs to be brought into the discussion at this point; in terms of value of money, HEIs are gaining in both financial terms and in terms of quality of service vis a vis 24/7 access.

RECOMMENDATION: decisions need to be left to library authorities to settle on whether to continue funding at SCRAN's normal rates. There is a much bigger political question which needs to be addressed of how exactly the Scottish digital heritage will be developed and accessed, whether that heritage should be held in a centralised commercial database or decentralised in a managed set of collections held by the public sector bodies that accumulate that heritage. At the very least a model of subscription needs to be

developed that reflects the fact that public libraries in Scotland have a great deal of content invested in SCRAN, and as such should be able to access it for a minimum fee.

Perhaps usage in public libraries could be metered and charged and offset by notional 'credits' from contributing materials to SCRAN? Another potential subscription option could be a concurrent user model, either locally-based or nationally based. In practice this could mean that each authority would be allowed a pre-defined number of concurrent licenses, decided upon locally or nationally, which should keep costs low, but provide the levels of access necessary based on demand.

Notwithstanding this, any future subscription fees for public libraries need to be realistic and comparable with the HEIs.

5.4. Wider Issues for Discussion

The wider political issue of ongoing digital access to Scotland's cultural heritage is one that needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. SCRAN was formed with Millennium Commission funds initially, and has navigated into being a commercial subscription service, while maintaining some funding from public sources for specific projects from time to time. For example, SCRAN was also a major partner in the Resources for Learning in Scotland (RLS) Project, again funded by the national lottery through the New Opportunities Fund (NOF). The aim of this project was to provide access to learning materials, but the site acts as little more than an advertisement for SCRAN subscription, offering extremely limited access to materials. Running a search provides access to only thumbnails of images, regardless of whether you are accessing material you have supplied or not.

The question remains whether cultural and heritage institutions should be paying for access to materials that should be in any moral sense, free at the point of use.

Materials from Scotland's libraries and museums are essentially public property, and the ethical question of how access to these materials is provided is a challenging one. The user survey conducted for this evaluation revealed a wide interest from people of all ages in Scottish digital materials. This is very positive and should be built on for the future.

The big issue remains the fact that there is great potential for public libraries, and therefore the communities they serve, being priced out of access to their own digital materials and materials from around Scotland. This makes a mockery of the opportunities digital technologies provide for allowing libraries and their communities to engage with their own heritage and runs the danger of many in Scotland being disenfranchised.

SCRAN is undoubtedly a useful service which has received a great deal of positive comment from both staff and users. However, the potential exists for such positive feedback to be based on the content rather than the service, i.e. users are happy to be accessing Scottish and local materials rather than the specific service delivering those materials. If funding for such a service continues to be maintained via the public purse, the political question is whether or not such access should be:

1. In the hands of a commercial entity?
2. Be paid for by public and other cultural institutions who have actively contributed to the resource?

We believe that provision of a national database of cultural materials could easily be provided by public bodies in Scotland if provided with appropriate funding. What is necessary is to ensure that rather than training for a specific service such as SCRAN, staff members in cultural institutions are trained to create and manage their own digital materials under a national umbrella. This would negate the need for the nation's cultural institutions to be reliant on commercial providers for delivering their digital materials, and instead allow the public to access their heritage free of charge.

The United States model of the American Memory site (<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/>) provides a workable example for bringing together a nation's resources under one site. The material on this site is free not just for American citizens, but to any visitors to the site. Notwithstanding the project's large injection of commercial sponsorship, it offers a potential model that could be used for any future Scottish resource.

The authors would, then, like to propose a period of reflection on how best Scotland can ensure its digital heritage is delivered to as many of its citizens as possible. Commercial models and restrictive licenses seem like an anathema to a truly inclusive Digital Scotland, and funding for any future service should be based around cascading of digital-curation skills to Scotland's cultural institutions, and free and open access to materials that are publicly owned. A distributed environment incorporating the forthcoming Creative Commons license for Scotland will offer an opportunity to present digital material outwith a centralised database structure. The improvements in ICT processing power, connectivity, and skills development mean that ownership of digital media can be harnessed more effectively locally.

7. Appendices

Appendix A – SCRAN Library Contacts and Training Dates

Appendix B – Staff Survey Results to 26th August

Appendix C – User Survey Results to 26th August

Appendix D – Case Study Form

Appendix E – Usage Statistics – January to May 2005

Appendix A – Staff Contacts and Training Dates

Training dates	1st session	2nd session
Aberdeen City Council	18/11/2004	10/03/2005
Aberdeenshire Library & Information Service	01/12/2004	25/04/2005
Angus Council	17/11/2004	22/03/2005
Argyll & Bute Council	13/01/2005	19/04/2005
Clackmannanshire Council	04/03/2005	18/04/2005
Dumfries and Galloway Libraries	19/01/2005	16/02/2005
Dundee City Council	14/12/2004	01/03/2005
East Ayrshire Library & Information Service	24/02/2005	03/03/2005
East Dunbartonshire Council Community Services	11/01/2005	15/03/2005
East Lothian Council Library Service	29/11/2004	21/03/2005
East Renfrewshire Council	13/12/2004	10/02/2005
Edinburgh City Libraries	09/12/2004	27/01/2005
Falkirk Council Libraries	20/01/2005	12/04/2005
Fife libraries	25/01/2005	28/01/2005
Glasgow City Council	17/12/2004	
Highland Council	14/04/2005	15/04/2005
Inverclyde Council	10/11/2004	09/02/2005
Midlothian Council - Library Service	15/12/2004	09/03/2005
Moray Council Technical and Leisure Services	02/12/2004	13/04/2005
North Ayrshire Library and Information Service	26/01/2005	23/02/2005
North Lanarkshire Council	17/02/2005	17/03/2005
Orkney Islands Council	23/11/2004	08/02/2005
Perth & Kinross Council	19/11/2004	04/02/2005
Renfrewshire Council	26/11/2004	11/02/2005
Scottish Borders Council	24/11/2004	02/03/2005
Shetland Library Service	07/12/2004	21/02/2005
South Ayrshire Council	31/01/2005	18/02/2005
South Lanarkshire Council	03/12/2004	03/02/2005
Stirling Council Library Service	06/04/2005	16/05/2005
West Dunbartonshire Council	10/12/2004	18/03/2005
West Lothian Council Libraries	15/02/2005	27/04/2005
Western Isles Libraries/Comhairle nan Eilean Siar	16/11/2004	08/03/2005

Training contacts

Aberdeen City Council
Aberdeenshire Library & Information Service
Angus Council
Argyll & Bute Council
Clackmannanshire Council
Dumfries and Galloway Libraries
Dundee City Council
East Ayrshire Library & Information Service
East Dunbartonshire Council Community Services
East Lothian Council Library Service
East Renfrewshire Council
Edinburgh City Libraries
Falkirk Council Libraries
Fife Libraries

Glasgow City Council
Highland Council
Inverclyde Council
Midlothian Council - Library Service
Moray Council Technical and Leisure Services
North Ayrshire Library and Information Service
North Lanarkshire Council
Orkney Islands Council
Perth & Kinross Council
Renfrewshire Council
Scottish Borders Council
Shetland Library Service
South Ayrshire Council
South Lanarkshire Council
Stirling Council Library Service
West Dunbartonshire Council
West Lothian Council Libraries
Western Isles Libraries/Comhairle nan Eilean Siar



Main contact first



Susan Bell
Anne Harrison / David Catto
John Doherty
Eleanor Harris
John Blake / Helen Finlayson
Michael Russell / Lynn Nield
Frances Scott
Dawn Vallance

Don Martin
Andy Holmes
Scott Simpson
Jim Thompson
Gil Vick
Janet Klak / Chris Neale / Aileen McLachlan
Retiring soon Alex Tomeny (Karen Cunningham)
Norman Newton / Joyce Watson
Sarah Galloway
Sandy Winton
Joan Wood
Sandra Kerr
Margaret Hamilton
Karen Walker
Eddie Durkin / Steve Connelly
Cathy Gormal / Jenifer McFarlane
Gillian McNay
Morag Nicolson
Joan Black
David Moncrieff / Fiona Renfrew
Steve Dolman
Arthur Jones
Hilda Gibson


Bob Eaves

Appendix B – Staff Survey Results to 26th August







Status of Respondent - Professional or Paraprofessional (n=418)




Role of respondent (n=419)




How would you rate your ICT skills? (n=415)




SCRAN Training - How many sessions have you received? (n=418)




SCRAN Training - Who provided? (n=411)




SCRAN Training - How useful? (n=402)




**Which of the following online services have you heard of?
24 Hour Museum (n=407)**




**Which of the following online services have you heard of?
Know UK (n=418)**




**Which of the following online services have you heard of?
Kompass (n=413)**




**Which of the following online services have you heard of?
Newsbank (n=412)**




**Which of the following online services have you heard of?
Oxford Online (n=411)**




**Which of the following online services have you heard of?
SCRAN (n=409)**





SCRAN Training - How Many Sessions (n=418)




SCRAN Training - Provider (n=411)







Coverage of online local history resources in your area (n=417)




Coverage of online family history resources in your area (n=408)




Coverage of online scottish cultural resources in your area (n=417)




Coverage of online material for homework support in your area (n=418)




Coverage of online material for adult education in your area (n=417)




Except for training, how often have you used SCRAN in the past year? (n=414)




How would you rate the coverage of local history for your area on SCRAN? (n=412)




How would you rate your familiarity with the SCRAN service? (n=412)




On average, how long did you spend per session using SCRAN? (n=416)




For what purpose did you use SCRAN? (n=417)





How often would you estimate that the material you accessed on SCRAN was available elsewhere in the library? (n=412)




How often did you find what you were looking for on SCRAN? (n=412)







SCRAN Marketing in your area - Leaflets (n=414)




SCRAN Marketing in your area - Posters (n=409)




SCRAN Marketing in your area - Desktop Icon (n=412)




SCRAN Marketing in your area - User training (n=411)




SCRAN Marketing in your area - Newspapers (n=411)




SCRAN Marketing in your area - Word of Mouth (n=411)






Appendix C – User Survey Results to 26th August


Public Survey - Respondent by Local Authority (n=351)




Sex of Respondents (n=346)




Age of Respondents (n=348)




How would you rate your computer skills? (n=349)




Would you be interested in using online services? (i.e. materials accessible via computers in the library) (n=349)




What type of online services would interest you? (n=351; all categories could be selected)




How much would you be willing to pay per session for an online service providing all of the materials discussed in Q.5? (n=336)




Are you aware of the SCRAN service available via the library computers? (n=343)




If you have used SCRAN, how would you rate Quality of Information (n=178)




If you have used SCRAN, how would you rate Ease of Searching (n=176)




If you have used SCRAN, how would you rate Speed of site (n=174)




If you have used SCRAN, how would you rate the Design of the site (n=175)




If you have used SCRAN, how would you rate the Ability to use downloaded materials (n=169)




Sex versus interest in online materials (n=345)





Sex versus awareness of SCRAN's availability in the library? (n=338)




Sex versus how much would you be willing to pay per session for online resource (n=331)





Age versus how much would you be willing to pay per session for online resources (n=333)





Library Case Study

<p>Library authority:</p> <p>Library:</p> <p>Contact name:</p> <p>Job title:</p>
--

Promoted Scran

Used Scran

Workshop or event

<p>Aims and objectives</p>

<p>What did you do?</p>	<p>And who did it?</p>
<p>Please attach any examples</p>	

<p>What were the benefits and who benefited?</p>

<p>Outcomes</p>

<p>Was this successful and would you do it again?</p>	<p>What might you change next time?</p>
--	--

Appendix E – Usage Statistics – January to May 2005

2005 Authority	Hits						Sessions					
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Total
	Fife	3992	6124	7969	6300	3246	27631	76	165	228	149	75
Dundee City	2281	5258	11362	5209	1662	25772	51	98	186	111	38	484
Glasgow City	3582	2116	2933	3858	575	13064	98	69	84	99	26	376
Highland	332	2620	4157	5241	589	12939	12	84	113	119	14	342
Angus	642	1097	6084	3864	433	12120	37	48	128	101	22	336
Dumfries & Galloway	1444	6002	2832	751	681	11710	48	129	83	33	13	306
South Ayrshire	1667	2726	2138	4740	1434	12705	27	66	56	117	32	298
Aberdeenshire	944	3156	3629	2973	141	10843	37	63	128	46	5	279
Aberdeen City	404	759	2592	2334	173	6262	37	65	75	65	11	253
Perth & Kinross	358	3561	1449	2423	608	8399	16	110	39	52	24	241
South Lanarkshire	1660	3290	3121	442	61	8574	90	74	34	29	4	231
The City of Edinburgh	3683	3498	971	981	256	9389	64	79	39	32	14	228
Shetland	268	4021	1627	1072	471	7459	11	73	68	41	25	218
Falkirk	660	2329	1824	3954	278	9045	39	58	48	62	9	216
West Lothian	39	4295	836	4171	1224	10565	8	65	35	67	26	201
East Dunbartonshire	2393	534	2889	761	57	6634	50	22	83	35	7	197
Scottish Borders	833	2215	3860	1144	227	8279	24	49	69	41	11	194
North Ayrshire	2008	4740	1684	3025	277	11734	36	77	42	29	5	189
Moray	409	924	469	2729	959	5490	13	52	29	68	17	179
West Dunbartonshire	573	397	3738	434	76	5218	24	25	92	21	8	170
East Lothian	612	3048	1652	939	433	6684	21	60	31	37	14	163
Orkney	439	4496	762	134	273	6104	21	81	47	4	7	160
Stirling	45	851	604	2724	112	4336	6	29	26	89	9	159
East Ayrshire	179	2120	2604	218	103	5224	9	44	71	7	5	136
Midlothian	340	856	2606	272	45	4119	10	19	74	19	4	126
Renfrewshire	459	1933	390	566	433	3781	14	61	14	24	12	125
Inverclyde	95	1684	243	2224	117	4363	6	27	11	66	2	112
East Renfrewshire	148	1562	547	1362	20	3639	7	35	19	36	2	99
North Lanarkshire	9	416	2062	120	309	2916	1	7	48	4	2	62
Clackmannanshire	22	0	1217	2411	104	3754	2	0	16	40	1	59
Argyll & Bute	529	59	156	2828	35	3607	9	1	3	34	2	49
Western Isles	0	0	1834	383	0	2217	0	0	23	18	0	41

Authority	Resources Accessed					Total	Branches	Training
	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May			
Fife	1345	1052	1351	1166	586	5500	57	2
Dundee City	1741	829	1958	1010	285	5823	16	2
Glasgow City	1227	339	442	602	107	2717	37	1
Highland	168	562	920	997	101	2748	42	2
Angus	359	211	804	745	68	2187	12	2
Dumfries & Galloway	962	852	481	130	149	2574	26	2
South Ayrshire	486	511	460	975	325	2757	16	2
Aberdeenshire	480	537	556	430	54	2057	37	2
Aberdeen City	149	66	425	372	39	1051	19	2
Perth & Kinross	237	401	142	401	61	1242	14	2
South Lanarkshire	1233	647	472	80	7	2439	25	2
The City of Edinburgh	916	717	160	241	57	2091	26	2
Shetland	126	436	304	148	145	1159	9	2
Falkirk	805	468	337	759	51	2420	8	2
West Lothian	87	668	163	1080	202	2200	16	2
East Dunbartonshire	425	101	510	185	9	1230	10	2
Scottish Borders	412	488	552	180	30	1662	13	2
North Ayrshire	578	789	268	772	64	2471	18	2
Moray	115	159	66	390	109	839	17	2
West Dunbartonshire	173	124	565	111	8	981	13	2
East Lothian	260	486	312	117	114	1289	13	2
Orkney	611	689	226	21	16	1563	2	2
Stirling	23	157	112	500	13	805	16	1
East Ayrshire	54	327	506	66	29	982	24	2
Midlothian	129	169	451	56	9	814	12	2
Renfrewshire	76	319	68	186	71	720	18	2
Inverclyde	120	253	52	506	14	945	8	2
East Renfrewshire	87	284	95	236	0	702	11	2
North Lanarkshire	39	63	270	16	79	467	25	2
Clackmannanshire	2	0	228	435	16	681	12	2
Argyll & Bute	193	8	29	457	5	692	13	2
Western Isles	60	0	333	63	0	456	9	2