## AT User Group Survey Results: Proposed New Features and Functionality May 16, 2008 – May 30, 2008

Where is your repository based?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A large university	38.2%	65
A smaller college or university	27.1%	46
A corporate archive	2.9%	5
A governmental archive	4.7%	8
A museum archive	5.3%	9
A historical society	3.5%	6
Other (please specify)	18.8%	32
	answered question	170
	skipped question	1

How would you describe the information technology services available to your institution, and your access to those services?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
My institution has a large IT dept and I have access to their services when needed	22.6%	35
My institution has a medium-size IT staff and they service my needs when they can	40.0%	62
My institution has a small IT staff and it is difficult to obtain their services	27.1%	42
My institution has no professional IT staff	10.3%	16
	Other (please describe)	23
	answered question	155
	skipped question	16

Does your repository currently provide descriptions of its archival resources using EAD?								
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count						
Yes, the majority of our finding aids are in EAD	25.6%	43						
Yes, some of our finding aids are in EAD	12.5%	21						
Yes, a few of our finding aids are in EAD	14.9%	25						
No, we have not started to use EAD	47.0%	79						
	answered question	168						
	skipped question	3						

How many FTE staff does your archive have? (If you are part of a larger organization, please only include staff members who work within the archives)							
Answer Options	Response Count						
	165						
answered question	165						
skipped question	6						

Number FTE	Response Total
0-1	52
2-5	65
6-10	24
11-20	17
21 +	7

Please select the statement that best describes your repository's implementation of the AT:								
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count						
We have the AT installed as a production application	31.1%	41						
We have the AT installed as a test application	47.7%	63						
We have tested the AT, but have decided not to use it in production	21.2%	28						
	Other (please describe)	39						
	answered question	132						
	skipped question	39						

Proposed New Modules										
Answer Options	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	Unimportant	I don't understand this feature as described	Rating Average	Response Count		
Appraisal module Support for recording information about the archival value(s) of a resource anytime during its lifecycle. Provides the means to track resources appraised but not accessioned.	29	28	45	39	9	4	3.11039	154		

<b>Rights management</b> <b>module</b> Support for tracking the intellectual property and license rights status of resources, resource components, and digital objects.	39	42	56	15	2	0	3.655844	154	
User registration module Support for registering a repository's patrons and collecting and analyzing information about them.	41	32	32	29	19	2	3.264516	155	
<b>Use tracking module</b> Support for tracking and reporting the use of a repository's collection.	55	45	38	13	4	0	3.864516	155	
Work orders module Support for tracking conservation and photoreproduction work, including digitization, for accessions, resources, and resource components.	46	49	36	17	7	0	3.709677	155	
If you would like to provide any reasoning or comments on your responses above, please do so below:									
answered question skipped question									

Proposed Revisions to Existing Answer Options	Modules Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	Unimportant	I don't understand this feature as described	Rating Average	Response Count
Digital objects record revision Module would be upgraded to include support for: - Creation of digital object records independent of resources - Visual metadata (e.g. thumbnails) - Accommodation of technical metadata (e.g. file characteristics, information about digitization software and hardware)	66	43	23	13	2	4	3.966887	151
Name record revision Involves the following: - Updating the name module per standards (MADS, EAC, and ISAAR (CPF) - Enabling support for See Also references - Enabling the import and export of names for MADS and EAC	42	49	41	12	2	5	3.675497	151
Searching revisions Would clarify the search results	55	55	34	4	1	1	4.04	150

so that the specific area (note, component record, instance, etc) within which the search term(s) occur is displayed.								
<b>Subject record revision</b> Support for faceted subject headings, as well as developing import methods for subjects.	44	62	36	9	0	1	3.907895	152
If you would like to provide any reasoning or comments on your responses above, please do so below:								
answered question								153
skipped question								

Proposed Revisions to Existing Modules									
Answer Options	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Of Little Importance	Unimportant	I don't understand this feature as described	Rating Average	Response Count	
<b>Data Migration</b> Would increase the means by which data can be imported from particular legacy formats into the AT. Also would increase	81	41	18	9	3	1	4.20915	153	

the Toolkit's								
exporting								
capabilities.								
Deaccessioning of								
entire resources								
and accessions								
Would provide a								
means for tracking the deaccessioning	24	36	50	36	6	0	3.236842	152
of entire collections,								
whether they are								
resources or								
accessions.								
Enable batch								
editing/ global								
updating								
Would enable	76	52	22	2	1	0	4.307189	153
certain edits to be	,,,	52		-	-	Ŭ	11007 200	100
made globally								
throughout the								
application. Web publishing of								
AT data								
Would allow for								
descriptive		10	10					
information within	77	48	12	13	3	0	4.196078	153
the AT to be								
published directly to								
the Internet.								
					16			12
If you would like to provide any reasoning or							13	
comments on your responses above, please do so below:								
								153
answered								

question	
skipped	
question	18