



survey title:

AT/ Archon Integration Pre-Webinar Survey

[Edit Title](#)

design survey

collect responses

analyze results

View Summary

Browse Responses

Filter Responses

Crosstab Responses

Download Responses

Share Responses

current report: [Default Report](#) [Add Report](#)



Response Summary

Total Started Survey: 26
Total Completed Survey: 26 (100%)

Page: Default Section

1. Your Name (Optional)

[Download](#)

Response Count

[Show replies](#) 22

answered question 22

skipped question 4

2. Type of archive that you represent

[Create Chart](#)

[Download](#)

Response Percent **Response Count**

Academic 73.1% 19

Historical society 7.7% 2

Governmental 11.5% 3

Business 0.0% 0

Museum 7.7% 2

answered question 26

skipped question 0

3. How many full-time professionals or paraprofessionals work at your archive?

[Create Chart](#)

[Download](#)

		Response Percent	Response Count
1-3	<input type="text"/>	20.0%	5
3-5	<input type="text"/>	16.0%	4
5-10	<input type="text"/>	24.0%	6
10-20	<input type="text"/>	24.0%	6
20 or more	<input type="text"/>	16.0%	4

[Hide replies](#) Other (please specify) 5

1. 6 FTE within our program area/division Mon, Dec 7, 2009 5:48 PM [Find...](#)

2. If you mean only archives, if you mean overall professional staff 6 Mon, Dec 7, 2009 9:59 AM [Find...](#)

3. I said academic above, but we've got 5 archives here, one a museum, 2 academic, 2 subject collections (historical-ish) Sun, Dec 6, 2009 7:37 PM [Find...](#)

4. This is across at least 2 repositories. Fri, Dec 4, 2009 12:01 PM [Find...](#)

5. 17.5 FTE (most on soft funding) Fri, Dec 4, 2009 10:39 AM [Find...](#)

answered question 25

skipped question 1

3. How many full-time professionals or paraprofessionals work at your archive?

[Create Chart](#)
[Download](#)

answered question **25**

skipped question **1**

4. Rate the following features according to importance.

[Create Chart](#)

	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Rating Average
Repository information	8.0% (2)	12.0% (3)	36.0% (9)	44.0% (11)	3.16
Repository statistics	8.0% (2)	20.0% (5)	36.0% (9)	36.0% (9)	3.00
Staff and public user information	0.0% (0)	31.8% (7)	40.9% (9)	27.3% (6)	2.95
Collection management	0.0% (0)	12.0% (3)	20.0% (5)	68.0% (17)	3.56
Classification	8.3% (2)	45.8% (11)	16.7% (4)	29.2% (7)	2.67
Location / space management	4.0% (1)	28.0% (7)	28.0% (7)	40.0% (10)	3.04
Accessions	0.0% (0)	3.8% (1)	15.4% (4)	80.8% (21)	3.77
Resource description	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.0% (2)	92.0% (23)	3.92
Digital object description	8.0% (2)	16.0% (4)	32.0% (8)	44.0% (11)	3.12
Rights description	0.0% (0)	25.0% (6)	45.8% (11)	29.2% (7)	3.04
Deaccessions	20.0% (5)	28.0% (7)	36.0% (9)	16.0% (4)	2.48
Name headings	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	44.0% (11)	52.0% (13)	3.48
Subject headings	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	52.0% (13)	44.0% (11)	3.40
Assessments	12.0% (3)	32.0% (8)	44.0% (11)	12.0% (3)	2.56
Audio visual assessments	20.0% (5)	44.0% (11)	32.0% (8)	4.0% (1)	2.20

answered question






skipped question

4. Rate the following features according to importance.

[Create Chart](#)

Imports	8.0% (2)	8.0% (2)	24.0% (6)	60.0% (15)	3.36
Exports	0.0% (0)	8.0% (2)	20.0% (5)	72.0% (18)	3.64
Reports	0.0% (0)	12.0% (3)	36.0% (9)	52.0% (13)	3.40
Stylesheets	8.0% (2)	28.0% (7)	40.0% (10)	24.0% (6)	2.80
Web access	20.0% (5)	4.0% (1)	20.0% (5)	56.0% (14)	3.12

[Hide replies](#) [Comments](#)

1. If "Staff and public user information" refers to the ability to set/modify granular permissions for users and user groups, this should be marked as "very important".
Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:24 AM 
2. We have an access system for our collection information with which we are quite happy, so are much more interested in back-end functionality than in web access. Also, in order for any kind of user registration/information system to work for us, it would have to function for tracking use of both our archival collections and book collections cataloged in our OPAC (this is what I assume "Staff and public user information" is getting at?). In terms of "Audio visual assessments," why the focus on that specific set of formats? I think a generic format-based assessment capability would be more valuable.
Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:12 AM 
3. A bigt unsure how to rank features, given our current reliance on distributed systems: A bibliographic (Aleph 500) ILS, a catalog-linked system of EAD finding aids and stylesheets, a standalone database for managing andf serving out still images, and a standalone (KeEMu-based) collection management system, which is the primay management tool for 3D collections and which provides accessions management and processing management for archival materials.
Mon, Dec 7, 2009 6:50 AM 
4. I wish you had a "not sure" up there. It really depends on a number of things. I've left all the 'not sures' blank.
Sun, Dec 6, 2009 7:37 PM 
5. Done importing accn data; location data to do next - but virtually impossible w/current links to Resource instances - not tied to series at this time.
Still testing Dig Obj.
Assessment reports need ability to give a TITLE or LOCATION to group of assessments - e.g. for a temporary location to price out a move, etc.
Fri, Dec 4, 2009 10:39 AM 

*answered question**skipped question*

4. Rate the following features according to importance.

[Create Chart](#)

6. We aren't far enough along to make all of these distinctions.

Fri, Dec 4, 2009 10:15 AM

answered question

skipped question

5. What requirements are lacking from the requirements document?

[Download](#)

**Response
Count**

Hide replies

16

1. - Module for creating and managing (e.g., search/browse, edit, etc.) digital objects, independent of archival collection/resource records.
- More flexible support to allow users to modify particular default data values that appear tag attributes in EAD, METS, MODS, etc. exports (e.g., be able to specify TYPE attribute on <dsc>)
- Support for EAD schema-based and EAD DTD-based exports
- Support for EAC-CPF exports (and imports?)

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 5:48 PM

Find...

2. It would be nice to have MARC import and export directly from the accessions module. I realize one can probably manage the import using the accession XML import, but that would take a lot more mapping and tech-savvyness than many folks have and it still doesn't help with export. Also, I may have missed this and if so I apologize, are there any plans for a web-interface to replace the current clients for all data entry (not just the display and access side)? - hope I'm making sense here!

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 4:22 PM

Find...

3. I think that overall, the document looks good. I would hope for some form of OAI functionality. I think it would be good to have the system create Google sitemaps. I would love to see a system that would work out of the box for consortial enviroments/union catalogs.

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 2:28 PM

Find...

4. Read only user level

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 2:00 PM

Find...

5. I would like to see the manual, and possibly all of DA:CS, available in Help screens that are linked at the field level

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 12:27 PM

Find...

< 1

> 10 responses per page

answered question 16





skipped question 10

5. What requirements are lacking from the requirements document?[Download](#)

I also have longed for the ability to view and edit EAD in AT, and view and edit MARC records for export, rather than exporting, viewing, and editing in a text editor.

Not lacking from the document, but some wishful thinking:

A mechanism for shared access would be welcome. We have been using Archivists' Toolkit for well over a year now, and are currently using it for our CLIR Hidden Collections grant, sharing the same database amongst 4 institutions through a VPN, which is not always reliable, using laptops. To have the ability to use a web-based client would greatly enhance both the speed and the ability to work collaboratively, especially if linked to a database hosted by a consortia such as the OAC. The creation of other such consortia would also greatly assist in the implementation of AT at institutions with only one or two staff members.

-
6. I must be missing this .. where is "title" (e.g. <untitl> in Resource? I see "finding aid title" and "finding aid filing title", but no title for the "unit" at collection or component level ... Mon, Dec 7, 2009 11:58 AM  [Find...](#)
-
7. Would like to see more item-level management and report output adaptability for workflow issues such as outgoing loans, conservation, licensing and digitization. Some standard functionality of finding aid-creating tool--must be user-friendly, easily navigable and used by student assistants. Needs ability to manipulate and configure reports for output of finding aid products, such as box and folder labels. Mon, Dec 7, 2009 11:11 AM  [Find...](#)
-
8. It appears to be quite thorough, I couldn't think of any missing items. Mon, Dec 7, 2009 9:59 AM  [Find...](#)
-
9. Location/space management need bulk sort and update location screen for when you shift a whole section; Accessions need ability to link unprocessed accruals to existing collections records; digital object description need time stamp description capacity for audio. Maybe also a 15-second audio web sample creator; Imports at the level of "resource records" i.e. tab-delimited box lists; Reports especially for reports of collections and accessions added by date Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:41 AM  [Find...](#)

answered question **16**

skipped question **10**

5. What requirements are lacking from the requirements document?[Download](#)

10. We locally added a field to Archon at the component level which we call "Private Title". The field exports to EAD as a unit title with an audience="internal" attribute. This allows us to fully process component titles for staff use that we do not want to share with the public at large due to privacy issues. We find this to be particularly useful for student names.

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:24 AM

 [Find...](#)

It would also be helpful for a name variant field to be repeatable in the Name/Creator manager such that multiple variants can be stored/exported separately.

< 1

>

10 responses per page

answered question 16**skipped question** 10**6. What requirements in the document do you not understand?**[Download](#)**Response
Count** [Hide replies](#)

12

1. Honestly, I'm still working my way through the spreadsheet we got this morning and I probably won't know until after I get home and can devote a few more hours to it!

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 4:22 PM

 [Find...](#)

2. I am not sure that I understand the stylesheets requirement. I am uncertain if it refers to what would be a view in an MVC environment, or if it refers to an XSLT stylesheet, or something else.

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 2:28 PM

 [Find...](#)

3. The Collection Management section; I am unsure how it is distinct from Accessions

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 12:27 PM

 [Find...](#)

4. How user information is intended to be used--is it primarily for user stats, or is it meant to align with public services workflow: duplication, licensing, etc.? Why an entire section on AVSAP materials?

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 11:11 AM

 [Find...](#)

5. I'm not sure what things are repeatable- for instance in Resources, can one add more than one

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 9:59 AM

 [Find...](#)

< 1

>

10 responses per page

answered question 12**skipped question** 14

6. What requirements in the document do you not understand?

[Download](#)

"Other URL" "other finding aids" or "related archival materials URL"?

6. None--seems pretty clear Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:41 AM Find...

7. Some elements were more technical than my general level of understanding. Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:35 AM Find...

8. It is not entirely clear where certain functions are controlled; e.g.:
 O Rights – somewhat controlled within Work Order, Accessions, and again in Rights
 O the Assessment Module and the AVSAP functions overlap. Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:21 AM Find...

Unclear what support will be given to AT while the development is going on.

o Collections Management and Assessment tabs:
 Both can be set to link to 0 or more resources, accessions, or digital object records. What is meant by linking to 0 resources? Shouldn't it instead be required that they link to at least one of those records, be it a resource, digital object, or accession record? Because collection management and assessment records don't include fields for title, etc., how would they be tracked without this link?

Why are content providers and end users being grouped in same category when info needed about each is different?

9. We responded to this question separately. Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:12 AM Find...

10. All the ones above that I left blank: Collection management, web access, rights description, location/space management, classification, staff and public user information. Sun, Dec 6, 2009 7:37 PM Find...

< >

answered question **12**

skipped question **14**

7. What are your expectations with regards to the performance of the integrated application?


[Download](#)

Response









answered question **17**

skipped question **9**

7. What are your expectations with regards to the performance of the integrated application?

[Download](#)
Count
 Hide replies

17

- | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|
| 1. It hardly needs to be said, but it must have a very user-friendly way of importing data from both/either AT or Archon, depending on how the final system is structured. We've also had issues/irritation with window resizing (screens and fields run off the edge of the monitors) and buttons along the bottom that seem to take up a lot of screen space on smaller monitors - it would be nice if some of that could be addressed in the process. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 4:22 PM |  Find... |
| 2. I expect it to do everything that Archon already does. I expect it to be as simple or simpler. I expect it to have added functionality for things that are in AT but not in Archon (ie. enhanced accessions functionality). I expect system administration to be as simple as Archon. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 2:28 PM |  Find... |
| 3. I'm hoping for an even more user-friendly application, with more to offer on the public delivery end than AT. I am also hoping for something with more basic features such as Find, Replace, auto save, etc. that make using the application more efficient at the data entry level. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 12:27 PM |  Find... |
| 4. Ease of use for repositories at all levels -- large institutions with extensive IT staff as well as those with small (1-2) staff. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 11:58 AM |  Find... |
| 5. Improved efficiency and accuracy in management of many functions related to archival collections, including accessions, assessments, statistical reports, and various workflows involving item-level control: conservation, digitization, outgoing loans. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 11:11 AM |  Find... |
| 6. It will be a more powerful tool with the benefits of both programs. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 9:59 AM |  Find... |
| 7. A one-stop shop for collections management and user access to collection descriptions | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:41 AM |  Find... |
| 8. Our repository requires that the application be supportable by our IT team and that there be access for my staff to input collection data. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:35 AM |  Find... |

answered question 17

skipped question 9

7. What are your expectations with regards to the performance of the integrated application? [Download](#)

9. The great hope that more than one person will be able to do descriptive data entry for a single collection at the same time (so long as they are not editing the same record) w/o workarounds; that there will be a web front end to provide researchers the ability to search collections. That the system will be reliable, that no data will be lost during and that the transition from the AT to the new integrated application will be easy. That the integrated app will be easy to use, supported, and have an open API. Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:21 AM Find...

10. We hope that the integrated application will load resources quickly, and that it will have a sophisticated API for plug ins that will allow repositories with special needs and with their own funding (or consortial funding) to develop and maintain plug ins to meet their local needs. Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:12 AM Find...

< 1 > 10 responses per page

answered question 17

skipped question 9

8. What concerns do you have about the Archon/ AT integration? What do you think the advantages will be? [Download](#)

Response Count

Hide replies 23

1. - We hope the integrated application will follow Archon's client-server based model, whereby the client is web-based (and not a standalone application). Mon, Dec 7, 2009 5:48 PM Find...

2. Advantages - best of both worlds (though it might be a struggle to get there in the short term). I think this is a fantastic way to go! Mon, Dec 7, 2009 4:22 PM Find...

3. My concern is mainly that I do not want to see the brilliant Archon web interface (esp. public) compromised in any way. Also, I prefer the ingesting features in Archon. Finally, I generally like Archon better because it runs on LAMP. I think the Mon, Dec 7, 2009 2:28 PM Find...

< 1 > 10 responses per page

answered question 23





skipped question 3




8. What concerns do you have about the Archon/ AT integration? What do you think the advantages will be?

[Download](#)

programming language choice will determine how involved many archivists can be in development.

That said, I like some of the features in AT that are not in Archon, and I look forward to this product very much.

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| 4. Will the resulting product be able to ingest data from our current AT instance? | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 2:00 PM |  Find... |
| 5. I can only see advantages, as the community will now be focused on the development of only one tool, and the training of the community of users. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 12:27 PM |  Find... |
| 6. Concern: Delay of AT or Archon implementation by institutions waiting for integration to be completed.
Advantage: More robust application with broad archival community support. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 11:58 AM |  Find... |
| 7. Main concerns: AT tech support during integration process/ progress on modules; Sustainability of the system and its ability to manage large collections, and the multitude of functions it's aiming to control.
Advantages: same as concern--its ability to integrate a multitude of archival functions, streamlining efficiency and control of data, eliminating need (and error possibilities inherent in) duplicative data entry. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 11:11 AM |  Find... |
| 8. I'm concerned that the end product will be a much more complex tool and that it could become more difficult to administer, especially for those of us without technology departments or IT people.

The advantage will be that it will be a more powerful way to manage both the administrative and descriptive aspects of collections in one program. It will save time currently spent entering the same data in two places. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 9:59 AM |  Find... |
| 9. We rely on volunteers and interns for assistance with the workload; we would like to see an interface that is relatively smooth to work with or train on. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 9:42 AM |  Find... |
| 10. Just hope too many codes doesn't spoil the batter. Also hoping it doesn't become fee-based like CONTENTdm. It needs to stay free--or at least inexpensive if we're going to create a monopoly. | Mon, Dec 7, 2009 8:41 AM |  Find... |

< 1

> 10 responses per page

answered question 23


skipped question 3

9. Comments[Download](#)**Response
Count** [Hide replies](#)


6

- 1.** Sorry for the late return on this.


Mon, Dec 7, 2009 2:28 PM

 [Find...](#)
- 2.** I'm looking forward to our discussions this week, and am pleased to be participating. I hope that my perspective as a representative from a smaller institution, with few resources in terms of staff, IT support and funds, will be helpful.

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 12:27 PM


 [Find...](#)
- 3.** It is important to have a sustainable governance structure for the long run. Such structure should allow flexible and easy way to accept funding contributions, contract management for future software development, and management of code contributions. Successful open source organizations must welcome financial and development contributions and must foster a warm and welcome environment for a supportive community to rally behind it. Example: Lucid and Koha.

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 10:46 AM


 [Find...](#)
- 4.** Archon and AT both employ differing software models (AT's desktop client vs Archon's browser-based interface). The current users of these systems have often chosen one product over the other due to issues of the perceived ease of usability and the challenges of technical support that these differing architectures pose, and I hope that this is taken into consideration. I'm also curious what scripting language the developers choose to use and why (AT's javascript vs Archon's PHP).

I also hope that the integrated product remains freely available open source software if possible.

Mon, Dec 7, 2009 7:59 AM


 [Find...](#)
- 5.** Looking forward to the webinars!

Sat, Dec 5, 2009 11:50 AM

 [Find...](#)
- 6.** There is no addressing where AT development will go in future; there was no report on sustainability of the program. This is one of my most pressing concerns.

In addition, the development of the AT site for sharing plug-ins and discussing issues/problems is lacking. I would hope that either an AT/Archon group or the SAA Roundtable leadership would take more responsibility in organizing this as a resource.

Fri, Dec 4, 2009 10:39 AM

 [Find...](#)

answered question

6

skipped question

20

[About Us](#) [Anti-Spam Policy](#) [Terms of Use](#) [Privacy Statement](#) [Opt Out/Opt In](#) [Contact Us](#) [We're Hiring!](#)

Copyright ©1999-2010 SurveyMonkey.com. All Rights Reserved. No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of SurveyMonkey.com. 37