

ADS IMPACT WORKSHOP REPORT AND FEEDBACK

BACKGROUND

As part of the ADS Impact study, a focus group workshop was held in York on 21st November 2012 to present and discuss emerging results from the study with a range of ADS stakeholders. The aims of the workshop were to seek stakeholder feedback on the emerging results, establish any change of perception of the ADS amongst participants as a result of the study, and seek their views on how the study results might be presented to the archaeological community and its funders.

Invitations were sent to a range of sector representatives, but not all could attend. Eleven delegates attended the workshop, of whom four were from the Local Authority sector, three from National Authorities, one from Universities, one from the Commercial sector, one shared university/commercial sectors, and one from Publishing.

No. of Delegates	Sector
4	Local Authority
1.5	University
3	National Authority
1	Publisher
1.5	Commercial

The agenda for the workshop was as follows:

- 13.00 – 13.20 Welcome (Julian Richards)
Introductions (Neil Beagrie + participants)
- 13.20 – 13.45 Workshops Aims (Neil Beagrie)
Initial Feedback (participants)
- 13.45 – 14.45 Study methods and Initial Results (Neil Beagrie)
Questions
- 14.45 – 15.00 Tea/coffee break
- 15.00 – 15.30 Discussion – Value and Impact of ADS (participants – facilitator Neil Beagrie)
- 15.30 – 15.45 Final Feedback (participants via feedback forms)

Facilitated discussion at the event and a structured feedback form were used to assess post-dissemination perceptions of value of the ADS. This is synthesised in this report. The workshop was held using “Chatham House Rules”: all feedback has therefore been anonymised.

INITIAL FEEDBACK

The initial feedback session was structured as a discussion focussing on identification of key stakeholders of the ADS that should be made aware of the study findings. Participants suggested the following key stakeholder groups: Curatorial sector involved in preservation by record

(planning/HER); research funders (HE and others such as HLF) both “willing” funders and developers required by planning to fund – it was noted those forced to fund are most likely to complain at any costs and most in need to be aware of likely benefits; users including university academics and students, contract archaeologists, private individuals, learned societies, national heritage bodies; other archives and repositories particularly museums with archaeological collections and institutional repositories in universities – it was noted there is a wide range of undeposited digital archives and a missed opportunity cost that could be quantified; European and other international peer repositories and organisations; publishers and learned society journal editorial boards for linked data and articles; other digital archives in the humanities and beyond with a relevant professional interest in the study. It was felt important not just to sell the ADS but the benefits of digital archiving generally that it supports.

FINAL FEEDBACK

The final feedback was gathered via a form with four questions and sections for associated comments to be completed by all participants. The number of participants is insufficient to detect any overall patterns or differentiation by sector, but the number of overall responses to questions is collated in brackets in the summary text and tables below together, with individual associated comments. The final feedback can be summarised as follows:

All eleven attendees felt the study results had changed their perceptions of ADS value. For most (6/11) this was a moderate change because they felt that they already valued ADS highly (6), but the study had extended their understanding of either the scope of that value (2), particularly economic (3) and/or the degree of its value to other stakeholders (2). Several workshop delegates commented positively about seeing value expressed in economic terms, as this was something they had not previously considered or seen presented (4).

Everybody agreed to a greater or lesser degree (with most people agreeing strongly) with all three statements provided on the value of a stakeholder benefits map, quotations from users and depositors, and economic analysis of benefits. In the comments, the necessity of targeting messages to the specific audience was emphasised (3) and it was also felt to be important not to dwell exclusively on economic measures of value (2). Clear messages (1) and good graphical presentation (2) were felt to be key.

Participants made a range of suggestions on how to disseminate results of the ADS Impact study to maximise their value for ADS including the following targets:

Organisations/ Institutions/Roles:	Publications	Email Discussion Lists	Conferences
FAME (2)	Current Archaeology (2)	ALGAO (1)	IFA (1)
IFA (1)	British Archaeology (2)	HERForum (1)	CAA (1)
ALGAO (2)	Public Archaeology (1)	Britarch (1)	AAA (1)
English Heritage (1)	The Archaeologist (1)	FISH (1)	
JISC (1)	Antiquity (1)	FAME (1)	
AHRC (1)	Heritage Counts (2)	CBA (1)	
HLF (1)	Planning, construction and architecture publications (2)		
SCUPHA (1)			
University Depts (1)	New media		
Heritage Champions (1)	Twitter (1)		
Budget-holding Directors (1)	Facebook (1)		

Finally participants were asked for suggestions on what additional resources or services the ADS could implement that would have a further impact on its value (economic or otherwise) to the archaeological community in the UK. The most popular suggestions were: Improve or expand OASIS, e.g. to include all grey literature (3); and Publication/archiving of more archaeological or local journals (2).

Q1. (a) Have the results of the study changed your perceptions of the value and impact of the ADS in any way?

No Change	Slight Change	Moderate Change	Significant Change	Major Change
	(2)	(6)	(2)	(1)

(b) Can you explain how your perceptions changed, or if No why they remain unchanged?

Haven't previously given any thought to 'value' of ADS in economic terms. Only really appreciated ADS as research tool and for digital preservation. Surprised by cost/benefit ratio –largely because I hadn't evaluated the 'value' of the service.

I always thought of it as valuable but I suppose the change is to do with a conceptual shift in thinking about it in different (monetary) ways. I think that we have difficulty assessing 'value' when things are free at the point of access.

It was good to see the broad spectrum of users pie chart. It was also good to see numerical values placed on how the ADS is valued.

I already knew, or at least thought I knew that the ADS would be seen as a valuable service to the community. I think the numbers have been a little higher than I might have thought.

It mostly confirms previous belief in the value of the service. But very good to see more definitive results and demonstrations of this.

It's really good to see how much value is in the ADS in real money; I've always understood its value as an archive. I hope as the value and quality of the data is better understood its future value will increase.

As a user of most collections offered by the ADS and having worked within local government archaeology services I believe I valued the service highly regardless of the economic reporting of value. In the future it will be maybe be easier to demonstrate the value and impact to others because of the assessment of economic impact by this study – this has changed my perception of how others might value the service in future.

I now have a better appreciation of the broader impact of the use of ADS outside my particular segment of the sector. I've also been made aware of main points and potential avenues of dissemination I'd not previously considered.

I have always felt the ADS is of value, but today has broadened my perception beyond my own experience, to show a broader perspective. Also, my perceptions of the variety of different values, including the economic value, and the views of different user groups have increased.

I have always recognised the value of the ADS, but very useful and enlightening to see it measured in economic terms, demonstrating the benefit to the sector. I hadn't considered the scale of the impact of the ADS on users in terms of time/efficiency savings.

Didn't know how I would have valued ADS, but this is higher than I would have, expected it to be less than this in some sense.

Q2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

(a) A stakeholder map of benefits improves perceptions of the value of ADS

1. Strongly agree	2. Tend to agree	3. Tend to disagree	4. Strongly disagree
(7)	(4)		

(b) Quotations/feedback from users and depositors improves perceptions of the value of ADS

1. Strongly agree	2. Tend to agree	3. Tend to disagree	4. Strongly disagree
(9)	(2)		

(c) Economic analysis of benefits improves perceptions of the value of ADS

1. Strongly agree	2. Tend to agree	3. Tend to disagree	4. Strongly disagree
(7)	(4)		

(d) Any comments?

Stakeholder benefits showed some I'd not considered, so [that]would probably apply to others.

The quotations will help to highlight the less tangible social and cultural benefits of making data available via the ADS.

Agree [economic analysis of benefits improves perceptions of the value of ADS], but you have to be careful in wording, so as to keep message clear and not obfuscated by jargon.

Economic analysis will only improve perceptions of value amongst certain groups e.g. people responsible for financial costing etc.

Economics/figures have the possibility of turning people off/away, so presentation is key! (Infographics essential – complex info at a glance)

The economic analysis will be particularly useful for supporting arguments for continued and further funding.

Strongly agree with all statements – on the assumption that each can be pitched in a way that's meaningful to the target audience.

I think you need to use a holistic model that sees value in qualitative (and anecdotal) evidence as well as quantitative methods.

Need to ensure good graphics, tied to good, clear text.

The right message needs to be tailored to the different audiences in the sector.

I think users of ADS will be aware it has value, even if they didn't quantify it.

Q3. Do you have any suggestions on how to disseminate results of the ADS Impact study to maximise their value for ADS?

Comments:

I think the dissemination of results should be done with a view to promoting/advertising the role of ADS. In contacting a range of stakeholders through a range of mediums, the opportunity for self-promotion should be grasped! From a commercial standpoint, I can only think of FAME and IFA as means of disseminating to the Units.

Disseminate widely through conference/journal routes to archaeologists/planners/ALGAO. Disseminate to EH/JISC/AHRC/ etc. at a more strategic level. Think about more 'populist' approaches via Current Archaeology/HLF. Find ways to link with broader context of archives via other organisations/funders and highlight 'best practice'.

Popular magazine article in British Archaeology/Current Archaeology. This should be about what the ADS is/does generally, 'advertising' it to prospective users and using the study data to say 'Look at how much people already value it'. Academic journal article about the study would be of interest to the journal 'Public Archaeology' I'd think. But somebody would need to write it...

Adverts in leading archaeology journals e.g. Antiquity. Repeated twitter announcements (over weeks, not just one) of results -> printing the top level summary/digital info sheet on ADS website (with links to detail if people want it). Infographics work well on facebook (student/professionals of the future) and easily passed on. SCUPHA/FAME/Museum email lists. Individual Archaeology departments -not necessarily Heads of Departments – also many now have digital noticeboards so possibility of an 'animated' slide or even slides for relevant tutors to include in their own presentations about archiving/dissemination etc. Also ensuring feeds back to main grant-giving bodies like AHRC to ensure funds re. mandatory deposits.

An article in Heritage Counts would be very good at raising positive perceptions of digital archiving and online access in general to a 'broad heritage audience', especially those with influence over resources. Targeting Heritage Champions similarly.

For me, ensuring directors of organisations and others who spend a lot of time on budgets will get the message easiest and be able to do the most with it. I think the IFA, CAA, AAA and other conferences that capture these individuals. I would also suggest publishing in planning, construction and architecture publications.

Tailor the results to different groups. Some will only want higher level messages instead of detail/in-depth economic costing. Identify key groups but also encourage general circulation e.g. local government archaeology officers -> general email with key points circulated with authorities to catch groups outside of planning.

ALGAO email circulation list for local Government archaeologists
- contact algao.cji@btinternet.com

HERForum email circulation list for HERS

Britarch email circulation list for general archaeologists

FISH email circulation list for information standards

FAME email circulation list for contractors

I think there is a community archaeology email list run by the CBA that may be useful to contact that sector. More popular articles in British Archaeology magazine, Planning magazine and one for builders/minerals operators.

- Dissemination via ALGAO to reach local authority sector, provides useful information for use with local planners and developers and archaeological contractors.
- Publication in The Archaeologist, to reach archaeological managers.
- Inclusion of key facts/figures in Heritage Counts

A few key, simple points driven home in various media/outlet channels, so that the same message is picked up by all.

Q4. Do you have any suggestions on what additional resources or services the ADS could implement that would have a further impact on its value (economic or otherwise) to the archaeological community in the UK?

Comments:

... sometimes struggle to deposit digital archive with museums – they do not have experience to preserve the data. At this late stage in development process, we have no access to additional funds to deposit the digital data with ADS as obvious repository. Could this be addressed?

Do ADS have a reduced or ‘free deposit’ for unaffiliated individuals or community groups with any significant funding?

If OASIS could be developed to contain all past grey literature, that would be fantastic! Open access image bank? Contributed to by the public for all?

Further feedback to depositors on the particular users, and uses, of data that is deposited and re-used. Increasing access to information about the broader historic environment (buildings, maritime). More co-operative Research Environments (VREs) for data sharing and re-use online.

I would like more skills taught in examining and re-using other peoples data. If more was understood about the data we have already generated I think this would increase the value of the archives. It is much easier to justify the ADS when as many users are using the data as much as possible.

Improve grey literature library by encouraging greater uptake, depositing of digital reports through OASIS e.g. some contractors ‘send by other means’ a hard copy to HERS. Need to sell this more as a benefit to users but also contractors.

Investigating access to local county and period journals in the same way as currently mount PSAS or CBA Research Reports. Some material is harder to get at – out of print or only in limited institutions. Perhaps HLF funding available to assist local societies in this – some have already digitised theirs, perhaps they could be introduced to the benefits of long term digital preservation (we had one local society fold, its website is now down and all that data is lost/inaccessible).

- Further development of the ADS as a grey literature archive, would add tremendous value to the archaeological community.
- Publication/archiving of more archaeological journals would be highly beneficial.
- A more accessible/easy to use service to encourage digital archiving from the commercial sector.

Some examples of work/benefits that would not have happened without it would be useful e.g. use of ADS by EnglaID project, access to e.g. Med Arch emphasising the benefit of searching multiple datasets in one place, e.g. show what a search would locate looking at only certain datasets in the collections, and how that changes as other datasets are brought in.