

September 2012

2011 VRA Travel Award Recipients' Session Reports

Heidi Eyestone

Carleton College, heyeston@carleton.edu

Vicky Brown

University of Oxford, History of Art Department, victoria.brown@hoa.ox.ac.uk

Follow this and additional works at: <https://online.vraweb.org/vrab>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Eyestone, Heidi and Brown, Vicky (2012) "2011 VRA Travel Award Recipients' Session Reports," *VRA Bulletin*:Vol. 38: Iss. 3, Article 5.
Available at: <https://online.vraweb.org/vrab/vol38/iss3/5>

This Association News is brought to you for free and open access by VRA Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in VRA Bulletin by an authorized editor of VRA Online.

2011 VRA Travel Award Recipients' Session Reports

Abstract

Summaries compiled by the VRA Travel Awards Committee Chairs and written by the 2011 VRA Travel Award recipients. In 2011, the Visual Resources Association granted four Luraine Tansey/VRA Association Travel Awards; two Corporate Travel Awards; the Kathe Hicks Albrecht Travel Award; the Joseph C. Taormina Memorial top-up award; two New Horizons awards; the New Horizons Student award; one New Horizons Top-Up award and one international award (from a private donor), providing financial assistance for thirteen VRA members to attend and participate in the 29th Annual Conference in Minneapolis, a joint conference with ARLIS/NA.

Summary: Opening Plenary

Works and Fair Use: Can Bridges Be Built Between Educational Users and Copyright Owners

Summary by Gráinne Loughran, University of Ulster

Speaker: Jule Sigall, Associate General Counsel, Microsoft

Organizer: Gretchen Wagner, ARTstor
VRA Intellectual Property Rights Committee

Moderator: Elisa Lanzi, Imaging Center, Smith College

Elisa Lanzi, Chair of the Visual Resources Association Foundation and Director of the Imaging Center, Smith College opened the session by thanking the VRA Intellectual Property Rights Committee, and Gretchen Wagner and Christine Sundt for organising the session. She also thanked the generosity of the session co-sponsors, ARTstor and the VRA Foundation. Elisa described the increasing demand on organizations to build digital collections, with the central concern focusing on rights management. The move towards digital learning environments has led to the increasing emergence of rights management issues in education. Introducing the plenary speaker, Jule Sigall, Elisa provided the audience with some biographical detail. Jule is Associate General Counsel for Copyright in Microsoft's Legal and Corporate Affairs Department. Prior to joining Microsoft, Jule was Associate Registrar for Policy and International Affairs in the US Copyright Office. He was also Adjunct Professor at George Washington University Law School where he taught copyright law. Prior to his government service, Jule practiced in the Intellectual Property and Technology Group of Arnold and Porter, Washington DC.

Jule began his talk by thanking the VRA and ARTstor for inviting him to speak at the conference about orphan works. He offered an alternative title to the plenary, which he felt should resonate with many of the delegates - "Why Is Copyright So Hard?" He explained to the audience that much of the lack of progress to date relating to orphan works legislation could be illustrated with a single image, an illustration by Nick Anderson, the editorial cartoonist for the Huston Chronicle. Jule explained that he felt that this image was emblematic of what illustrators had done to oppose the orphan works legislation – a visual/illustrated petition comprised of cartoons about what they thought the orphan works legislation would do to their copyrights.

Jule began his story of working on the orphan works legislation with an image by the artist Mondrian. One of Jule's first tasks at Arnold and Porter was to ascertain the copyright status of a Mondrian painting for the Phillips Collection. The questions raised while carrying out this work prompted him to establish a summer associate project at Arnold and Porter, which would create a flow chart for the Phillips Collection to use to enable them to answer these copyright questions about works in their collection. This project resulted in a 64-page incomplete document which highlighted to Jule the extreme difficulties in ascertaining copyright status, and how the questions about the status of orphan works was part of this bigger problem.

On leaving Arnold and Porter in 2003, Jule joined the Copyright Office. At that time, copyright issues were becoming increasingly complicated, with 12-year old children being sued for file sharing. Stories like this encouraged Jule to try to find ways in which the Copyright Office could help to resolve these issues and put copyright on a more solid footing, helping to make the relationship between owners and users more productive. At this point in the presentation, Jule showed a slide of Raphael's School of Athens, which depicts Michelangelo as Heraclitus, explaining that Heraclitus's theory on the Harmony of Opposites in which productive tension produces vibrancy and makes things happen inspired him to think about copyright in these terms. By highlighting the copyright tensions which affect everyone, e.g. the music industry, the motion picture industry, book publishers, Jule felt that an effective solution could be found. Jule described how he then approached Mary Beth Peters, US Register of Copyrights with his proposal to find a solution to the problem of copyright for orphan works. Having had similar experiences with establishing the copyright status for works in the Library of Congress, Marybeth was keen to encourage this work, suggesting that Jule should initially establish whether there was Congressional interest in the issue. Several members of Congress with an active interest in copyright issues were approached. These members did not hesitate in suggesting that Jule study the issue for a year, solicit comments and organise various round-table discussions. The work resulted in the "Report on Orphan Works: A Report on the Register of Copyrights" in January 2006. Consequently, in 2006 the Orphan Works Bill was passed in the House, but not the Senate. In 2008, the Bill was reintroduced, when it was passed in the Senate by unanimous consent, but did not get through the House because of the active opposition of individual creators, photographers and illustrators. At the same time, the proposed settlement to the Google Books publisher's litigation was announced. Although this was not a visual publishing issue, it put a halt to any legislative activity because a solution for orphan works for books had been built into the proposed settlement and Congress could not do anything on the legislation for visual orphan works while this was pending. This legislation was rejected three days prior to the VRA/ARLIS conference, and this will hopefully lead to an open field for Congress to begin legislating again on visual orphan works.

Jule then returned to the Nick Anderson cartoon, and Anderson's blog post explanation of what he thought would happen after orphan works legislation had been passed - that exclusive

ownership and control of his own work would be lost and his work de-valued. While Jule felt that there was some truth in all of Anderson's comments, none of them actually relate to the issue of orphan works. All of the issues Anderson had raised in his blog, were already occurring precisely because of a lack of legislation. While Orphan Works legislation would not solve these problems, it would not exacerbate them either, but could help to resolve other issues. Jule explained that a lot could be learned from this experience, and from looking at the incentives for individuals taking certain actions. He goes on to give a technical explanation as to why photographers and illustrators have acted against orphan works legislation by using the theories of the economist Mansur Olsen in his text *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Olsen argues that most legislation is passed when there is a combination of two things - concentrated benefits versus diffuse costs. Concentrated benefits mean that the benefits of the passing of this legislation will go to a relatively small number of people, who are highly motivated to seek those benefits. Diffuse costs means that the benefits are spread over a larger group of people who are less motivated to achieve the benefits, have less incentive, and consequently less benefits to gain. Jule relates this theory to examining and understanding the various incentives for passing copyright legislation.

Jule closed the plenary session on an optimistic note. He explained that there are steps that can be taken short of legislation to help with both the problems of orphan works, and the problem of more free use of materials for educational purposes. He used the example of the Documentary Filmmaker's Statement on Best Practices in Fair Use and other similar works on the fair use of materials in scholarly research and explained this is the type of literature which Federal Judges will turn to when making their decisions on copyright cases, so these publications are invaluable. Jule encouraged organisations to proactively publish their best practices on copyright issues as this will provide powerful evidence and guidance to the legal profession. A good example of this is the Creative Commons group who has done a lot of work in filling in the gaps in copyright guidance.

A question and answer session followed the presentation touching on a variety of issues relating to copyright and orphan works legislation including: the solutions needed to move orphan works legislation forward in the light of objections from individuals; how fair use threatens the livelihood of professional photographers who supply images for use in education; the consequences of the *Golan v Holder* case on orphan works and copyright legislation; the need for education and better understanding of copyright law among both students/users and creators of images; the fair use of museum images on the internet, and how litigation might impact on legislation; the dynamics between law, practice and technology and how technology can be used to protect ownership of images through, for example, watermarking or embedding information in images.

Summaries: Case Studies

Case Studies I

Summary by Jen Green, Digital Projects Librarian, Plymouth State University

Moderator: Allison Benedetti, Project Librarian, Harvard Graduate School of Design

Session Sponsor: ARLIS/NA, VRA

Speakers:

Anne Hepburn and Jason Williams, Pacific Northwest College of Art,

“It’s Not You, It’s Mimi!: Building an Institutional Repository Specifically for an Arts Community.”

Eric M. Wolf, Head Librarian, The Menil Collection,

“Beyond Catalogues and Image Databases—Leading a Museum-Wide Collections Management System Committee.”

Ryan Evans, White Columns Curatorial Associate & Archivist, Pratt MLS Candidate,

“On Re-Housing Special Collections of the Alternative Spaces.”

Anna M. Fishaut, Art & Architecture Library, Stanford University

“Rethinking the Reference Collection.”

Elizabeth Hahn, The American Numismatic Society

“KOHA-llaboration—Utilizing the Resources of the Open-Source Community to Migrate the ANS Library Catalog.”

(not present due to illness)

Allison Benedetti explained the new Case Studies session format at this year’s annual conference. Each of the presenters would provide case studies of projects underway in their libraries or collections, and then time would be given at the end to allow the session attendees to walk around the room and ask specific questions of the presenters. Benedetti then introduced the first presenters.

Anne Hepburn and Jason Williams introduced *Mimi*, Pacific Northwestern College of Art’s “home-grown” institutional repository, which is a collaboration between the Library and Information Technology departments. Hepburn explained that Mimi (which is not an acronym) serves as a multi-media archive for the institution and currently houses four component collections including: (1) student artwork and library archives; (2) Museum of Contemporary Craft images; (3) Communications and Public Programming department images; and (4) Education department collections. Hepburn explained that the largest of these very diverse component collections is the student artwork and the library archive. This collection consists of approximately 44,000 original student artworks and is cataloged and curated by librarians and library staff.

Since 2009, the Museum of Contemporary Craft has contributed images of both local and regional arts and crafts. The Communications and Public programming department’s collection

contains documentary photographs of public events, while the Education department has contributed a children's archive that spans 100 years. Hepburn explained that commercial content management products had been researched and considered before they decided on a home-grown system. ContentDM was the frontrunner in this process along with Luna, but since the institution has had success building their own calendar system, designing and building an institutional repository was within the realm of possibility for them. The process of designing, building, and implementing a home-grown institutional repository was a collaborative process. For example, the library worked with PNCA's IT department to develop the metadata schema (based on Dublin and VRA Core) and procure grants. These departments also worked together to optimize the system's features including the ability to add item records to an album or "favorites" and inclusion of user-generated tags. Along with the collaborative departmental component of Mimi's development, PNCA also relies heavily on volunteer support from MLIS students within Portland, OR and PNCA's museum. Mimi's short-term goals are to add 150,000 items to the student portfolios and thesis work collection as well as improve collaboration with the institution's museum. Mimi is not currently "live" to the public, but its developers at PNCA would like it to be within the next 2 years.

Eric Wolf of the Menil Collection in Houston, TX opened with a Charles Dickens quote, which describes the terror of the Industrial Revolution. Wolf noted that Librarians are currently facing a similar time of transition as well as similar fears, budget constraints, etc. In some situations, the physical space and ideals of the library are threatened. In other situations, the museum at-large is becoming more like a library in the way that it must manage information. Museum collection paper registers are being augmented/replaced by online collection management systems. Authority control and shared cataloging were unheard of 20 years ago, but now they are the norm. One of the challenges that librarians face is working with standards, such as MARC, which were not originally designed for online searching. Wolf points out that librarians are uniquely positioned to play a key leadership role in institution-wide digital initiatives. At the Menil collection, the collections management committee recently met and discovered that they have multiple FileMaker databases spread all over the institution, which has resulted in what Wolf called a "mess." A single system seemed to be the solution needed to manage multiple existing collections, but a committee was formed in order to determine this and to initiate the process of managing these multiple collections across campus. Wolf is a co-chair of this committee. Because it was of primary importance for the committee to see the reality of where they were in terms of managing multiple collections, they first created a document with separate tabs for each separate collection. Then the committee developed a budget and timeline for the project, which they passed on to the museum's collection management team. Next, they researched several content management projects, wrote an RFP, for which they are currently awaiting approval, in the hope that they can implement the institutional repository within the next fiscal year. Whether or not his direct involvement results in the adoption of a new system, Wolf says that the collaboration has allowed him to learn more about the various departmental needs.

Ryan Evans, Curatorial Associate and Archivist of White Columns in New York, NY presented his research (based on his perspective both as a professional and an MLS student at Pratt) on alternative spaces for special collections. White Columns undertook a Special Collections re-housing Initiative with the goal of increasing access to materials without overshadowing other work duties. Evans noted that space and budget constraints sometimes make re-housing materials a necessity, but it is important that when materials are re-dispersed they are also contextualized. Evans provided three examples of collections that were re-housed with the benefit of improved access. The first, the Franklin Furnace Archive's artist books collection, was founded by artist Martha Wilson in 1976. It consists of international examples of artists' books, periodicals, postcards, manifestos, and broadsides. Transferred to the MOMA in 1994, the collection is now cataloged in the MoMA DADATABASE.

Since the materials have moved, they are now easily accessible online, but still maintain important contextual information about their previous home at Franklin Furnace. A second example is the New Museum of Contemporary Art Library, which held a collection of artists' monographs and exhibition catalogs dating from World War II to present. In 2005, the collection was transferred to New York University. With the capability of cataloging the materials, NYU has indicated the material provenance in both the catalog and the physical item. This digital catalog is linked to the NYU library catalog, thereby increasing access to this collection once housed within the New Museum of Contemporary Art.

A third example was ABC No Rio Zine Library collection, which contains 12,000 items comprised of independent and underground publications on the topics of music, culture, politics, travel, and personal experience. The collection began in 1998 during the real estate crisis that threatened the Blackout Zine collection housed in the South Bronx and was later moved to ABC No Rio to continue growth and enable access to these materials. While re-housing collections is often necessary and has positive results in improved access, Evans continued his discussion by outlining both the positive and negative impacts of this process. Included in the benefits are: (1) a new relation with a larger institutional collection puts special collection materials into a larger context which increases their ability to be retrieved, (2) a shift in the historical context or location requires the move and the materials can be saved from a worse end, (3) primary source materials found in these special collections can fill in research holes found in larger institution collections. Negative outcomes of re-housing specials collections include: (1) it often marks the end of an era of sustainable independent special collections, (2) access is limited to smaller communities that previously utilized the collections, and (3) the integrity of the collection is often compromised. Evans concluded the presentation by noting that this case study has informed a digitization project underway at White Columns, and serious discussions about transferring their repository to a larger library have begun.

Anna Fishaut from the Stanford University Art and Architecture Library presented on the Stanford reference weeding project. A formal reference evaluation had not taken place for many years; as a result they had 350 linear feet of shelves filled to overflowing. In addition to the

crowded, overflowing state, materials were also underused and occupied prime real estate in the reading room. Fishaut determined that many of them were irrelevant including multiple museum and academy registers and price guides. Each were important in their own way, but did not reflect the current scholarship and teaching at Stanford University. Approaching reduction within the reference collection required Fishaut to take a “holistic view” of the process. Fishaut weeded, replaced old editions with new ones, moved to digital copies when available, and did a lot of dusting! The goal, beyond creating a current and compact collection, was to increase relevancy, use, and visibility of the collection. Books shelves were turning into room dividers, which precluded their goal of increasing cohesiveness within the space.

Fishaut acknowledged that she did not analyze one usage statistic throughout this process. Stanford’s Library has historically been a non-circulating collection, and after a few years of experience as a Librarian at Stanford, she has been able to gather enough anecdotal data to understand that usage was low. She did not keep a concise count of how many books were in the reference collection when she started the weeding process and did not count how many titles she subsequently sent to offsite storage—this was not within the scope of the project. Fishaut undertook the project as an experiment to assess where the reference collection is headed. She looked at each title on the shelf and made a decision about whether it should be moved to the circulating stacks, moved to offsite storage, or discarded. The Grove Dictionary of Art, for example, was moved to offsite storage and the online version was purchased. Fishaut said that when her focus transitioned from one of reviewing materials to one of understanding the collection’s contents, she felt that the weeding project transformed from one of maintenance to one of curation. Throughout the process, “ready reference” was moved from behind the reference desk into the regular reference stacks because it became clear that the separation between regular and ready reference was just a hindrance to use. Fishaut decided to add a number of introductory texts to the stacks, especially those that were part of comprehensive series (e.g., World of Art). She saved many primary sources and historical texts that could serve multiple purposes for patrons. What resulted is a multi-purpose collection that works as a whole and is a nice parallel collection to the regular stacks. Connoisseurship shifted from just Stanford Curators and Art Faculty to undergraduate students approaching ideas, theories, and research topics for the first time. The Reference Section now presents a broad range of art literature and should prove to be a valuable source of information. This has increased the relevance and cohesiveness of the collection for student and faculty use as well as supporting classroom pedagogy. The final piece of the project was to revise the circulation policy so that reference books now circulate for one week instead of not at all. The library’s perspective is that if people want to bring books home with them, then their re-evaluation of the reference collection has been a success.

Elizabeth Hahn from the American Numismatic Society did not present her work with KOHA as she was unable to attend the session due to illness.

Rather than a traditional question/answer portion after the presentations, the Case Studies I session ended with the presenters breaking out into different areas of the room so that participants could approach them and ask questions in a smaller group format.

Case Studies II

Summary by Jennifer Kniesch, Dickinson College

Moderator: Merriann Bidgood, University of Houston, Visual Resources Curator

Speakers:

Tammy Ravas, University of Montana, Visual and Performing Arts Librarian, and Megan Stark, University of Montana, Undergraduate Services Librarian at the Mansfield Library, “I Spy with My Little Eye.”

Julia Simic, University of Oregon, Visual Resources Librarian, and Katie Moss, University of Oregon, Digital Metadata Technician, “Engaging Faculty Research and Teaching through Collaborative Digital Collections.”

Teresa Slobuski, New Jersey Environmental Digital Libraries, Project Manager, “The Role of the Information Professional in an Increasing Digital World.”

Liv Valmestad, Architecture/Fine Arts Librarian, University of Manitoba, “Q (a)R(t) Code Project: a Convergence of Media.”

Merriann Bidgood opened the session by introducing the Case Studies II panelists and concluded by stating that each speaker would be present at the tables around the room for further discussion and questions after the entire session concluded.

Tammy Ravas from The University of Montana stated that Megan Stark wasn’t able to make the conference and therefore, she would be delivering the presentation on behalf of both of them. Both Ravas and Stark began the case study by evaluating The University of Montana’s library guide, defining visual literacy, and reviewing the issues of visual literacy within the broader scope of various disciplines. The University of Montana Museum of Art and Culture, in conjunction with The Freedom Forum and the Newseum, held a travelling exhibit in 2009 entitled Capture the Moment: the Pulitzer Prize Photographs. The University of Montana’s Mansfield Library corresponded closely with and assisted undergraduates on pedagogical activities in conjunction with this exhibition. Ravas demonstrated an example of the collaboration that took place. She emphasized that in order to define the needs of undergraduate patrons, they had to define what visual literacy meant, as “skills of interpreting and

discriminating visual objects and their potential meanings, but vary[ing] according to discipline.”¹ The students were provided a photograph from the exhibition and were asked to answer the following: “what do we have the right to observe?;” “what is this image?;” “who is the author?;” “what facts do you have here?;” and “do you have the right to view this?.” The evaluations and outcomes quantified major questions and answers. Students did not have the background information or context of the photo prior to being asked these questions. They struggled with the lack of context, normally provided through text accompanying the image. The University of Montana’s librarians created a visual literacy resource guide to assist undergraduates in obtaining images for authoritative visual analyses and critical evaluations. ARTstor, CAMIO, and a few examples of meta-sites, including Boston University Libraries assist students in their search to gain authoritative descriptive metadata that correlated with images.

Julia Simic and Katie Moss from the University of Oregon discussed their case study regarding the University of Oregon’s digital collections: the grants that were received to build the digital collections and the methods for building digital collections. The purpose was to try to steer away from typical patterns of engaging faculty: i.e. suggesting images and providing instruction for the collection, states Simic. She continued by discussing how relationship building is not typically used in the library or special collections. “They build the collection hoping people will use it.”² This session earmarks the variation on the digital collections we build for constituents. For example, Simic showed the University of Oregon’s Art and Architecture Image Collections website, stated that “faculty and students inform me of their needs, I digitize the images and then place them in the collection.”³ The Northwest FolkLife Digital Collections also embodied the ideology of a specific subject need. They obtained a grant obtained for the first year. The collection currently holds approximately 75,000 images. Simic showed and discussed the University of Oregon’s Mongolian Altai Inventory Image Collection. This collection obtained a grant because faculty needed a digital repository for references and context on thousands of images locations. The examples discussed produced fruitful collaborations between the faculty, Subject Specialists at the Library, Nathan Georgitis (Metadata Librarian and Special Projects Team Leader), Julia Simic, and Katie Moss, which raised awareness of the Visual Resources

¹ Tammy Ravas, “I Spy with My Little Eye,” session at Second Joint Conference, Visual Resources Association and Art Libraries Society of North America, *Collaboration: Building Bridges in the 21st Century*, 25 March 2011.

² Julia Simic, “Engaging Faculty Research and Teaching through Collaborative Digital Collections,” session at Second Joint Conference, Visual Resources Association and Art Libraries Society of North America, *Collaboration: Building Bridges in the 21st Century*, 25 March 2011.

³ *ibid*

Collection and the University of Oregon's libraries as a whole. Katie Moss discussed the Petrarch Collection, which is currently hosted and maintained by the Department of Romance Languages. Produced by Moss, Karen Estlund (Head of Digital Library Services), and Professor of Italian, Massimo Lollini, enables scholars and students to read, study and teach Francesco Petrarca's (Petrarch's) *Il Canzoniere*, thus reiterating successful collaboration between various departments across University of Oregon's campus. Moss's final example of digital cross-departmental collaboration was the African Political Ephemera Collection. A federal grant of \$4,000 provided a platform to develop a collection of 50 items. Moss emphasized that while it is a low number of items, the collection indicates the "highest uses per item out of all the University's digital collections."⁴

Rutgers University's Library and Information Science alumna, Teresa Slobuski, discussed the outcomes from a case study she produced regarding keyword search queries in large digital image collections. While this project initially began as an Independent Study, it flourished into a much larger project that developed more questions and needed more quantifiable answers. The questions Slobuski used to begin the project were:

1. What is the current state of metadata in art image databases?
2. What access points do users need to know to find what they want?
3. How do search interfaces help or hinder the search process?
4. With image databases so large (and growing) how can one navigate the multitudes in order to find what they need?

Based on the Art Historical Survey guidebooks, such as Janson and Gardner, Slobuski began to break down the History of Art. She broke them down into seventeen different time periods, with each of these time periods broken up into regions. The project was then identified by medium, such as applied arts, mosaics, performance art, painting, sculpture, and bibliographic information, such as titles, creators, and dates. After the faceting, the decision was to have the foci of the case study to remain on undergraduates who had knowledge of Art History Survey 101 or less, and computations of the precision of keyword searching in ARTstor and Bridgeman Education. The conclusion was that, depending on the artwork, one or all of the following was necessary to have a successful search: knowledge of advanced search strategies, such as limiters, Boolean, etc.; familiarity with genre terminology; knowledge of foreign languages or alternative spellings; and demonstrate creativity in the search process. For further information and results regarding the case study, please read Teresa Slobuski's essay published in the Fall 2011 issue of Art Documentation.

⁴ Katie Moss, *ibid.*

Liv Valmestad, Librarian at the Fort Garry campus of University of Manitoba in Winnipeg, Canada, discussed her most recent project producing QR Codes through various free digital media and advertising artworks on campus through QR codes and mobile technology. Beginning as a pilot project on mobile technology its use in outreach, the project evolved into the inspirational convergence of web 2.0 software and public art on the University of Manitoba campus. The project began with photographing eighteen public sculptures on campus with an iPhone and uploading the images onto Flickr. Valmestad labeled the Flickr image collection University of Manitoba Public Art to generate tagging and cataloging bibliographical information. The artwork's location was mapped with a Flickr geo-tagging plug-in. The geotag pin was dragged to its geographical location on a series of maps at the national, provincial and city level. GIS Librarian, Larry Laliberté, assigned a GPS location to each artwork with assistance from the GPS Motion X mobile application. Since each artwork has a GPS coordinate, the artwork's latitude and longitude were input into Google Earth. With the assistance of html coding, the coordinates were catalogued with bibliographical information and a thumbnail image for each work via Flickr, so that the image was displayed in Google Earth. This created a site that provided interactivity and a Word formatted print guide, so individuals could take a walking tour with the assistance of Google Maps. A blog now exists to "function as a repository of information from which the QR code will draw."⁵ Entering the blog's URL into the QRReader generator application, <http://goqr.me/>, a QR code was produced which could be scanned with a QR code reader. Valmestad utilized the QuickMark QR Code Reader application on her iPhone and scanned the QR codes, which brought up the mobile version of the blog. The literal images were not seen on the site, but were hyperlinked and could be viewed if the patron wanted further resources. Valmestad printed the QR codes onto Avery labels and stuck them onto glass blocks, which were placed next to each correlating artifact on campus, so that each artwork could be "scanned" on-site. Wikitude and foursquare are other mobile applications that enhance the patron experience. Wikitude provides the distance between the end user and the object in real-time, and foursquare users "check-in" at a location and then can view and add any messages that correlate with that geo-location. For further information please see Karen Keiler's IFLA article published in 2010.

Merriann Bidgood thanked all of the session presenters and stated that all questions and comments could be placed at the tables located within the room. The room provided the speaker's name(s) on the table and the presenters split off to their respective tables.

⁵ Liv Valmestad, "Q (a)R(t) Code Project: a Convergence of Media," session at Second Joint Conference, Visual Resources Association and Art Libraries Society of North America, *Collaboration: Building Bridges in the 21st Century*, 25 March 2011.

Case Studies IV

Summary by Emilee Mathews, Indiana University

Organizer and Moderator: Mary Alexander, University of Alabama Libraries

Speakers:

The Orang Asli Archives: Visual Resources & Geo-Tagging (Rodney Obien and Kara Young, Mason Library, Keene State College)

Image Discovery Week: a holistic approach to marketing image resources (Barbara Brenny, North Carolina State University Libraries)

What the Heart Remembers: The Women and Children of Darfur (Audrey Powers and Barbara Lewis, University of South Florida Libraries)

From Filing Cabinet to iPhone: How Collaboration and Technology can Introduce Photo Collections to New Audiences (Deborah Boyer, Azavea)

Library Instruction in No Time! (Amy Trendler, Architecture Library, Ball State University)

Mary Alexander opened the session by introducing each panelist: Rodney Obien and Kara Young from Keene State College, Barbara Brenny from North Carolina State University, Audrey Powers and Barbara Lewis from University of South Florida, Deborah Boyer from Azavea, and Amy Trendler from Ball State University.

Rodney and Kara opened the first presentation, which described the digital image archive project hosted by the Wallace E. Mason Library, dedicated to cultural and artistic objects from the Orang Asli, an indigenous Malaysian people. Rodney and Kara collaborated with Dr. Rosemary Gianno, an anthropologist, to assess what kinds of materials would be most valuable to archive. They collected materials from scholars and others who had lived with the Orang Asli people. The archive includes thirty linear feet of materials in all formats, including maps, photographs, slides, notes, and unpublished materials. They created a website to serve as a starting point for searching the collections, including finding aids and their digital collection. They digitized the visual resource materials, and put them on KDig, their version of CONTENTdm.

They wanted to create a resource discovery tool, and decided that Geotagging would enable an interesting and relevant way to search the digital collections. They used a map of Malaysia that showed ethnic regions, and for each region, they would show all the images associated with that

region. Another map-related resource discovery tool Rodney and Kara utilized was Google Maps API. This technology pinpoints the geographic locations of the images on a Google Map of Malaysia. They are continuing to add images and tags to optimize fullness of results.

Next, Barbara presented about Image Discovery Week, an image awareness outreach event at North Carolina State University. This was a collaboration between the Lyons Design Library and the Special Collections Research Center, with the main library as well. Initially, the project was hosted just by the design library, which in spring 2009 had implemented an Image Awareness Week. During this event, they highlighted library-provided image collections, such as ARTstor, CAMIO, Oxford Art Online, and their own in-house digital collections. They also provided bookmarks, brochures, and informational sessions, both one-on-one and in groups. They also made cookies to lure students into the library.

Barbara explained that the team felt this event was overall a success, but could benefit from some modifications. They asked the Special Collections Library to collaborate with them, thus adding several more digital collections to their list of image sources, including the university archives, a collection of digitized books, and several specialized image collections. There were several other changes to the program, including a name change from Image Awareness to Image Discovery (students were under the impression that image awareness pertained to their own personal image), and changing cookies to candy as a less labor-intensive yet effective outreach aid.

The team advertised the Image Discovery Week on the main library's website as well as on posters across the three library locations. They also included QR codes for smartphone users. At each physical location, the team had placed bookmarks, brochures, candy, and laptops for users to browse image resources on the spot. Since the Image Discovery Week program was initiated, library administration has approved having the bookmarks and brochures year-round, and the team will continue to look for ways to provide outreach for students to access image resources.

In the next presentation, Audrey and Barbara showcased a digitization project at the University of South Florida libraries. As the libraries started considering what collections they could acquire for the new Holocaust and Genocide Research Center, Audrey and Barbara became aware of Waging Peace, a non-governmental organization dedicated to helping war-torn regions, especially concentrating in Africa. Waging Peace had gone to refugee camps in Chad and Darfur, provided the children with crayons and paper, and asked them to draw their memories and their hopes for the future. They also interviewed the mothers about their experiences. USF Tampa met with Waging Peace Director Rebecca Tinsley, and acquired 500 drawings for the Genocide Research Center. Currently the drawings are part of a travelling exhibition—but once the drawings return, they will be permanently added to USF Tampa's collection, which will serve as a repository. Both sides of the drawings have been digitized, as they often contain information on

both sides, and an assistant is translating the Arabic. The drawings have been digitized according to artifact standards, with margins appearing on all sides. They were initially scanned as 600dpi, and are saved as uncompressed TIFF files. They manipulated the images in Photoshop, editing only minimally for color trueness. The Genocide Research Center team is currently working on a web presentation mode, which is still under development. This will provide access to the images and provide additional information, such as historical context, geomapping, and other resources directed to the researcher.

Additionally, two faculty members from theater and dance approached Audrey and Barbara for ideas for an original project; and the librarians proposed that the drawings collection be used. The faculty produced an original production entitled *What the Heart Remembers*. The librarian continued to support their efforts by providing library resources as they wrote the piece. Along with each performance, they also had a series of speakers, such as a *Lost Boy of Sudan*, students from social studies and African studies, a professor from Africana Studies, Director of Waging Peace Rebecca Tinsley, and the faculty members who put on the production. Additionally, the students who participated in the production fielded questions from the audience about their experiences in participating in the event.

Deborah presented the next topic, a photo digitization project produced by the company Azavea for the City of Philadelphia Archives. Azavea is an independent company that provides GIS/mapping technology. Five institutions across Philadelphia contributed their materials for this collaborative online service. Deborah highlighted the user-friendly nature of a digital photo archive: it's a great way to get material out there to the public and have them be able to use the collections on their own time. The Archives only saw 300 visitors a year, and the digitization has vastly increased the use of the collections. 93,000 images are included in the archive. Most of these were geo-based, with specific locations. The search query enables the user to type in an address, and additionally the user is able to browse by neighborhood. There is a blog attached, and there are featured search and interactive links to increase resource discovery. This can be used by scholars for social and cultural history, but also is very useful for the public, since many Philadelphia residents are very interested in their city's history. The collection integrates five departments, including the Philadelphia Water Department, the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Library Company of Philadelphia, and the Office of the City of Representatives. Since the images have location-based metadata, they can be utilized with a variety of Web 2.0 applications. Azavea is currently working on an augmented reality application for the photographs, where historic photographs can be overlaid on present day locations. They are continuing to investigate how augmented reality can be applied to cultural heritage projects.

There have been many benefits to the digitization project. It is beneficial for the libraries and departments involved, which are getting more publicity for their collections. It is also beneficial for the public, who get to access the collections freely for their own interest and use. Since it is a

collaboration, there are also ways to individualize the collections, including links to the collection, and limits to administrative access, so each library/repository can be in charge of their own metadata. So while it presents a unified access to the public, there is actually a great deal of institutional control as well.

The public also has an opportunity to provide feedback, and they have helped to correct errors. This gives them an opportunity to participate in cultural institutions. They also have done mash-ups and re-photography of the collections. Deborah mentioned that she will be publishing a white paper describing the augmented reality application to this project.

Amy Trendler's presentation spoke to her successful implementation of brief library instruction sessions. She recommended to the audience that they should capitalize on whatever time they have, and remember not to cram in every possibly useful item of information. As the subject specialist for architecture at Ball State, Amy participates in the first year program for architecture students, and also regularly attends graduate seminars. Despite the difference in educational level and attention level, for both groups she has significantly pared down the amount of information in her limited time frame.

Amy's goal in instruction is to use the session as a way to create in students' minds the concept of the library as a place to find things that are useful; not an illustration of how to search, how to interlibrary loan, and so on. Rather, she talks briefly about the collections, how they're organized, and then, to make things more concrete, she asks them to find books she's already picked out and knows are available. Amy selects these books for their currency, relevance, and aesthetic quality, to further promote the idea in students' minds that the library has interesting items that they should use. She does the same thing for articles. Oftentimes, students are not paying attention during the whole session, so asking them to immediately apply their skills, to go into the stacks or the periodicals area and find items, and positioning herself as a helpful friendly presence provides a much better introduction to the library. She wants to promote the interaction between students and resources, positioning herself in the sidelines, rather than controlling how they access the resources, as this is more akin to how students will interact with the library during their own projects. Amy added that in aid of this effort, she ensures that her LibGuides are up to date and relevant, since this is the most likely avenue of access to library resources for the students. She also provided a handout to jumpstart the audience's efforts to plan brief instruction sessions at their own institutions.

Summaries: Conference Sessions

Beyond the Silos of the LAMS

Summary by Jen Green, Digital Projects Librarian, Plymouth State University

Organizer and Moderator: Elisa Lanzi, Imaging Center, Smith College

Session Sponsor: VRA, ARLIS/NA

Speakers:

Martha R. Mahard, Professor of Practice, Simmons College Graduate School of Library and Information Science,

“The Best of Both Worlds: Positioning Cultural Heritage Informatics in Library Science and Archival Education.”

Marilyn Nasserden, Head, Centre for Arts & Culture, Libraries and Cultural Resources, University of Calgary,

“The Evolving and Converging Environment for the Libraries, , Archives, Special Collections and Museums at the University of Calgary.”

Michael Fox, Executive Director, Minnesota Historical Society,

“Raising Sheep: Helping Lam(bs) Grow Up.”

Ann Whiteside, Librarian/Assistant Dean for Information Resources, Harvard Graduate School of Design,

“Response from a Community Perspective.”

Elisa Lanzi introduced the session and explained the history of work that has been done regarding LAMs (Library, Archives, and Museums). In 2007-2008, Günter Waibel led a series of workshops on the convergence of LAM. At the time, he highlighted LAM collaboration from a local institutional perspective and first coined the phrase “on the LAM” in a subsequent article. Lanzi pointed participants towards a few resources to supplement information shared within the session. These included the Zorich, Waibel, Erway report entitled “Beyond the Silos of the LAMS”, the Center for the Future of Museums blog (<http://futureofmuseums.blogspot.com/>) and hangingtogether.org (<http://hangingtogether.org/?p=814>), the hangout spot for libraries museums and archives.

Marilyn Nasserden discussed the University of Calgary’s major reorganization and convergence of library and cultural resources into shared physical and virtual spaces. The process, beginning in 1998, included the University of Calgary’s library, archives and special collections, the Nickle Arts Museum, and the U of C Press. In 2006, Tom Hickerson, Vice-Provost (LCR) and University Librarian, introduced the concept of convergence and work environments began to change. By 2010, the Libraries and Cultural Resources (LCR) facility had emerged along with new inclusive terminology and organizational structure, which reflected positions pertaining to

the whole LCR instead of just the library. The LCR's current organization configuration includes 33 staff members with balanced representation from all of the LAM groups. Guiding principles were established to focus collaborative work done within the LCR and ensure that it met their mission and vision. Construction of a new, shared facility was critical to convergence between units. For example, randomly assigned offices prevent staff from sitting next to their professional cohorts, thereby increasing collaboration between units. The scope of acquisition selection criteria has broadened to include museum materials and objects. The LCR has implemented a unified search discovery system (Summon) and LCR staff work together to merge duplicate records or create super records. Searches with this tool can still produce overwhelming results, and Nasserden states that the LCR needs a system that will accept EAD, hierarchical records, and finding aids. The library metadata group has been working closely with archival and museum staff on metadata, but museum staff would like more technical support in this area and are concerned about the library vocabularies working well for them. While librarians continue to fill the department liaison role, archivists, librarians, and curators now provide user and learning services. Nasserden stated that the LCR is optimistic that converged units will strengthen the instruction program within the LCR, but convergence has not happened without challenges. Collection funds are still carved from existing money instead of reflecting expanded areas. Many curators and archivists still feel like they are being subsumed by the library, and the LAM discovery tool often hides unique collections. Differences in professional lingo make communication challenging and often time consuming, however, in the beginning stages of convergence, the benefits continue to outweigh the drawbacks.

Michael Fox discussed the process of converging resources at the Minnesota Historical Society (MHS) and connected this to their goal of providing adults and children with lifelong learning activities. MHS operates many programs, but they also operate 26 historic sites and museums. Fox contended that a museum is not a museum without a supporting library and education program. In 1992, the MHS moved to a new central history facility in St. Paul, MN. At that time, the MHS also decided to centralize collection storage across libraries, archives and museums (LAM) and implement an integrated catalog for all collections, which would streamline researchers' access to resources. Formerly, patrons frequently visited five separate reading rooms to complete their research. The move, as well as integrated storage and systems, allowed patrons to visit one reference staff member in one building. The transition has been positive, but it has also included a history of trial and error. Fox explained that their convergence happened in three phases including: (1) "we have a theory now how do we make it happen?" In this phase, staff envisions their ideal tools and outcomes; (2) "MARC the great emmigrater," which involved migrating MARC records created in the late 1980s into the MNPals cataloging system. This phase took a shift in mentality for museum professionals since they were asked to migrate records into a software that was developed for libraries; (3) "Best of Breed," which focuses on online access as a way of improving overall access to collections. Early on, the MHS had six separate software products to manage multiple collections, including

a system for newspaper holdings, one for cataloging serials, and another for three-dimensional objects. Fox discussed how the MHS needed to address the question of presenting collections efficiently and effectively online, and then the organization realized that they needed to respond to larger forces within the profession to answer questions about user experience. This three-phased process towards a one-stop system has required substantial change in mentality and workflow for museum professionals. But, Fox contends further change is required for library and museum professionals to understand that users care less about highly structured metadata and more about rich metadata. For years, the MHS staff assumed that the user wanted seamless access to information, but have recently discovered that they actually want synoptic access to materials and subjects. Essentially, users want systems that help them make connections. Considering this information, Fox argued against a single all-encompassing catalog because it is not sustainable and it doesn't reflect what they've learned the users want. However, LAMs still need to find balance in the number of platforms to which users are exposed. Fox believes that simpler technology solutions that knit the pieces (systems) together are needed now, and this fits with the broader vision of access that has long been the MHS goal. Originally, they attempted to bring together resources within their own institution, but now it's evident that they need to incorporate other institutions' collections. Their vision of one system that stores everything has really evolved into the construction of one system that will search other systems where assets are housed. With the help of a programmer, they have created a single access portal that reaches a variety of institutions and resources.

Martha Mahard has transitioned professionally from information practitioner to professor and has thus taken on the role of preparing the next generation of information professionals for convergence. Mahard is developing a Cultural Heritage Informatics program at Simmons College, which strongly emphasizes digital resources, preservation, and archives curriculum. Through this curriculum, Mahard teaches emerging professionals key perspectives on what Culture Heritage Institutions should be providing for their patrons: (1) "online users do not need to know that a collection is part of a library, archive, or museum." The differences between the two are important to us, not them; (2) "engage users or lose them. " CHI should take advantage of new information technologies and encourage growth; (3) "information wants to be free." The best way to breath life into information is to give it away. It is important to adopt new technologies that allow CHIs to give away information while providing added value and maintaining quality; (4) embrace commonalities and diversities. Institutions need to retain their unique differences over time. Mahard noted that several scholars agree that convergence of collections is a good thing and cultural heritage professionals want to make institutions more accessible, economic, and integrated. But, according to Jennifer Trant, while physical barriers to collections may recede, intellectual barriers still remain. To Mahard, these intellectual barriers represented a perfect opportunity for Simmons to develop courses to address this. In 2009, the program began to develop through the implementation of a digital curriculum lab where students could practice LAM convergence. Simmons offered the first Cultural Heritage Informatics

course during Fall 2010. Twenty-three students from varying degrees and interests enrolled. An IMLS grant has allowed Simmons to partner with seven Cultural Heritage sites. Students and faculty work with these sites to help them converge existing collections struggling with limited IT assistance. The first class visited three sites as a group and developed teams to provide an overview of the site. The range of digital assets found within these seven sites has offered a broad scope for student study and practice, however one challenge of this grant-funded project is communication. The collections' staffs are eager to work with students in order to improve access to collections, but maintaining consistent and effective communication with all involved has been a struggle. The launch of Cultural Heritage Informatics at Simmons has endured its first year "growing pains" ranging from handling student anxiety and developing next year's curriculum. In the future, students will potentially interview site managers with the goal of understanding how they are using digital image files so that a tool can be designed around the need of the institution. Mahard noted that shaping this year's project has been challenging, partially because Simmons is one of only 11 ALA accredited schools offering a track from cultural heritage management and sees this program as a work in progress. Students this semester are building models for future projects and partners are defining goals. Mahard reminded the audience that although a variety of silos exist within the information professions, the goal is not necessarily to tear them down, but to open them up to each other. The Cultural Heritage Informatics offerings at Simmons are designed to ensure that new professionals don't become an obstacle to convergence.

Ann Whiteside provided some community perspective on the presentations based on her experience at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. Whiteside has observed that patrons look for research materials no matter where they are. They are not generally concerned about ownership (e.g., archives, library), and they are using content creatively. Expectations that information professionals have of patrons' research habits has to change to meet patrons' growing needs. Whiteside reiterated that we are looking at blurring the definitions of libraries, archives, and museums because users are not seeing the differences between them anymore. Whiteside then took questions from the audience. The first question was, "how far along are we in changing professional norms that Michael outlined in his presentation?" Fox believes that this requires a lot of patient conversation and an understanding of the differences that are not going away. Lanzi commented that information professionals used to envision one system that would bring everything together, but now realize that this is not a reality. This knowledge needs to be communicated to academic administrations. Fox added that education will force convergence, but we need quality education to bring this about. The second question was, "What was the driver for converging areas at the University of Calgary?" Nasserden stated that the process started in 1998 and has required a number of focus groups, which revealed that patrons didn't care about professional boundaries. The final question was, "how do we actually implement convergence early on when we are at the bottom of the hierarchy?" Responses from across the panel recommended that new professionals get involved on projects and start making

suggestions, find an ally at the institution, continue to participate in mentoring relationships, and be sure to mention other collections in Libguides.

New Voices in the Profession

Summary by Whitney Gaylord, University of Chicago

Organizer and moderator: Maggie Portis, New York School of Interior Design

Speakers:

Katherine L. Kelley, MLS Candidate, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Wisconsin, Madison. “The Complications of Bridgeman and Copyright (Mis)use.”

Diane Bockrath, Digitization Specialist, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books, The Walters Art Museum. “Parchment to Pixel: The Walters Islamic Manuscript Digital Project.”

Jamie Lausch, North Quad Programming Coordinator, University of Michigan. “Discovery Channel: Bringing Collections to New Audiences through Digital Display.”

Kathryn Pierce, IMLS Preservation Fellow, School of Information, University of Texas at Austin. “You Need More Fingers than Ten: Collaborating to Document Architectural Practice.”

Emilee Matthews, MLS Candidate, School of Library and Information Science, Indiana University. “Close Encounters of the Third Kind: Studies in Image Reference and Instruction for Film Studies.”

Maggie Portis opened the session by giving a brief history of the panel and introduced the speakers. The New Voices panel is unique in that it provides an opportunity for students and new professionals to present their work at a conference. Often this is the first professional speaking experience for the presenters, giving us a chance to learn about a whole new concept or application or to watch fresh eyes examine an existing issue.

Katherine Kelley began her presentation by summarizing the Bridgeman Art Library vs. Corel Corp court case. The court ruled that exact photographic copies of public domain images could not be protected by copyright because they lack originality or creativity. Corel Corp had distributed a CD-ROM, which contained digitized images of paintings by European masters. Bridgeman Art Library had many of the same images in its collection and claimed copyright on the photographs. Bridgeman sued Corel Corp claiming that since no other photographs of the works had been authorized (other than the repositories directly to Bridgeman), the only source for the images was Bridgeman’s own digitizations. Judge Kaplan ruled that the images could not

be copyrighted because the images were not original works (they lacked any creativity and their sole purpose was to reproduce an object). Reproductive photography is the only kind of photography that is not copyrightable because of these decisions.

Katherine also noted the *Feist Publications vs. Rural Telephone Service Co.* court case, which similarly ruled that because there was no originality in Rural's phone book, the information could not be copyrightable. Museums and libraries are now ignoring these decisions and requesting licensing fees for reproductions of works in the public domain, greatly hindering the work of artists and art historians. Their claims only hold power as warnings, but are enough to dissuade users from gaining access. Katherine suggests that the only motivation for asserting these claims is for financial gains and often brings in the 2nd highest profit under museum gift shops.

Diane Bockrath has headed a major digitization project of 900 Islamic manuscripts at the Walters Museum, which began in 2008. When deciding where to begin, the team focused on reaching the widest audience by creating free downloads of the images. They decided to begin digitizing the Islamic manuscripts because the works were physically stable, understudied, but also an emerging area of research. Diane explained the workflow, which began with a conservation review to ensure the manuscripts were not too fragile for handling and scanning. Next, the staff would catalog the works using Dublin Core, maintaining the exact order of the plates. The manuscripts were then ready for imaging, first all the rectos then all the versos to limit handling. A V-shaped cradle with a vacuum wedge was used to safely hold the manuscripts during the exposure. Diane noted that the team was able to digitize about 250 images per day. The files then underwent verification, which included color correction and resizing. The original RAW file was saved, along with a master TIFF, JPEG, and a thumbnail. Through the Digital Walters website, high resolution images are available for download, along with a page-turning site, and a Flickr stream of over 600 images. Diane expressed that the project has been a great success: the manuscripts remain in good condition, it has received positive reception and it has resulted in an open source, searchable tool.

Jamie Lausch is the North Quad Programming Coordinator at the University of Michigan. Although she is a librarian, Jamie describes her job as a "covert operation on behalf of the library." She explained that the renovation of the North Quad building created new space to be used as a "media gateway." It consists of lounge areas, areas for impromptu teaching and study groups and also has 11 LCD screens. Each screen is a Samsung LCD, with a Mac Mini (running Windows) attached to the back of the screen. Jamie has focused on using this technology in new spaces to promote local museums and has partnered with the Museum of Dentistry, the Kelsey Museum, and the Museum of Art. She leaves all copyright decisions up to the museum's collection managers and hopes to extend the project to other campus buildings.

Kathryn Pierce raised many interesting issues regarding the preservation of architectural records. Because there is such a large disconnect between contemporary architectural practice and

archivists, preservation is not a priority. With the switch to digital records, problems have increased and no one knows what to do with the records of the moment. Firms often use 3D modeling and complex files that are often stored with the proprietary software or in emails. MIT and the Art Institute of Chicago have both looked at these issues and how the practice is changing. MIT has successfully archived 2-3 projects per year. The goal is also to coordinate architects, engineers and contractors to preserve the most well-rounded and thorough records. Thus far, asset management systems and DVD preservation have been used. Kathryn asked if libraries can become repositories for contemporary architecture. Maybe their perspectives and priorities are far too different.

Emilee Matthews conducted a survey of image needs between the Art History, English and Communication & Culture departments. She found that Communication & Culture had the fewest visual resources. Film students were frequently creating their own film stills using screen capture. Film stills are used extensively for film studies scholars, for close visual analysis and for general illustrative purposes. Yet there is no dedicated resource for film stills available through the library's resources, as there are for visual arts images. She developed a research guide in response to this lack and to aid students in finding and using film stills for educational use. Educational use is important to note here, because this has been developed with the needs of researchers in mind. U.S. Copyright law precludes the appropriation of another entity's intellectual product for profit, however those who are researching the artistic product in an educational sphere are able to use these products. Her guide is available at filmstillsresources.blog.com.

The semantic web, libraries, and visual resources

Summary by Anne Hepburn, Pacific Northwest College of Art

Organizer and Moderator: Steve Tatum, Art and Architecture Library, Virginia Tech University

Speakers:

Christine Cavalier, Department of Art and Art History, Tufts University

Amy Lucker, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University

Greg Reser, Arts Library, University of California, San Diego

Steve Tatum introduced the session and gave a brief overview of the semantic web, pointing out that language is a metaphor for the web and that the semantic web exists to extract meaning from data. He went on to explain RDF (Resource Description Framework), which is a framework for

metadata and linking metadata. He spoke briefly about authorities and vocabularies, specifically about Human Readable views, visualization, and machine readable data. He then discussed the need for STITCH, or semantic interoperability, and VIAF, which is the Virtual International Authority File.

After Steve's introduction, Christine Cavalier came up to present on "Concept Mapping for Teaching Art History". She explained that at Tufts they are trying to escape the "Flatland", a term she uses to describe the linear methods by which Art History courses are usually taught. She paraphrased Edward Tufte, claiming that escaping Flatland is the essential task of envisioning information. She compared the traditional methods of teaching Art History (slide presentations, comparisons, books, image collections, and course management tools) with more updated and interactive methods (maps, web resources, video) which provide context for Art History lessons. Concept mapping makes connections within course content and beyond, encourages classroom discussion and collaboration; enriches papers and projects, note-taking, and the design of course syllabi. Concept maps shift pedagogical focus from straight memorization to contextual integration.

Christine's presentation was followed by Greg Reser, who gave a more in-depth description of the semantic web and linked data. In a nutshell, he described the semantic web goal as structuring data to allow machines to make connections that we humans easily make. Linked data allows machines to "brainstorm" and make relational connections. He went on to explain the RDF, which utilizes links to create this meaning. Why use links? Because they are the easy, ubiquitous way that we already connect things on the Web. RDF is ideal because it has a universal API (Application Programming Interface) and makes simple statements about things, so that it is easily understandable. RDF links give meaning using ontology, schema, and vocabulary.

Amy Lucker followed with a presentation on "Reconciling Vocabularies on the Semantic Web", which was a logical follow-up to the Semantic Web discussion. She expounded on many of Reser's points, specifically on the issue of designing/implementing controlled vocabularies in order to bring about the truly semantic web, which will connect meaning within existing metadata. The semantic web means that machines can already do this; however the structure does not exist yet, and machines only know what humans tell them. Using controlled vocabularies will provide a structure for relationships "syndetic structures" (i.e. "see also" references.) Lucker went on to explain the differences between keywords and controlled vocabularies. The simple difference being that while keywords are easier to translate, they are more difficult to control and that while controlled vocabularies are easier to control, they are harder to translate. She finally laid out the main roadblocks that stand on the way of the Semantic Web: lack of interoperability of languages, strings versus keywords, maintaining syndetic relationships, faceted versus rigid hierarchies, and, finally, that ideas are the realm of humans not machines. She offered several solutions including the alignment of existing vocabularies; creating a dictionary (which unfortunately does not include Chinese, Japanese, or Arabic

characters); creating crosswalks like the Getty's Metadata Standards Crosswalk; and finally harvesting into RDA and SKOS. Unfortunately no one approach or tool will work for everything, so there will need to be some creative integration.

After Amy Lucker's presentation, Greg Reser got up to speak once again to discuss the Embedded Metadata Working Group, which is dedicated to expanding the embedded metadata tools and standards. He also added a caveat that the panel members are not necessarily advocating the semantic web, they are merely explaining it and its potential benefits and ramifications. Information that is now contained within image files includes image width, length, and the file size. Things that they believe should be included in addition would be descriptive metadata, artist, and copyright information because there is a need to describe both the image itself, as well as what is portrayed in the image.

Discussion after the presentations was cut short for lack of time. However, those interested in more of the ideas presented by the panel were invited to visit some reference websites, including the following:

Steve Tatum's presentation: <http://lod-cloud.net> (Linking Open Data Cloud)

Christine Cavalier's presentation: vue.tufts.edu (a concept mapping creator tool created by Tufts University)

VRA Metadata Working Group: <http://metadatadeluxe.pbworks.com/w/page/20792294/VRA-Embedded-Metadata-Working-Group>

Collaborative Ventures, Collaborative Gains

Summary by Sarah Christensen, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

Organizer and Moderator: Karin Whalen, Reed College

Speakers:

Stacy Brinkman and Diane Fellows, Miami University

Christina Updike and Mary Anne Chappell, James Madison University

Carolyn Caizzi and Barbara Rockenbach, Yale University

Karin Whalen opened the session by speaking about the overall theme of collaboration, and how it is becoming necessary for libraries and visual resources centers. However, libraries are especially adept at creating and fostering collaboration inside and outside of institutions, and so can maintain their relevancy in the age of technology. The speakers, comprised of librarians, image professionals, and technology experts, discussed strategies they have used at their institutions to support teaching and learning through collaboration.

Carolyn Caizzi and Barbara Rockenbach both spoke about the need to shift the perception of libraries as a place of research to libraries as a place of teaching resources. Current literature indicates that libraries are putting themselves out of business; using several case studies from Yale University, Carolyn and Barbara emphasized the need for and benefit of collaboration. The first case study involved an American studies professor who had previously found technology cumbersome, but realized that digital technology could freshen up his lectures. After a consultation, he saw that creating lectures with multimedia would take many hours and that he would need assistance. This faculty member also realized, however, that technology-enhanced lectures would ultimately benefit the students. He eventually went on from making multimedia lectures to creating his own documentaries.

In a related case study, another American studies professor needed to create and edit video, but had no access to video training. As Carolyn is skilled in video creation and editing, she created a 3-part workshop at Yale's Collaborative Learning Center. This case study highlights the need to do a needs assessment within your user base, as there are likely many other faculty who need access to this knowledge but don't know where to go. In another collaboration with a faculty member, what began as a personal research and teaching interest turned into the Historian's Eye, a digital humanities project with over 1,000 photographs and an audio archive. Through collaboration with faculty members, the Yale University Library and Visual Resources Center has helped to create digital projects that have significant positive impact on the scholarly community and students population.

Perhaps Yale's greatest collaborative effort is the Collaborative Learning Center, established in 2007 to bring together units across campus. While initially funded through grants, the CLC is now sustainable and staffed by people from around the university. Through workshops and lecture series, such as "Teaching with Technology Tuesdays" and the 3-part video workshop, the CLC responds to the need to use technology in teaching. Using a course consultation model, the faculty member needing assistance emails the CLC to arrange a meeting with experts across campus. In doing so, the faculty member no longer has to run around campus trying to find an appropriate point of contact. The CLC assumes that responsibility. During the meeting, different collections, technologies, and pedagogies are explored. The need for this type of resources was highlighted through the example of the faculty member who wanted to make her Women, Food, and Culture course more interesting to students who were having trouble paying attention. This faculty member wanted to use images to engage and educate students, but wasn't sure if a Google image search was the most appropriate venue. To find more information, she approached

the library's information desk and the campus technology group. While she finally learned about the VRC and was eventually able to receive assistance, the CLC would have been able to serve as an efficient and singular point of contact.

With Diane Fellows unable to attend, Stacy Brinkman presented their segment, titled "Visual Thinking and the Art of Research and Writing." At Miami University, Stacy acts as an embedded partner in a design and research methods graduate class in the architecture department. In this role, the students see her as an ally and supporter, rather than someone who will ultimately grade their work. As a result, there is less censorship in expressing ideas and concerns with her. The course is part of a 2-3 year masters program in which the students are to produce a conference-ready paper and design.

To help prepare the students with their projects and integrate information literacy, Stacy employs practices that are already familiar to them. This includes sketch notebooks, media, hand drawings, and posters. At the beginning of the semester, students write a "minute paper" to share thoughts and anxieties about their project, which helps in deciding how best to address these issues. Throughout the semester, other activities include 10-minute free-writes (approximately 40/semester), graffiti boards, and a poster presentation. The free-writes are intended to be a low stakes writing assignment akin to sketching out their designs in a notebook, and are shared with other students in order to deepen voice. Responding to Milos Forman's *Man on the Moon* (1999) has been a particularly valuable free-write assignment, as it asks the students to further consider concepts of audience and voice. The graffiti boards are a particularly collaborative aspect of this program, as students are asked to publicly display their concept maps and write on each other's boards. While the students are used to verbally critiquing each other's work, this assignment helps with getting them used to writing down their ideas. In addition, the graffiti boards facilitate identifying key works and sources, as well as making connections to other concepts. The graffiti boards lead to a formal poster presentation, which includes citations, and asks the students to think about how they are presenting, what ideas are still unclear, and where to look for more information. Faculty members are asked to attend this session, and so the poster presentations serve a second function of a matchmaking service for students and faculty advisors. The faculty members seem particularly impressed with this, as the students are well prepared with ideas and research. Through this faculty-librarian collaboration, students have increased knowledge of information literacy, such as the ethical issues involved with using images, texts, and citations and knowing where to find peer-reviewed information. They are able to continually clarify, refine, critique, and synthesize their projects.

Christina Updike and Mary Anne Chappell from James Madison University discussed how their respective roles at the University contribute towards facilitating collaboration. As the Visual Resources Specialist, Christina discussed how analog slides do not require partnerships, as interactions are limited to users in his or her own department, but that digital technologies make collaboration easier. Christina described her role as liaising with numerous faculty members and departments on campus, including the University Library and technology specialists. In addition

to working closely with faculty members in developing online or hybrid courses, she also works closely with the Center for Instructional Technology and Systems, Research and Development in the development of MDID 3. Christina went on to describe MDID 3 developments, such as student content and tagging, stable URLs, and an updated media viewer. A student exhibition hosted on MDID is also under discussion, furthering the collaborative nature of the updated software.

Mary Anne described her role as the Educational Technologies Librarian, where she collaborates with faculty and departments across campus to improve student learning outcomes. Her expertise is in social media and social networking, and helping faculty to find ways for students to convert their web 2.0 skills for educational and professional use. Mary Anne also described James Madison's organizational chart and collaborative approach, highlighted by the Center for Faculty Innovation and the Center for Instructional Technology. Faculty are at the heart of the CFI, as it provides a space for faculty to try out new technology approaches and offer support to make innovation happen. While the CIT works more with the overall academic experience, it also provides in-depth immersive experiences. The teaching institutes are a part of the CIT, and provide week-long workshops on topics such as online and hybrid teaching. Included in these workshops are hands on activities and mentoring with faculty who have taught online courses previously. As incentives to take these workshops, the university offers faculty a \$2,000 stipend, as well as access to resources, consultation, and production support. The CIT also partners with Classroom Technology Services in order to streamline the amount of training faculty need in order to teach across campus. As the CFI and CIT have similar goals, the two centers collaborate to produce biannual teaching with technology symposiums. It was clear after hearing Christina and Mary Anne speak that James Madison University places significant value on the benefits of collaboration.

The questions that followed the speaker's presentations touched on a variety of topics, but mostly dealt with the institutional structures that enabled these projects to happen. Many members of the audience were interested in creating collaborative centers, such as the ones described, as well as how to better integrate librarians into courses, following Stacy's model. When describing the background of the Collaborative Learning Center, Barbara Rockenbach stated that faculty members should now think "I cannot teach without the library," rather than "I cannot do research without the library," which neatly summarized the motivations behind the session's theme of collaboration.

More Than Meets the Eye? Retrieving Art Images by Subject

Summary by Maggie Hanson, Portland Art Museum

Organizer & Moderator: Karen Kessel, Art & Art History Department, Sonoma State University

Speakers: Patricia Harpring, Getty Vocabulary Program; Judy Weedman, San Jose State University, School of Library & Information Science; Dustin Wees, ARTstor; Hans Brandhorst, Iconclass

Slides: <http://www.slideshare.net/event/vra-arlisna-2nd-joint-conference-2011/slideshows>

Karen Kessel, organizer and moderator, spent the first part of this session introducing not only the speakers, but also the concept and context of subject cataloging for visual materials. Kessel explained that although subject cataloging for books has been commonplace for a long time, cataloging for images is still in the nascent stages of development and adoption. She elaborated, stating that subject matter in visual resources can be more specific, but it can also be more elusive. Subject cataloging refers to what an image is “of” or “about.” Qualifying the layers of “of-ness” and “about-ness” in visual works complicates the process. She explained some of these complications, using the example of Pieter Brueghel the Elder’s painting, “Landscape with the Fall of Icarus.” Although Brueghel’s work depicts a farmer plowing his land (*of-ness*), the title of the work indicates a deeper layer of subject matter (*about-ness*). How the story of Icarus relates to this painting is subject matter that may not translate to viewers without explanation.

Kessel next discussed the history of subject classification in the VR profession. She provided background information about the commonly used Fogg and Tansey classification systems, which both provide general categories within an alpha-numeric call number system. The discussion of personal experiences led Kessel back to the problematic nature of subject cataloging for visual resources. She introduced Erwin Panofsky’s concept of three levels of meaning in art: physical description, expressional analysis and identification of subject, and iconographic interpretation. The problem, she suggested, is the delineation between the first two levels. Expertise (or lack of expertise) can obscure the identification of subject matter along these lines. Furthermore, how do you express those layers in a DAMS or CMS?

Expertise is a key factor in the success or failure of subject cataloging ventures. One example Kessel provided is Christopher Donnan’s experiment to identify iconographic themes in Moche art of Ancient Peru. What Donnan discovered is that, regardless of domain knowledge, it is possible to identify common themes and repeated motifs in the visual languages of unfamiliar cultures and styles. Here, Kessel provided examples from Christian iconography, such as the Nativity, Magi, etc. She explained, “even if you don’t know what a story is about, you can tell that there is a story.” This, at least, is a starting point for creating subject access.

At this point, Ms. Kessel introduced the session’s first speaker, Patricia Harpring, Managing Editor of the Getty Vocabularies (AAT, TGN, ULAN, CONA) and co-author of *Cataloging Cultural Objects*. Harpring introduced her presentation on the highly anticipated [Cultural Objects Name Authority](#) (CONA)—the Getty’s forthcoming iconographical authority file—

stating that the subject element is critical for the retrieval and disambiguation of images, but is most likely to be the missing element in catalog records. CONA, she explained, is an attempt to satisfy this requirement of a core CCO/CDWA record. To the question, “What is subject?” Harpring answered, “content and narrative, which can be iconic or non-objective meaning, conveyed by figurative or abstract images.” “Subject” can be representational or non-representational.

The problem with the missing element of subject matter in records is that users *want* to retrieve information and images by subject. Users *want* to search and discover via content. Although institutional repositories are the best source for subject data, most don’t index it—at least not consistently. An OCLC study in 2009 found that most museums were compatible with the burgeoning CCO/CDWA standards, except for the matter of subject indexing. Harpring suggested that subject indexing might have a future in the automatic parsing of elements like work title against controlled subject lists; she refined this thought, arguing that the combination of auto-parsing and human editing would be ideal. Again, it is human expertise that is needed to disambiguate and make necessary distinctions between layers of meaning where subject indexing is concerned.

Harpring then began an in-depth discussion of CONA—how it is structured and what it will offer. CONA follows the basic Getty vocabulary structure and is ISO and CCO/CDWA compliant. Although the manuals are currently online, the data will not be published for a while yet. Furthermore, the Getty probably will not take contributions until 2012. Like other Getty vocabularies, terms in CONA all have unique ID’s, which are linked to titles and names. What may be most exciting is that the CONA vocabulary is linked to other Getty vocabularies; subjects and historical figures, for instance, are linked to their corresponding authority files in ULAN. This non-artist facet includes figures like patrons and sitters, as well. Locations in CONA are linked to the TGN, and AAT is used to index work-type, style, and subject. Harpring noted that there may not be enough general terms in AAT for the scope of CONA, but that more can be added as necessary.

Outside of the group of terms linked to existing authority files is the Iconography Authority (IA), which contains names and terms that are not contained in the other vocabularies. Examples of terms in the IA are events, religious and mythological terms, and named animals. Some examples of terms are *Zeus*, the *American Civil War*, or *Adoration of the Magi*. Additionally, CONA allows references to other sources of subject index terms like Iconclass and LCSH. Harpring allows for the problematic issue of subjects that could, conceivably, belong in multiple vocabularies or authorities, such as lost settlements or historical figures, who were also legends or icons (such as *John the Baptist*). To this point, she argued that terms could exist in multiple authorities, but should only be entered once and linked across vocabularies. Other issues arise when subjects are separate artworks; this is problematic in work types like architectural drawings. For example, how are associative relationships made when a façade is never constructed from a plan or drawing? Do you still link to the built work?

Harpring wrapped up her discussion with a few final points. First, she explained that CONA can be used to index non-narrative subject matter (architecture, dedications of temples and churches, the function of decorative arts, nonrepresentational art, performance art, and text + image). She also reminded the crowd of the adage, “Broad and correct is better than narrow and incorrect.” Harpring finished her engaging presentation, noting that her slides (and other resources) are available on the GRI vocabularies website (<http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/training.html>).

Next, Kessel introduced Judy Weedman of San Jose State University, whose presentation was titled, “Subject on a Small Scale: Home-grown Vocabularies.” Weedman has spent a substantial amount of time studying the design process of building local and institutional vocabularies. She wondered, “Are these projects useful and scalable over the long term?” and “Does design language transcend [professional] fields?” Weedman stated that her interest in the topic was piqued when she noticed that there is a rich literature of design in many professional fields, but very little in the field of library and information science.

Weedman explained that she began her research emailing listservs to ask for participants in a study. Of her responses, thirty-four were usable; these responses provided descriptive information about building vocabularies. Ultimately, Weedman held interviews with fifteen of these respondents, who had designed, extensively maintained or revised local vocabularies. She did not focus her attention on respondents who had inherited vocabularies. The fifteen chosen participants were stewards to broad collections, ranging from aquariums to governmental documents to news to museums and various types of libraries. Weedman shared several statistics about her survey with the audience, providing insight to the vocabulary structures that participants used (post-coordinate (7), pre-coordinate (14), classification (10), and natural language (3)), kind of structure by creation date, subject (of and about / literal and interpretive (18) versus literal only (16)), and whether or not participants had considered or consulted existing vocabularies before designing their own. She noted that, of those considered, the most commonly cited sources were the Getty vocabularies, Iconclass, and LCSH. Participants who had consulted previously existing vocabularies incorporated some terms or based their terms on existing terms. When asked why standard vocabularies had not been adopted, Weedman found several reasons: current vocabularies were either too general; too specific; too large; designed for text, rather than images; worked for objects, but didn’t fit subject; just didn’t fit at all; required too much domain knowledge for non-expert catalogers; didn’t fit queries posed by users; or posed technical difficulties for online access. For more information about Weedman’s findings, please consult her slides on SlideShare (see above for URL).

Weedman transitioned to discussing design theory, stating that design is the fundamental professional activity—taking a problem situation and creating a solution. One major problem that needs addressing in this particular design situation is the multiplicity of relationships amongst images; both disambiguation and specificity compound this problem. In other words, how specific should you get in subject indexing?

Weedman offered final thoughts, including the statement that the “user warrants constraint.” She argued that design work is creative with a strong emotional component. Although she finds that there is anxiety involved in the design process, there is also deep satisfaction to be found in discovering insights into domain knowledge as you build your system. She stressed the importance of “adaptivity” and reminded the audience that vocabularies must be dynamic if they are to remain useful and relevant. She finished with the Stewart Brand quote, “All buildings are predictions. All predictions are wrong.”

The next presenter in “More Than Meets the Eye” was Hans Brandhorst from Iconclass. After providing some institutional background for Iconclass, Brandhorst introduced the RKD-sponsored Iconclass browser, available for free online (<http://www.iconclass.org/rkd/9/>). He explained how Iconclass can be used to index documents by themes, motifs, stories, situations, activities, gestures, events, ideas, messages, miracles, and more. Indexing, he argued, is only half the battle; Iconclass also helps users retrieve documents. Words are linked to alphanumeric codes, which are linked to textual descriptions. Brandhorst provided several examples of how images might be indexed using Iconclass and gave a demonstration of the online browser. In order for indexing by Iconclass to be effective, however, users need to maintain the designated Iconclass codes in their own database. The system allows users to export a virtual “word cloud” via a simple cut and paste tool within the browser. This information can be queried, using a free Iconclass plug-in that can be incorporated into your existing web interface via an i-frame in your html page. To obtain this plug-in, users need only contact Iconclass and ask for it. Brandhorst also gave a brief demonstration of Arkyves (<http://www.arkyves.org/>), which is a cheap (but not free) image database, indexed with the Iconclass tool.

The final speaker was ARTstor’s Dustin Wees, who ended the session on a humorous, yet effective note with a presentation revolving around images of cake (all culled from ARTstor’s coffers, of course), including statistics presented in “cake chart” format. Wees used his time to discuss both the potential and complications for ARTstor where the matter of subject indexing is concerned. He explained that metadata is merely one step for an aggregator and that ARTstor currently adds approximately 150-200K images a year with a very small metadata staff. Wees also explained the difficulty of aggregating disparate subject indexing—which is almost always done based on local and institutional needs—in a way that creates useful metadata for users across a broad federated repository like ARTstor.

Building on his cake metaphor, Wees described his “dream cake” as a critical mass of consistently applied terms in ARTstor. The current lack of consistency prohibits advanced searching by subject matter, which is one factor in the extremely limited amount of advanced searching that is conducted by ARTstor users. Reese revealed that approximately 85% of searching in ARTstor is keyword based, which can also be highly problematic. He illustrated his point with the following example: a user search for the term “impressionism” will, unfortunately, return results for images that might be indexed “not impressionism.” This is one reason why the thought of tagging in ARTstor frightens Wees; the real question is, “how could tagging be made

useful” in the system? Wees’ demonstration of a Google Image search for “jade” made his point crystal clear; ARTstor strips away levels of irrelevance by virtue of its very nature, but disambiguation of terms is still a daunting task with no controlled vocabulary across participant contributions. Looking forward, Reese hopes to start applying broad terms to images, using a controlled vocabulary that might at least account for issues like singular versus plural terminology.

With limited time for a question and answer session, this engaging session concluded with a few practical (mostly product-related) queries. While no solutions to the inherent problem were offered (*is there a solution?*), it is clear that there is a definite need for consistent and usable subject indexing in the VR profession and that several institutions are responding to this need in exciting ways. The tools are being developed; the tasks ahead are how we choose to adopt the technology, incorporate the workflows, and contribute to these efforts.

Paving the Way for an Uncertain Future: Teaching Art Information Management in the 21st Century

Summary by Yamuna Ravindran, Royal Academy of Arts

Session organizer: Heather Gendron, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Moderator: Rebecca Frank, University Library Associate at the Art, Architecture and Engineering Library, The University of Michigan.

The speakers are involved in teaching and organizing courses in Art Librarianship at schools that offer dual degree programs focusing on Library and Information Science and Art History:

Tony White, Indiana University, Bloomington. IU offers either a dual degree program with an MA in Art History and an MA in Library Science, or an Art Librarianship specialization within the MLS program.

Heather Gendron and J.J. Bauer, UNC Chapel Hill. The UNC course ‘Art and Visual Information Management’ focuses on Art Librarianship and Visual Resources Management and includes in-depth training on image cataloging.

Amy Lucker and Ken Soehner, Pratt Institute. Pratt offers courses on Art Librarianship, focusing on documentation of art information, new technologies in art libraries, and services and collection characteristics of various types of art libraries and visual collections. Students spend part of their time at Pratt and part of their time at the Watson Library at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Rebecca Frank opened the session by providing some background. In ARLIS/NA’s 2008 survey *Fine Arts and Visual Resources Librarianship: A Directory of Library Science Degree Programs*

in North America, 12 of the 56 ALA accredited programs in Library and Information Science indicated offering a course specifically devoted to Art Librarianship or Visual Resources Librarianship. Only 5 programs were listed as offering a formal dual degree option with Art History.

The speakers addressed 3 questions about the future of courses in Art Librarianship and Visual Resources Management, focusing specifically on the programs offered at Indiana University, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and Pratt Institute, New York.

Question 1: The consolidation of branch art libraries and visual resources departments means fewer specialist positions. Are these courses still relevant and should we continue to teach them? It's a given that a lot of people like art, but why offer specialized courses if few students are going to be able to become art librarians or visual resources coordinators?

All panelists agreed that institutions should continue to teach these courses. Ken Soehner suggested that consideration should be given to how courses are framed and how expectations are set. He increasingly believes that courses should focus on the broad range of skills needed by a contemporary librarian within the context of an art library, rather than focusing on the defined track or identity of an 'art librarian'.

Amy Lucker added to this that Pratt is changing the course title to 'Art Libraries' instead of 'Art Librarianship' and Heather Gendron also mentioned that they have decided to change their course title to 'Art and Visual Information Management' moving even further away from the idea of a physical, specific library. Branch libraries are being consolidated but the need for subject specialists has not gone away. Therefore they are focusing on the idea of Art, Architecture, Design, and Visual Information as starting places for talking about a wide range of issues facing all librarians. These issues include: convergence of branch libraries, redefinition of roles, libraries without walls, and how to deepen relationships with faculty and researchers.

Tony White commented that at IU many new students in the department are interested in rare books, archives, and digital libraries. He feels that having a subject specialization will be important whether or not you are merged into a new department. At IU, where they have just reorganized, he is now in an Arts and Humanities department but he is still a subject specialist and is involved with issues such as security and access. Special collections and art books provide challenges that his colleagues rarely deal with; having subject-specific skills are important. However, at IU they are thinking about re-conceptualizing the art librarianship specialization to have an arts and humanities, or digital arts and humanities, or digital curation focus.

Lucker suggested that a lot of previous divisions are now meaningless. Art librarians and visual resources professionals all work with text, images, and researchers. Lucker would like to see subject specialists sticking around. But while some institutions are very committed to this,

patron-driven acquisitions are being introduced to other libraries as a way of doing without subject specialists. She pointed out that while some people may think this is terribly misguided, it is important to remember that these libraries have very constricted budgets. The value of subject specialization, in this case, is not always understood.

J.J. Bauer compared this trend to departments that eliminated Visual Resources positions and handed faculty members scanners instead. It was cheaper to pay for a \$200 piece of equipment for each faculty member. This was done without any expectation of ultimately building a collection for the university at large. This arrangement also overlooked the fact that there are different types of digitization, and that even humanities people have very different requirements for their digitization projects. She provided the example of a geography intern who was cataloging monuments in North Carolina. The geography faculty member had only required GPS map coordinates; however, the library realized that other people may want to utilize the information once it was in their digital repository. They brought in an art specialist intern to ascertain what kind of metadata other people would search. It was a very productive project and illustrates the value of a specialist to these kinds of projects.

Question 2: How do changes in the Visual Resources field affect curriculum and programs?

Lucker commented that it has changed teaching in general. Images have moved out of the hands of just Art Historians and have moved across the whole campus. This means we all have to be more involved in copyright issues. It also means that the people who know how to use, manipulate and deal with images become more important, not just to one department, but to the school at large.

At UNC, Bauer tries to teach students that they can be effective in helping to change pedagogical methods by using new technologies in the VR field. White agreed that during recruitment, hiring libraries value visual literacy and an ability to reach out to all departments in their candidates. They also like to see skills such as working with digital technologies and tools, and multimedia formats.

Lucker mentioned that NYU has now added a position that deals only with a copyright. This position includes the responsibility of talking to students about images in dissertations, especially now that NYU requires all dissertations to be digital. It is essential that students do not just know about what can be done with resources but are able to pass that knowledge on. White agreed, stating that in the last six months one librarian position at IU has been dealing extensively with advising on publication. Another position in the digital publishing department advises on copyright and contracts and things of that nature, so it is evident that the librarian role is being diversified.

Heather, Amy and Tony commented that they all have in-depth sessions on copyright in their courses.

Question 3: What strengths of art information professionals can be leveraged or sold to both libraries and library students as assets in an increasingly digital arts and education environment?

Lucker pointed out that in the last few years the growth of standards in still image, moving image, and sound have been huge. However, the bibliographic field has had these for some 50 years, and although there is a move from AACR2 to RDA this is still a small set of new standards by comparison. Institutions are realizing that metadata management is actually the same as cataloging and that people working with art information have metadata skills that apply to more than just bibliographic materials. University and museum libraries are hungry for people who understand image metadata and standards, so this is a huge skill that can be sold to a central library, especially if you are coming out of a department library.

Heather added that subject specialists also have a deep understanding of pedagogical issues such as how artists work, how they work in an academic environment, how art historians do research, how artists do research and expectations of students in curricula. Bauer added that the technological applications provided should enhance learning and must make the connection to an arts constituency. Further it is not necessary to have an exhaustive knowledge of all technologies but to have enough knowledge to put a patron with the right specialist.

White agreed that the metadata component, pedagogical knowledge, media fluency, and teaching and outreach skills are critical.

Question 4: Is a second Masters degree more or less important now?

Gendron carried out an analysis of institutions a few years ago for a core competencies project and found that the number of job descriptions that included a second masters as a requirement were very few. While it is definitely required often in Visual Resources Centers and museums, many librarians in academic institutions do not have a second Masters. Gendron would argue that it is not required for most academic positions, and Gendron herself does not have a second Masters but rather an undergraduate degree in Studio Art. She advises students that a second Masters represents a huge financial and personal commitment and it is possible to find a job without it.

However, Lucker cautioned that a survey of job postings now as opposed to a few years ago indicates a significant change. It is also necessary to take into account that there is much more competition now, and in many cases the person with the second degree wins.

White agreed with Lucker. Having chaired a variety of job search committees in the past he found that candidates having a dual degree go in the preferred pile. Unless other candidates have specialized skills such as languages or are studio artists applying for studio programs, they do not progress further. Because the job market is very competitive, he advises students who want to be art librarians to get the dual degree. He also drew attention to the policy at NYU: those without

the dual degree are placed on a nine year tenure track instead of a seven year track, and are expected to get the second Masters degree while completing all the requirements for tenure. He commented that it is very difficult to do all of this simultaneously. For those students who cannot afford a second masters he recommends the specialization, involvement in ARLIS, and publication so they have a professional network and they can start building opportunities.

Soehner commented that the second degree has a legitimizing value in terms of gaining respect from faculty and he also tells students that they should pursue it, but they should definitely find alternative funding rather than funding it themselves if possible. However, he also feels that while it is good to have special knowledge in an additional subject, it does not necessarily benefit the library. Rather it is more important to have technological, language, management, project management and budget skills. He advocates getting away from specialization and towards 'deep generalization'.

The session closed with questions and comments from the floor. The main discussion was focused around the following questions:

In the art librarianship and archives world we have been seeing leadership and management positions with PHD preferred or required. What is the rationale behind the PhD requirement? Is this the future with so many academics not finding jobs? And how do we prepare for leadership, as it is one thing to go back to get a Masters but quite another thing to go back to get a PhD?

Lucker suggested that one reason for requesting PhD candidates is that they are available. For example, Princeton recently filled a support position in the library with a candidate who had 2 Masters degrees and 12 languages. They received 67 applications from very highly qualified candidates. Further, it is not necessarily the subject experience employers require but knowing that someone has gone through the rigorous experience of earning a PhD.

A comment from the floor noted that the MLIS is not seen as equivalent to graduate degrees in other fields and that this is a real failure of our curriculum as it should be of equal standing. We are not promoting our profession by promoting publishing, research etc. in our field.

Lucker agreed that we do not expect the same kind of academic rigor; however this raises the question of whether we are preparing students for a trade or providing an academic program. Here-to-fore it has been more skills-based and trade-based. Gendron agreed with the comment and had recognized the gaps in LIS literature when compiling reading lists for her courses. There is a lot of research and publishing still to do in the profession and Gendron encouraged art library and VRA professionals to contribute to this.

References:

Fine Arts and Visual Resources Librarianship: A Directory of Library Science Degree Programs in North America at:

http://www.arlisna.org/pubs/onlinepubs/degree_programs_directory.pdf