



**Art Libraries Society of North America, 34<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference  
Fairmont Banff Springs, Banff, Alberta, Canada, May 5-9, 2006**

**Session 5: Aggregated Image Collections : Enriching and Aggravating?  
Saturday, May 6, 2006**

**Recorder:** Marilyn R. Healey Art Bibliographer  
University of Georgia Libraries

Deborah K. Ultan Boudewyns: "Licensable Digital Image Collections Making or Breaking Collection Practices"

This paper dealt with the impact on an academic library and art librarians when a Licensed Digital Image Collection, LDIC, is added to the electronic menu. The presence of the LDIC challenges acquisition practices, collections, staffing, budgets, and the roles and responsibilities of the art librarian. The intention of the Libraries when they subscribe to an LDIC is that the license will allow all disciplines across the campus to use it. This makes it necessary for the library to support it further with the required equipment and user education. Staff time must be budgeted so that a program of training can be implemented.

As budgets and time are challenged by the presence of the LDIC Collection Development will change. Collections / knowledge managers have a dual identity as liaisons with the faculty and leading user training. At University of Minnesota 50% of the selection is outsourced, while priorities must be established so that the distinctive collections continue to grow with the individual attention of the selectors.

How do users use the e-landscape? The importance of user studies to inform how the Libraries structure user education and the flow of new electronic acquisitions is emphasized in the University of California, Berkeley study, "Use and Users of Digital Resources: A Focus on Undergraduate Education in the Humanities and Social Sciences." Peggy Johnson in her book Fundamentals of Collection Development and Management urges librarians to heed their role as mediators between users and resources.

Image databases such as *ArtStor* and *Cameo* were compared in a small survey at the University of Minnesota regarding the quality of the image collections and the ease of use of the software. While *Artstor* was rated as having better content, *Cameo* was recognized as easier to use. *Cameo* images, also, can be downloaded to Power Point whereas *ARTstor* cannot.

It is essential that the Art Librarians and the Visual Resources Librarians develop a collaborative relationship. Since the Visual Resources Librarians work closely with the Art and Art History faculty on their presentations, they may be helpful in assisting with promotion and/or user training. Faculty may be unwilling, however, to spend

the time to acquire the training it takes for new and/or complicated interface.

LDIC user groups that meet at ARLIS/NA and VRA are good places to determine the effectiveness of various approaches to training and using LDICs. These groups may have a practical and philosophical impact on products. The Librarians' mediation abilities may help to develop a more effective database. Task-forces may also be one way for subscribers or potential subscribers to share criteria standards, training templates, or training methods.

Margaret Webster : "Pandora's Box You've licensed it; Now What?"

This presentation tackled the problem of educating faculty outside the realm of Art History in the use of Digital Image Databases. DIs are used for enrichment of students' classroom experience in many different fields not just Art History. This requires that DI resources be made available Campus wide. The needs of the faculty at large are broader and more eclectic than Art History alone. Therefore a one to one replacement of the analog collection will not meet the needs of the whole faculty. Service support for new user services is mandatory. Librarians and Directors of Visual Resources will need to be integrally involved in this process.

Experience has shown that "Build it and they will come" does not apply to Digital Image Databases. Several institutions have conducted user surveys in order to find out what faculty want and how they want it. In addition to identifying the types of images that will be useful we will need to know what kind of metadata content is desirable. These two criteria will help in the selection of the appropriate resource for the job.

Surveys of faculty use of images are in the process of analysis. They have been done at Yale, Cornell and University of Pennsylvania.

A combination of LDIC's and digitized local collections may best meet most teaching needs. E-grants may be pursued to assist slide libraries in the local development of DI's especially the digital importation of faculty collections.

Some problems that were discussed were:

- The reticence of faculty to learn a complicated image delivery system.
- It is clear that Power Point is the preferred software for faculty.
- The presence of errors in the meta-data information provided with the image.
- If descriptive meta-data can not be suppressed it is a problem.
- Some faculty have objections to proprietary systems.

Marylly Snow: "Rolling Out UC Image Service"

This presentation dealt with the experience of "Rolling Out" or promoting the UC Image Service Collections using Luna Insight as a delivery mechanism to the faculty and students at all 10 UC campuses in a coordinated system-wide approach.  
<http://www.imageservice.cdlib.org/>.

A committee was formed called ISRAC, the Image Services and Rollout Advisory Committee and charged with the responsibility of "Rolling Out" UC Image Service  
<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/hops/israc/> Rolling Out is more pro-active than announcing the product to librarians, who then disseminate the product or

service to their clientele on an as needed basis. A more concerted broadcast using Announcements could be made through various approaches such as: flyers, book marks, newsletters, electronic resource guides, public catalogs, and web sites. The main problem is that these methods serve those who are already looking for information about using imaging technology. In addition to the above methods of announcing a new service, e-mail was chosen as an example of a "push technology," as a way of getting the word to faculty. In addition, experience has shown that faculty, sometimes become aware of electronic resources through their students. This is referred to as the "trickle up" effect. Because of the trickle up effect, ISRAC decided to announce UC Image Service first and to set up training, first for trainers, then for educators, second.

There were many unexpected complications trying to set up a system-wide roll-out. Each campus and each University Library has developed its own culture, its own branding, and has its own priorities. One example of a complication encountered was with using central campus e-mail lists. Each owner of a central e-mail list had their own expectations of what was considered appropriate use of their list. On one campus, the ISRAC member was referred from the Chancellor, then to the Vice-Chancellor, then to the Vice-Chancellor of Instructional Technology, where a training program was expected to be in place before the rights to use the list were granted. The training would need to be coordinated with the university's technology units which were quite busy with their own priorities and not available for partnering with ISRAC.

There were other challenges in reaching the target population of UC. Among them were: the size of the UC system with over 130,000 faculty and staff and over 200,000 students; the complexity of the institution; accessing email lists and establishing training programs.

After a year of biweekly conference calls, ISRAC was thanked for its hard work and dismissed. Whether roll-out continues on the local campuses, instead of a coordinated-system-wide level, remains to be seen.