

# ARLIS/NA

ART LIBRARIES SOCIETY of NORTH AMERICA

2015: 43<sup>rd</sup> Annual Conference  
Fort Worth, Texas | March 19–23, 2015

## **Academic Division Meeting**

March 21, 2015

Submitted by Emilee Mathews

Moderator: Emilee Mathews

Vice-Moderator: Cara List

Recorder: Leslie Jankowski

Welcome from Academic Libraries Division Moderator Emilee Mathews.

Nominations and election of Andi Back (University of Kansas) for 2016 moderator.

In response to the Ithaka S+R Report *Supporting the Changing Research Practices of Art Historians*, released in April 2014, Mathews divided the attendees into 5 groups to discuss five main points summarized by Rebecca Friedman (Princeton University) and Heather Gendron (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill). After small group discussion, attendees summarized responses for the entire group. Working backward, the following was discussed:

### **Finding 5: Graduate students have limited exposure to research methods and professional networking opportunities.**

The group agreed the most important consideration is the great range in student preparedness from institution to institution. It is hard to give a blanket statement on skills/preparedness because of this reality. Networking is crucial for building student skills. Furthermore, art history graduate students are not entirely interested in tools but in stuff—the output from those tools.

### **Finding 4: Scholars need better skills and research tools for working with digital images.**

Scholars' rights and fair use are important considerations for building better skills. As for librarians, their competencies are addressed by ARLIS/NA and SEI. A baseline skill set, however, would help scholars and artists. Training with a focus in personal information management could be undertaken by librarian-led workshops and the creation of LibGuides. In addition, collaboration with museums would help this process.

### **Finding 3: Art Historians need better tools for discovering objects.**

There are barriers to having a centralized portal. There isn't much incentive to recatalog or a willingness to publish in a public interface. It is unlikely to have a centralized tool not only because of time and money, but also because of intellectual property rights. The DPLA, Europeana, ARTStor, and the Google Art Project are already attempting to gather artworks and other cultural objects; however, this would be a great opportunity for linked data. In fact, there is a linked open data project underway on the East Coast among museums. Also, the Yale Center for British Art currently links to secondary sources as part of an ongoing program and the Mellon American Art Collective has 14 shared databases.

**Finding 2: Institution-level planning sometimes overlooks opportunities for improved research services for scholars.**

Some geographically related institutions have linked catalogs. At the institutional level, you have to give your users opportunities to research services; there is a disconnect there sometimes. In addition to standard interlibrary loan of physical items, some institutions are experimenting with eBook ILL, like Occam's Reader.

**Finding 1: Art historians are already applying technology to their research in significant ways, though their methods do not always fit into the narrowly-defined category of "digital humanities."**

The newest faculty often have the best tech knowledge but also the biggest burden for tenure. Also, art historians may not like the term "digital humanities" as it can be alienating. Art historians are using digital tools and this does not necessitate a new identity.

After discussing the Ithaka Report, the group turned toward brainstorming for the Seattle ARLIS/NA conference in 2016. Suggestions included:

--Postcards from the Edge session centered on the Ithaka report in collaboration with the VRA

--Managing digital images with academic and visual resource librarians/staff. The Education Committee has retooled ideas that may be worth exploring.

--A session based around the importance of subject specialists such as art librarians; universities are more frequently consolidating departments and no longer hiring subject specialists. There is a need for on-the-ground reports from ARLIS/NA and a resonance from outside the society in order to emphasize subject specialist relevance. Perhaps a session about developing tools to present our relevance would be helpful for our own annual reports/evaluations/personal goals.

Meeting adjourned.