



College Art Association Focus Group: February 10, 1999 Summary of Questionnaires

Based on six (partially) completed questionnaires.

Background

The College Art Participants did not have great familiarity with the AMICO database prior to coming to the Focus group meeting. They reported an average of 3 on a scale of 1-5 (I've explored the AMICO Library myself before coming here), but some commented that this experience consisted of as little as ten minutes.

RLG Application

As a consequence of having little experience with the Library, and probably also of having less experience with on-line systems in general, they had little to say about the RLG application appearance or functionality. Where they did rank features, there was little consensus. Perhaps the single issue that attracted attention was the perceived need for an improved Notebook function (ranked 2.25 on a scale of 1-high to 3-low and commented on elsewhere under saving previous search sets).

Use

Where: Somewhat surprisingly, CAA participants ranked the Library as first in places AMICO would be used by themselves and their students, followed by the visual resources collection, home and office. The classroom was checked by only one CAA participant, and as relevant only to students!

Linkages: CAA participants saw links to Art History texts, Course web sites and local slide libraries as valuable. Links to encyclopedias, on-line library catalogs, personal databases were ranked lower.

Content

When asked to indicate percentages of the AMICO Library of particular genres, sources, cultures, or historical periods, CAA participants were unable to suggest targets, but in general they expressed the view that breadth was preferable, and that under-represented and hard to get works and collections should be featured. Perhaps surprisingly, they agreed that works that we would not expect from known collections, and works from relatively unknown collections, were preferred. Also, modern and contemporary work was seen as a positive. They were interested in being able to provide suggestions about content to AMICO, but in a more general fashion rather than requesting specific works.

Rights

CAA participants would like to see works included in the AMICO Library even if full rights are not available - in general with rights enumerated at the item level. They would be interested in having links to where other rights can be obtained and possibly links to agreements offered by rights holders, but do not feel this should be incorporated at an extra cost.

Users

In general, the CAA participants felt it was desirable for almost anyone to be a user; they agree that it was essential to include Distance Education students.

Currently allowed uses: CAA participants were adamant that viewing, use on course web sites, and research uses be permitted but were willing to give up (or probably to sometimes not have) copying to CD or slides, overlaying images, manipulating them, or incorporating them into one's own art work.

Currently prohibited uses: Not surprisingly CAA participants were interested in having the right to publish in academic journals and in retaining for educational use after the license term. When asked for the value of such a post-use copy, however, they felt it was less than \$5 (our lowest number) - possibly only \$1 per image. All thought that faculty being able to retain copies for research was an important extension of the existing rights.

Reporting

By and large, CAA participants were not willing to report on use, though two felt that reporting on copying would be ok.



Art Museum Image Consortium

Visual Resources Association Focus Group: February 13, 1999 Summary of Questionnaires

Based on eight completed questionnaires:

The VRA participants had a fairly high degree of familiarity with the AMICO database. Most had used it extensively and some had developed AMICO applications.

RLG Application

The overall appearance and functionality of the RLG application was rated very highly by these participants. A few exceptions, or observations of note, were:

- the new image frames should be correctly sized and perhaps have a fixed location
- the pick lists as implemented might not scale well
- image only views needed at least a creator, and perhaps a creator/title caption
- there might be one too many sizes of images (full screen?)
- saving the notebook will be a good innovation

Priorities for Authority Files

AMICO were overwhelmingly to link/or incorporate, AAT/ULAN. Abstracting and indexing services ranked second, but considerably below AAT/ULAN. All other secondary and tertiary targets, including textbooks, encyclopedias, and journals, ranked lower than primary sources from archives or museums.

Delivery Options

Generally existing AMICO delivery strategies were endorsed. VRA participants favored separate media files rather than authored multimedia; 1024x768 lower boundaries for images, with black and white only for items which are b/w in their originals. However, they were happy to accept watermarks on higher resolution images. In generally they felt that cataloging in the language of the repository should be accompanied by indexes in English.

Rights

VRA participants were uniformly willing to accept item-level rights limitations; only two felt we should continue to exclude everything that did not have full rights. Only one participant was willing to accept text without images. While they felt that links to rights holders, and perhaps to agreements, were desirable they were not interested in paying for them. On the other hand, they felt that an AMICO Library with substantial contemporary art content was worth 10-20% extra.

Users and Uses

VRA participants did not think any new categories of users were necessary. They agreed that downloading, classroom projection, research and course web site mounting uses were essential and showed considerable willingness to give up overlay, manipulation and incorporation into new works.

On the other hand, they strongly felt that retaining access after the license was important and were willing to pay an average of \$10 per image for that right. They accepted all other prohibitions on use that are currently in place.

Reporting

Surprisingly those who responded were willing to report on modification as a condition of receiving rights to modify.

Location of Use

Interestingly, VRA curators agreed that heaviest use would take place in libraries, with home as second. Visual Resources Collections, classroom, and offices ranked third.

Linkage with other resources

VRA curators ranked links to local slide holdings as most important, followed by course web sites. They overwhelmingly ranked ULAN "interoperability" highest in the metadata links, with AAT a distant second and MARC, VRA core and DC as "also rans".

Documentation

VRA curators believed almost uniformly that exhibition history was the most important new content to add to AMICO. Scholarly essays came second.