AMICO

The Art Museum Image Consortium
http://www.amico.net

**Focus Groups Studying
Users and Uses of
the AMICO Library**

Jennifer Trant
Executive Director, Art Museum Image Consortium
December 23, 1998

AMICO

Focust Groups Studying Users and Uses of
the AMICO Library

Contents

Appendices

Appendix I: AMIICO Members

Appendix II: AMICO University Testbed Participants

Appendix III: AMICO Users and Uses Committee Members

Appendix IV: Moderator's Guide for Focus Groups

Appendix V: Curriculum Vitae for Jennifer Trant and David Bearman

1. Introduction

Enabling access to cultural heritage information over the web has become a shared goal for many cultural heritage organizations. But the organizational and economic infrastructure to support and enhance access to in-depth multimedia documentation about works of art in museum collections has kept pace neither with the technological capability nor with user demand for access to multimedia museum documentation. North American Museums have joined together to form the Art Museum Image Consortium (AMICO) to address these issues.

Between March and September 1997, staff of museums in Canada and the United States engaged in planning a consortium that would enable them, collectively, to create a digital art library for educational use. Twenty-three museums (of the 30 in the planning process) formed AMICO in October of 1997. AMICO members pay the costs of capturing the images and data as well as clearing the rights, and contribute a membership fee to the consortium that makes the library available for educational use.[1] The twenty-three museum directors who became founding members of the AMICO Board did so because they felt that education was a significant part of their mission. They believed that working together within the consortium they could leverage their expertise and their investments in the creation of digital documentation of their collections. AMICO now has twenty-six members in North America and is discussing membership actively with other institutions in the US and abroad. Full details about AMICO and its activities can be found on our web site at http://www.amico.net

In its first year of operations, AMICO has assembled a testbed library of almost 20,000 images, developed a distribution partnership with the Research Libraries Group (RLG) to delivery the AMICO Library to higher education, launched a testbed delivery research project involving 16 university campuses, and partnered in a successful grant from the Institute of Library and Museum Services (IMLS) – led by Indiana University/Purdue University Indianapolis – to deliver the AMICO Library to K-12 and Public Library Users in the Indianapolis Metropolitan area.

Each of these activities tackles some of the challenges facing AMICO as we create a self-supporting distribution system for digital cultural heritage documentation. But these projects address primarily technological and organizational issues. Much still remains to be learned about the needs and expectations of users of the AMICO Library.

1.1 Understanding Users

Despite considerable anecdotal evidence and a few systematic studies, we still know very little about how scholars use images, and less about who uses digital images on campuses and what uses they make of them." [2] We know little about what users identify as desirable in the technical characteristics of images themselves, their associated documentation, or the delivery systems that support their use. Nor do we know how these various inter-related factors contribute to effective use of image data. We lack cross-institutional analysis of the use of the same dataset

---

[1]   See "Economic, Social and Technical Models for Digital Libraries of Primary Resources: the example of the Art Museum Image Consortium (AMICO), an invited paper for the *New Review of Information Networking*, at press.

[2]   See for example Elisabeth Bakewell, William O. Beeman, Caroll McMichael Reese and Marilyn Schmitt (ed.) *Object Image Inquiry, The Art Historian at Work*. Report on a collaborative study by the Getty Art History Information Program (AHIP) and the Institute for Research in Information and Scholarship (IRIS), Brown University, Santa Monica, CA: Getty Art History Information Program, 1988., or *Linking Art Objects and Art Information*, a special issue of *Library Trends* (Vol. 37, no 2) Fall 1988, and more recently the reports of the Museum Educational Site Licensing Project (MESL) *Delivering Digital Images: Cultural Heritage Resources for Education* and *Images Online, Perspectives on the Museum Educational Site Licensing Project* (both J. Paul Getty Trust, 1998).

and delivery system, and we are without longitudinal studies comparing more than a single year's usage.[3]

The members of AMICO considered the study of user needs, requirements and expectations critical to the successful development and deployment of a system to provide digital art documentation to universities. They designed a system to deliver images to different groups of educational users using different non-profit and governmental "distributors". In this way AMICO hoped to facilitate input from each community to a known service provider, and to maximize the likelihood that user requirements would be met in the design of interfaces and tools for use with AMICO. As a first step, AMICO members enlisted universities and the major provider of scholarly information to research universities(RLG); we designed the "University Testbed Project" to build our understanding of this sector's needs.

In October 1997, AMICO issued an invitation to universities worldwide to join in the AMICO University Testbed. Participants acquired the AMICO Library a year early in order to help answer a number of questions keyed to a published set of Research Objectives (available online at http://www.amico.net/project/objectives.shtml). These included conducting studies of users and uses. Of the universities that applied, 18 were selected to participate in the project (see Appendix II for a List of Participants. Highlights of each AMICO University Testbed Project are available at http://www.amico.net/project/highlights.shtml). Beginning in the fall of 1998, participating universities have received access to the AMICO Library through the Research Libraries Group (RLG) and have begun to conduct research on its use. Their projects are ongoing on individual campuses, and will be reported at the close of the 1998/99 academic year.

1.2 Image User Studies in Higher Education

The Art Museum Image Consortium proposes to build upon the institutionally-based research during the University Testbed Project, with a series of coordinated activities designed to develop a shared understanding of the needs of users and issues in the uses of digital images in the arts and humanities. We will analyze and document users and uses of the AMICO Library during the second semester of the academic year 1998/9 (beginning January 1999 through June 1999. AMICO-let activities will supplement and enhance the single campus studies, gathering inter-institutional data.

The focus of this proposal is two in-depth focus groups to be conducted with academic users and image managers to identify their anticipated needs and expected requirements. The overall project will be coordinated by AMICO's staff: Jennifer Trant, Executive Director, and David Bearman, Director of Strategy and Research, Laura Shelley, Member/Client Services Coordinator, and Brad Dietrich, Technical Coordinator. The Focus Groups will be led by Jennifer Trant and David Bearman (Curriculum Vitae appended). Trant and Bearman are experienced group leaders with a wide range of experience in planning, consensus building and group facilitation. As examples, Trant ran the series of disciplinary review meetings for the Art Information Task Force's *Categories for the Description of Works of Art.* Bearman facilitated a series of meetings of Museum Directors, designed to provide input into the strategic planning of the Canadian Heritage Information Network. Together, they facilitated the planning of the Art Museum Image Consortium.

---

[3]   Both of these factors are critical, as they enable us to begin to separate user satisfaction with an image delivery system and its content from their reactions to the context within which it was used (i.e. a particular course). We also will have the soon to be released report of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation funded study "The Cost of Digital Image Distribution: The Social and Economic Implications of the Production, Distribution and Usage of Image Data," by Howard Besser and Robert Yamashita. See http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/Imaging/databases/1998mellon/ Trant and Bearman were actively involved in the scoping of this study.

2. Focus Groups of AMICO Users

First hand contact with users of the AMICO Library is invaluable for building our understanding of their needs and expectations. In February-March 1998, staff of AMICO member institutions and AMICO staff attended the College Art Association (CAA) and Visual Resources Association (VRA) meetings in Toronto and Philadelphia and gleaned valuable informal insights from attendees. We realized then that AMICO could benefit substantially from a more systematic collection of user requirements and desires through focus groups of academic users.

AMICO plans to hold two user group meetings, one of instructors and one of visual resource curators, in conjunction with the College Art Association (CAA) and Visual Resources Association (VRA) annual meetings in Los Angeles, in February 1999. Historically we have found differing priorities and requirements from those who are tasked with maintaining collections of visual resources for use on academic campuses and those who use these resources in their teaching and study. As the AMICO Library will have to meet both these requirements, we propose two separate groups, to allow these needs to be probed in depth.

2.1 Methods

Focus groups research provides the best method for obtaining in-depth, comparable, qualitative data from a target population. Because the participants are expecting to spend a substantial amount of time many more questions can be asked and much more common context can be established than is the case in traditional survey research. Focus groups often provide far more information than surveys, and can be used to complement them.[4] Because the group is together, individuals can all answer questions first in the way that they would if they were alone, and then through discussion within the group, move towards common ranking or consensus in their responses, or identify areas of real differences of opinion when these are present. As a consequence, first impressions and biases can be captured, but final opinions can also be obtained which are more carefully considered and dependable. Because participants can observe various options closely, and then rank them, they can provide valuable feedback about choices that are being considered.

The focus groups in this study will be facilitated by Jennifer Trant, David Bearman; selected members of the AMICO Users and Uses Committee (listed in Appendix III) will be present as recorders. The User and Uses Committee as a whole will be involved in advance in finalizing the research questions and Moderators' Guide (the latest draft of which is attached as Appendix IV).

Each user group will meet for a three hour session. They would receive a brief introduction to the AMICO Library, and then would be asked to address specific questions which are correlated with concrete decisions facing AMICO members in the evolution of the AMICO Library. Further questions will be based on those asked of the MESL Focus Groups.[5]

Sessions will be videotaped[6]. Following each session, video tapes would be transcribed. These transcripts, along with preliminary insights from the facilitators and Users and Uses Committee Representatives would be circulated to the full AMICO User and Uses Committee. A full day meeting of the Committee will be held in conjunction with the American Association of Museums annual meeting, to analyze the result and determine their implications for the way the AMICO Library is compiled, edited and delivered in 1999/2000 and beyond.

The day would be planned so that one focus group met in the morning, and the second in the afternoon. Lunch would be served to the morning group to enable some personal networking time

---

[4]   Such as, for example the recent survey by Lorna Corbetta-Noyes, of the Research Libraries Group: "Using Digital Images in the Classroom : User Survey Report". A summary of the results of the Digital Images Survey conducted in May and June 1998.

[5]   See "The Costs of Digital Image Distribution" Appendix VI.

[6]   Plum Video Productions, a firm which specializes in focus group documentation, will provide 3/4" Umatic (broadcast standard) S-VHS and professional cameramen for the 6 hours at $460.

and follow on discussion. Refreshments will be served to the afternoon group to encourage the same. In a follow-up exercise, the entire group would participate in a Delphi ranking exercise, based on a section of the MESL Instructor Survey.[7] Participants would be asked to rank a set of functions and content that could be included in a future image database.

2.2 Art Historians and Image Users

Invitees to the CAA focus group would be members of the art history faculty of twelve universities - six with experience of the AMICO Testbed Library and six without. (Each University Testbed participant will be asked to identify a pool of possible participants from outside the testbed.) The three hour session would be divided into six segments of approximately half an hour each.

    A.   Introduction to AMICO and the AMICO Library (what is it, isn't it)

    Focussed questions: What would make AMICO Library most valuable to the faculty?
    B.   Content (Collections Development and Documentation)
    C.   Rights (How they can best be administered)
    D.   Delivery Service (With an emphasis on uses by faculty)
    E.   Tools (Imagining and ranking future features)

    Wrap-up discussion
    F.   Experiences and Expectations, Opportunities and Barriers

2.3 Image Collection Managers

Invitees to the VRA focus group would be visual resource curators from twelve different universities. As with the art historians, they would be drawn half from institutions with access to the AMICO Library and half from institutions without. (Each University Testbed participant will be asked to identify a pool of possible participants from outside the testbed.) The Visual Resources focus group will also be divided into roughly thirty minute segments, but will address a slightly different set of issues:

    1)   Introduction to AMICO and the AMICO Library (what is it, isn't it)

    Focussed questions: What would make AMICO Library most valuable to Visual Resources Curators and their clientele?
    2)   Content (Collections Development and Documentation)
    3)   Rights (How they can best be administered?)
    4)   Delivery Service (and integration into current resources)
    5)   Tools (Imagining and ranking future features)

    Wrap-up discussion
    6)   Experiences and Expectations, Opportunities and Barriers

Full details of the questions to be asked and issues to be explored can be found in Appendix IV, the Moderators' Guide.

2.4 Analysis and Reporting

The tapes of the focus groups will be transcribed, coded and analyzed, and the individual surveys coded and tabulated. The two will then be compared and analyzed in order to draw out critical factors that will influence the development of the AMICO Library. These results will also be compared to those of the MESL Evaluation projects mentioned.

---

[7]   Developed by Beth Sandore at the University of Illinois. See Appendix 3: Instructor/Student Surveys, and in *Delivering Digital Images, Cultural Heritage Resources for Education,* The Museum Educational Site Licensing Project, Volume 1. C. Stephenson and P. Mc Clung, eds., The J. Paul Getty Trust, 1998.

The AMICO Users and Uses Committee will hold a one-day meeting, in association with the American Association of Museums Annual Meeting) to review a preliminary analysis of the results. This group will discuss preliminary conclusions, and will provide direction for further analysis of the transcripts and survey responses.

Although it is not traditional to do so, the results of these focus groups will be reported (all data will be anonymized) both to AMICO Members and University Testbed Participants, and to the general community. As interest in these issues is high, the moderators of the focus groups will use the results to author an article on requirements and desires for the development of digital art libraries. We hope that the communication of the results will aid others making decisions similar to those of AMICO.

3. Conclusion: Future Use of Research Results

A solid understanding of the users and uses of networked museum multimedia documentation is critical. Not knowing the requirements and desires of our educational users, museums are making expensive "shots in the dark" as they digitize and distribute information about their collections. AMICO will use its University Testbed Project to lay concrete groundwork for future activities. By identifying the priorities of one of our prime user populations – the academic and research community – we will be able to schedule the developments and enhancements of the AMICO Library and the its distribution systems, to meet their needs.

Strong user data will also be of great help to AMICO as it develops the Technical Advisory Service requested by its members.[8] We cannot develop digitization guidelines and best practices in a vacuum. Our use of technology, and our distribution of information must be based on real requirements if our investments are to be cost effective. AMICO will use the results of these user studies to inform its future project: the definition of Best Practices for Museum Digital Documentation and Image Digitization. Many museums are crying out for guidance in the digital capture of images and in the conversion of textual documents. AMICO can help them to make appropriate choices, based on an established body of practice and a strong knowledge of the functions and purposes that the art museum community wishes to fulfill with its digital multimedia documentation. The focus group study outlined in this proposal is one of several research efforts that will provide needed background information to ensure that museum digital documentation is captured and delivered in manners suited to the needs and desires of educational users, helping AMICO to fulfill its mission of enabling educational use of museum multimedia.

---

[8]   See the AMICO Mission Statement at http://www.amn.org/AMICO/amico.shtml for an outline of projected AMICO Member Services.

Appendix I

Art Museum Image Consortium
Members

(as of September 1998)

1. Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, NY
2. Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto, Ontario
3. Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, IL
4. Asia Society Gallery, New York, NY
5. Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ
6. Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, OH
7. Davis Museum and Cultural Center, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA
8. Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
9. The Frick Collection, New York, NY
10. International Museum of Photography, George Eastman House, Rochester, NY
11. J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, CA
12. Library of Congress, Washington, DC
13. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, CA
14. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY
15. Minneapolis Institute of Arts, Minneapolis, MN
16. Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, Montréal, Québec
17. Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal, Montréal, Québec
18. Museum of Contemporary Art, San Diego, CA
19. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, MA
20. National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario
21. National Museum of American Art, Washington, DC
22. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia, PA
23. San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, San Francisco, CA
24. San Jose Museum of Art, San Jose, CA
25. Walker Art Center, Minneapolis MN
26. Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, NY

Appendix II

Art Museum Image Consortium
University Testbed Participants

- Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA
- Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA
- Columbia University, New York, NY, USA
- Harvard University, Cambridge, MA , USA
- Herron School of Art, Indianapolis, IN, USA and
- Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis,
- IN, USA
- Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA
- Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY
- University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
- The University of Illinois, USA
    University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL
    University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL
- University of Leiden, Leiden, The Netherlands
- University of Texas, Austin, TX, USA
- University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
    University of Toronto at Mississauga, Mississauga, Ontario
    University of Toronto at Scarborough, Scarborough, Ontario
- Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA
- Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA, USA
- Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, USA

Appendix III:
Art Museum Image Consortium
Users and Uses Committee

Albright-Knox Art Gallery	Karen Lee Spaulding
Art Gallery of Ontario	Jane Rhodes
Art Institute of Chicago	Jack Perry Brown
Asia Society Galleries	Helen Abbott
Cleveland Museum of Art	Stephanie A. Stebich
Davis Museum and Cultural Center, Wellesley College	Peter Walsh
Frick Collection	Amy Herman Inge Reist
George Eastman House. International Museum of Photography	Roger Bruce Marianne Fulton
J. Paul Getty Museum	Erin Coburn Ken Hamma
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	Diana Folsom
Metropolitan Museum of Art	Deborah Howes Kent Lydecker Julie Zeftel
Minneapolis Institute of Arts	Tammy Sopinksi Perlman
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston	Nancy Allen
Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal	Benoit Bissonnette
National Gallery of Canada	Daniel Amadei
National Museum of American Art	Virginia Mecklenburg
San Francisco Museum of Modern Art	Peter Samis Thom Sempere
San Jose Museum of Art	Patty Hickson
Walker Art Center	Steve Dietz

**Appendix IV:
Art Museum Image Consortium
Moderators' Guide for Focus Groups**

December 1998 Draft
(under discussion with AMICO Users and Uses Committee
and qualitative research specialists)

Contents:

1. **Format of the Groups**

Two focus groups, of Art Historians/Researchers and Visual Resource professionals for 3 hours. During this time, 10-12 individuals will engage in a discussion that will be structured and directed (through suggestion) by the moderators. A structured methodology is essential to ensure that the group addresses each of identified research areas. Prior focus groups on this subject[9] have been far less structured. As a result, while they provide general insights into positions and attitudes, they did not yield the concrete information needed to help AMICO direct the development of its programs.

Prior to each Section of the discussion, each member of the group will individually complete a set of survey questions on that topic. This will both provide the researchers with an additional data source that can be correlated with the opinions expressed in the group (providing a check on group dynamics that might lead the discussion). It has also been cited as a way to help focus participants and improve involvement and motivation.[10] Open discussion on the more general topic will then follow, with the survey questions serving as a guide for the moderator to topics they would like to see covered.

A significant amount of time, at the end of each session, will be provided for a more free-wheeling discussion that is led, or directed by the participants. We want to facilitate the introduction of new ideas and perspectives, and provide an open environment within which experiences, ideas or concerns can be raised, discussed and explored by the group.

2. **The Research Questions**

The discussion will be organized into four broad sections, each of which explores particular themes and issues in the creation and use of the AMICO Library.

---

[9]   Such as those conduced by the Mellon Foundation funded Study of the Costs of Digital Image Distribution" cited above.

[10]   "There is something about the process of writing things down that reinforces a person's commitment to contributing these thoughts to the group, even in the face of apparent disapproval. Having written statements available also gives the moderator a legitimate basis for asking for input from those who have not said anything yet." David L. Morgan. F*ocus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Second Edition. Qualitative Research Methods Series, No. 16, A Sage University Paper, Sage publications, 1997, p. 50

2.1 Introductory Session

A. Participants and Facilitators Introductions

B. A Brief Introduction to what the AMICO Library is...

- multimedia information about works of art in collections of member institutions
- A collection growing in breadth, depth and richness of indexing in response to user needs
- Content delivered by annual subscription to different users, by different distributors

and isn't...
- An online slide library - it contains important definitive and interpretive text and multimedia
- A directory of where images are or where to obtain rights - it comes with rights
- An encyclopedia or Art 101 text - it can help illustrate these with examples
- An exhibition or piece of courseware - the focus is on individual works
- A biographical/bibliographical reference tool - it is not comprehensive
- A specific set of software functions - these differ by distributor, and will develop, we hope

C. AMICO and the AMICO Library

Using the Research Libraries Group (RLG) delivery service, we will explore the AMICO testbed library and explain its purposes and the functions of the RLG delivery service.

D. Conclusion of Section 1: General Discussion of AMICO

2.2 Content of the AMICO Library

Overall framing - AMICO needs to make numerous decisions about collections development and documentation for the AMICO Library, almost all of which have financial consequences and require time commitments. Understanding the relative importance of possible choices to our users is, therefore, critical to improving the Library in ways that will be valued. A schema illustrating the content of the testbed library, the content of the 1999-2000 year library, and plans for future growth will be shared with participants.

A. Collections development - Genre Balance

Framing: AMICO currently includes works in any medium held by member institutions which are largely fine arts museums. By changing membership criteria or pursuing other options for contribution of content, AMICO could extend to other media.

Options: Please indicate the percentage of works in each genre that you would consider ideal:

- Painting
- Prints and Drawings
- Photography
- Sculpture
- Decorative Art & Design
- Architecture
    - photographs

- drawings
- Other, please elaborate

B. Collections Development – Sources

Framing: AMICO members are non-profit institutions with collections of art - principally museums. Other sources could be pursued.

Options (ranked with 1 as highest):

Area	Rank
archives	
libraries	
Private collectors	
contemporary artists	
outdoor sculpture	
public architecture	
other, please elaborate	

C. Collections Development - Cultural Balance

Framing: Members of AMICO choose the works contributed to the AMICO Library. This may result in cultural bias, especially in early years while the collection is growing. Ideally, what do you think the proper balance should be?

Options: Indicate percentage of works from::

Area	Percentage
Europe	
• Northern	
• Southern	
North America	
• Canada	
• US	
• Mexico	
Latin & South America	
Africa	
• Sub-Saharan	
• Saharan	
Asia	
• Middle East	
• Far East	
• Indian Sub-Continent	
Oceania & Australia	

D. Collections Development - Historical Balance

Framing: The distribution of works by date raises the same kinds of balance issues as the distribution by geography, but it also raises issues about the kinds of museums that should be encouraged to participate in AMICO, the kinds of documentation they will create, and the nature of AMICO's program, particularly with respect to modern and contemporary works.

Options: What percentage of Western art works do you think should come from::

Period	Percentage
Pre -history	
Ancient World	
Early Christian era	
Middle ages	
Renaissance	
16th&17th c.	
18th c.	
19th c.	
20th c.	

E. Collections Development Depth vs. Breadth

Framing: Different types of courses and research require different degrees of depth and breadth. AMICO member institutions find themselves asking whether to document several hundred works by the same artist, or works by several hundred artists; whether to provide multiple impressions of prints and photographs supplied also by other AMICO members or drawings related to paintings already in the Library.

Options: . For the next two years there will be 50-100,000 works in the AMICO Library. Given this:

1a) AMICO should aim to build depth (>1000) works for particular:
- artists
- school
- style/period

1b) If so, which?

2) AMICO should encourage multiple impressions of a print/photograph? Yes / No

F. Collections Development - Museum Representation

Framing: AMICO was formed by North American museums. Its membership is open to institutions worldwide but bringing such institutions in involves substantial investments in accommodating different legal, linguistic, social and institution traditions, all of which will significantly impact AMICO.

Options (ranked with 1 as highest):

Policy	Rank
Maintain current policy - Encourage institutions worldwide to join if they are prepared to accept terms applied to current members.	
Make substantial effort to bring in European museums	
Make substantial effort to bring in Asian museums	
Make substantial effort to bring in African museums	
Make substantial effort to bring in Latin American museums	
Make specific effort to bring in the following institution(s):	

H. Collections Development - Specific Works/Subjects

Framing: The AMICO Library will grow annually, but at any size it will not have everything that a particular scholar or student might want. Currently the philosophy is to encourage museums to include those works with which they are involved in any given year - new acquisitions, items going on loan or exhibition, items being published or requested photography - on the grounds that these will prove also to be of greatest interest. Other options have been proposed.

Options (ranked with 1 as highest):

Policy	Rank
Continue current practice	
Provide mechanisms for users to request specific works as a "popularity" contest only	
Provide mechanisms for users to request specific works with payment by the individual to enable the work to be included	
Provide mechanisms for users to request more works of a particular sort, topic or artist	
Provide mechanisms for users to "seamlessly" incorporate their own content locally	
Provide mechanisms for users to "seamlessly" incorporate their own content to contribute content to the AMICO Library for use by other subscribers	
other, please elaborate	

I. Documentation - Integration

Framing: AMICO data could be tightly linked to other museum data through editorial efforts and tool development. Each of these would doubtless enhance the value of the AMICO Library.

Options (ranked with 1 as highest):

Policy	Rank
Focus on links to more internal museum resources represented in the multimedia in the Library	
Enable links to abstracting/indexing of art literature - citation references	
Enable links to encyclopedias of art and culture - contextual background	
Enable links to full texts of scholarly writing represented in JSTOR etc.	
Enable links to textbooks - such as the standard "Art 101' texts	
Enable links to internal resources at licensee institutions - local digitized slides, course material	
other, please elaborate	

J. Documentation - Interactivity

Framing: AMICO data could be a set of loosely linked resources or tightly authored multimedia content. It could be delivered with specific tools for multi-media authoring or without such tools.

Options (ranked with 1 as highest):

Policy	Rank
Keep the collection as independent files of content in various modalities (text, image, sound)	
Promote development of integrated multimedia programs as one of the types of content, recognizing that this will reduce the number of independent elements in the Library	
Promote delivery of tools for editing multimedia elements into interactives, recognizing that this could add to the cost of delivery	
other, please elaborate	

K. Documentation - Depth vs. Breadth

Framing: AMICO could encourage, discourage, or even prohibit certain amounts of depth/breadth. Currently the "minimum" contribution of an AMICO member is 500 works of art with at least a catalog record and one image for each. We could, for instance, encourage deeper multi-media documentation of particular works by substituting a minimum contribution of a fixed number of digital "files" for a minimum contribution of a number of "works".

Options: Kinds of multi-media documentation of particular interest (ranked with 1 as highest):

Option	Rank
scholarly essays	
curriculum materials from education offices	
conservation reports	
exhibition and publication texts	
interactive programs	

L. Documentation - Images

Framing: Providing high resolution images presents a number of technical and social challenges and if certain thresholds of minimum resolution are adopted may keep some works out of the AMICO Library altogether. Some documentation only exist in black and white. There are some works for which it is not possible to obtain rights or create new images. Should minimum thresholds be established? If so, what levels?

Options (ranked with 1 as highest): (Y/N)

	Y/N	Rank
Establish an absolute minimum resolution below which no image should be included in the AMICO Library:		
800x600 dpi		
1024x768 dpi (full screen 17" monitor/max for most projectors)		
1600x1440 dpi (full screen 19" + monitors)		
no minimum, encourage best possible		
Encourage contribution of extremely high resolution images (5MB+) in addition to projection		
only if not watermarked		
even if watermarked		
Establish an upper limit for images that can be easily accessed by most browsers and projected by most digital projection equipment. As this standard moves in the coming years, move the bar		
Permit black and white photography		
Yes?		
Never		
Only if the original is black & white?		
No, unless the existing photography is b/w and it is not possible to obtain other photographs		
Permit text only		
Yes?		
Never?		
Only if rights to the image cannot be secured?		

M. Documentation – Language

Framing: As we obtain documentation from museums world-wide, it will necessarily be in numerous languages.

Options (rank preference, recognizing likely cost and or inclusiveness implications):

Option	Rank
Leave all documentation in original languages	
Index all documentation in English	
Index all documentation in all the languages of contributing institutions	
Translate documentation into one of several European languages	
Translate documentation into English	

N. Conclusion of Section 2: General Discussion of AMICO Content development strategies and documentation requirements

2.3   Rights

Overall Framing: A large part of the value of the AMICO Library to users is that they do not have to research rights for works of art and documentation that they find - they may use the material for education purposes without further permission. The job of obtaining these rights falls on AMICO members. But the nature of rights holding in the contemporary world makes this a difficult job for the museums and various trade-offs are often proposed.

A. Uniform rights
Framing: If all items in the AMICO Library are licensed to subscribers with the same rights, then works or documentation for which AMICO members cannot obtain these rights must be excluded from the Library.

Where uniform rights cannot be obtained, should AMICO:
1) exclude the items from the library
2) include them in a special subset of the library for which there are different restrictions
3) document rights at the item level, restricting tools/views as appropriate for the specific rights that have been obtained
4) other, please elaborate

B. Additional rights
Framing: While the AMICO license provides substantial educational use rights (far beyond those permitted under fair use), it excludes commercial uses and republication. Ease of acquiring these and other rights is something that AMICO could assist with, though it involves implementing systems (human and machine) and resource commitments.

On a scale of 1-10, where 1 is absolutely critical and 10 is of no importance, how important is it to you that AMICO help you acquire these additional rights? On a scale in which the cost to the additional subscribing institution is in parentheses, indicate the added amount you would be willing to pay p.a..

1)	provide name/address of rights holders and electronic link/mail-to if known	$100	$200	$500	$1000	$2000	Other:
2)	provide link to in on-line form agreements, if they exist	$100	$200	$500	$1000	$2000	Other:
3)	provide standard forms of agreements	$100	$200	$500	$1000	$2000	Other:
4)	provide standard pricing	$100	$200	$500	$1000	$2000	Other:
5)	administer standards pricing and agreements	$100	$200	$500	$1000	$2000	Other:

C. Contemporary and Modern Art
Framing: Much of the art of the twentieth century is covered by copyright owned by artists and their estates rather than by the museums which own the physical works. Museums would like to make these works available in the AMICO Library but they often have to pay royalties to the copyright owners on an annual basis to do so. Should the AMICO library contain works licensed from contemporary artists and their estates?

How much additional cost for including your preferred ratio of works of the twentieth century (indicated in answer to Collections Development earlier), would you consider a good investment?

None	*5%*	*10%*	*20%*	*50%*

D. User Community

Framing: The broader, or more loosely defined, the user community which is permitted to access the AMICO Library, the more difficult it is to persuade rights holders to provide AMICO with the right to relicense their works for educational uses. Recognizing that the consequences could be the withdrawal of some works, which if any of the following groups of users beyond the currently Designated Users (enrolled in/employed by educational institutions) do you feel are:

> Essential to include among AMICO Designated Users
> Desirable to include among AMICO Designated Users
> Optional to include among AMICO Designated Users

Options, please rank in order of desirability/importance:

				Rank
1) Walk-in visitors to the University/school library	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
2) Families of the designated users	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
3) Alumni of schools (which are subscribing institutions)	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
4) Members of museum (which are subscribing institutions)	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
5) Non-degree students	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
6) Students in distance education or life-long learning programs	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
7) Any public library cardholder, through their public library	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
8) Other, please elaborate	Essential	Desirable	Optional	

E. Uses During the License Period

Framing: Some practices are permitted and others prohibited under the terms of the current AMICO license. These are always enumerated explicitly so that the boundaries are clearly understood by all parties. Sometimes rights holders turn down requests from AMICO to include works to which they hold rights because AMICO permits uses to which the rights holder objects.

If you would be willing to see any of the permitted practices prohibited in the future, please rank the top 3 in order of their acceptability to you ($1^{st}, 2^{nd}, 3^{rd}$).

Permitted Uses	Rank willingness to prohibit (top 3)
Downloading	
Viewing from any place	
Placing on (non-public) course web-site	
Copying to CD/slides for educational use	
Retaining in professional portfolio (CV) for life	
Displaying in class/conference papers	
Showing artists image with overlays	
Incorporating image in work, with credit	
Classroom presentation	
Use in any research context, with collaborators	
Any "fair use" under copyright law	

If you would like to see any prohibited practices permitted in the future, rank the top 3 in order of importance to you (1st,2nd,3rd).

Prohibited Uses	Rank desire to Permit (top 3)
Systematic copying	
Providing access to non-designated users	
Placing on Public Web Site	
Reproducing for distribution to non-designated users	
Retaining for educational use after license	
Publishing in academic journal or online	
Reposting modified images	
Incorporating image without credit to original	
Public exhibition	
Use in any fundraising context	
Any commercial use	

F. Practices Permitted with Reporting Only

Framing: Universities in the Museum Educational Site Licensing project report a desire to do some things with digital representations of works of art which made museums very nervous. A compromise was reached to permit universities to engage in these practices in return for their reporting on them annually. This would permit the museums to assess if they really had any reason to fear these practices and give them a basis on which to decide whether to permit them in the future.

If you were making the decision, would you accept the following permissions, assuming the associated reporting burden? (Y/N)

Permission	IF	Reporting Burden	Accept (yes or no)
1) Local Mounting of Records	IF	Annual Report of which records in what applications	
2) Copying to CD/other Media	IF	Annual Report of which works/How many CD's, slides, etc. /Uses	
3) Modifying/adapting works of art	IF	Annual report of which works/what kind of modification and what educational purpose where served	

G. After the License Expires

Framing: as long as institutions maintain their subscription to the AMICO Library, Designated Users in those institutions have the rights extended under the license. If the institution ceases to subscribe, certain rights will be taken away, others may be granted in perpetuity.

Please rank how important these extended rights are to you personally.

Rank	
	1) Students can keep AMICO works referenced in their papers/exams/or own art within their portfolio's, in perpetuity
	2) Museums may retain AMICO works in the documentation of related works in their own collections, in perpetuity
	3) University subscribers may ask for rights to use works assigned in classes in the first semester following the end of subscription so as not to disrupt class preparations/expectations, without charge

AMICO is considering allowing university subscribers to acquire an unlimited term license to works already mounted locally, for a price ($x per work). Some works, where rights are owned by living artists or their estates, would need to be excluded. What do you believe would be the value (per work) of such a license?

$5 $10 $15 $20   Other:

H. Conclusion of Section 3: General Discussion of Intellectual Property and Rights Administration issues.

2.4 Delivery Service

Overall Framing: AMICO has decided that museums are better at creating content than at delivery so it is using existing non-profit and governmental data delivery services to provide subscribers with access to the AMICO Library. In this testbed year, all access to the AMICO Library is provided through the Research Libraries Group (RLG), but in future years we hope to see numerous sources for the AMICO Library. While different services can develop different features for their client communities, we would like your reactions to the RLG service to help rank the features important to you.

A. Access/Security

Framing: How users security is administered will determine where users can use the library. Different strategies have different costs, but AMICO can require its distributors to provide methods that will satisfy users needs.

By %, from where do you believe you and your students/clients would want to access the library?

Location	Rank
office	
library or VR collection	
laboratory	
classroom	
home	

other, please elaborate	

B. Interface

Framing: Usability of the application depends on its interface.

Please give us your feedback on the following aspects of the RLG Service, ranking your opinion of various features low, medium and high.

Feature	Rank	Comments
Overall Appearance		
• Look and feel (first impressions)		
• Location of frames/buttons		
Options (customizing your environment)		
Maximum image dimensions		
• Inspection (640w x 480h pixels)		
• Presentation (1024w x 768h pixels)		
Sort order		
• Creator		
• Title		
• Owner		
Items in each search result screen		
• Five		
• Ten		
• Fifteen		
• Twenty		
Search result formatting		
• Images and text		
• Text only		
• Images only		
Full display viewing		
• Image borders and menu background		
• No borders or background		

Notebook		
Print		
Comments		
Help		
Other, please elaborate		

C. Search functionality

Framing: Satisfaction with searches of the database depends on the quality, consistency and depth of the information content and the functionality and ease of use of the searching features.

In each case, identify up to two positive and two negative features. Then rank all features according to importance to you.

Function	Positive?	Negative?	Rank
Simple search			
Advanced search			
Pick lists			
Previous searches			
Save sets/combine in new query			
Save items to Notebook			
Other, please elaborate			

D. Interoperability

Framing: The AMICO Library does not exist in a vacuum and will never be the only resource a student or scholar would need. Given this, there are advantages to sharing information content with other arenas.

Rank the importance to yourself/your users of whether the AMICO Library has:

	Rank
Dublin Core metadata	
MARC compatibility	
AAT index terms	
Library of Congress Subject terms	
ULAN artist names	
EAD compatibility	
VRA Core metadata	
other, please elaborate	

E. Linkage

Framing: AMICO cannot create links to other local resources, but knowing what kinds of local resources users want to link to could enable us to promote tools that make such linking possible.

Rank the importance of links to the following:

	Rank
Basic (Art 101) textbook indexes	
Course homepages	
Encyclopedias (Grove, etc.)	
Local library OPAC	
Local slide collection	
Personal databases	
Other, please identify	

F: Conclusion of Section 4: General Discussion of Delivery Issues

2.5 Tools and Future Uses

Overall Framing: Any data will be valuable to the extent that it can be used, and its value will increase to any group of users if the uses they most want to make are easily enabled. Enabling the use of digital information requires software tools. Determining which software tools are most desirable to whom, and finding ways to create tools which are sufficiently general to be used by a variety of users for their purposes while sufficiently specific to support complex and specialized needs, is always a challenge. Needless to say, developing software tools requires investment - in some cases it is preferable to use tools developed for more general purposes in order to save resources to make tools that would otherwise not be available at all.

A. Envisioning the AMICO Library in 2004
Framing: If you are subscribing to the AMICO Library in 2004, when we hope to have 250,000 works of art documented in rich multimedia, what would you imagine would be 5-10 highly desirable functions (by functions, we mean capabilities of a general sort, such as supporting creation and delivery of examinations, supporting dialogue between groups of students engaged in a common assignment, supporting sequenced presentation of works based on instructors curriculum plan, supporting presentation of works in contexts and presentation of works in relation to each other, with appropriate time/space contextualization and sizing, etc.)?

Activity: List (and briefly describe) the desirable characteristics of the AMICO library in 2004 in the order you think of them.

B. Ranking the Processes that the AMICO Library should support
Framing: As a group exercise, we will collate the functions proposed by participants on a white board. We will then classify the functions described into broad categories based on the process (research, teaching, studying, administration, etc.) they support.

Activity: Each individual will be asked to rank the Broad Categories in order of importance to them.

C. Ranking functions within processes
Framing: As a Group exercise, we will try to establish relative importance of individual functions within each category. We will use the Delphi method - each individual first raking them for themselves, and the discussing in the group the reasons for the outlying

assessments. We will keep track of which features weighed particularly heavily in arriving at any consensus about importance.

D. Features of these functions

Framing: Each of the functions we have ranked as significant will have many interrelated features. In your mind's eye, some of these features are being envisioned as essential. For the three functions that are most important to you (not necessarily those ranked by the group), please imagine the three features that would make them <u>really work</u> for you?

Activity: List three key functions and their three key features

E. General Discussion of Library Development and Tools

2.6   Expectations, Experiences, Opportunities and Barriers

Framing: The Focus Group will close with a general discussion of the issues and opportunities facing visual resource curators or art historians as they adopt new technologies for their teaching, research and other professional activities. This section of the Focus Group will be relatively unstructured. Where necessary, the moderators will stimulate the discussion by raising points from the outline below that have not been addressed.

A. Questions put by MESL Cost Assessment Focus Groups (Mellon Study)

Experience & Expectations:
   Do you have experience using digital images in teaching/in your visual resource collection?
      If yes, answer the following in terms of your experience.
      If no, answer in terms of your expectations.
      How many slides/digital images would you usually use in a course?
   Have you created some digital images yourself?
   Have you used digital images:
      In classroom projection?
      Assigned them for viewing?
      Displayed in individual lab setting?
   In your experience, which methods of using the digital images are most valuable?
   Did you expect anything that didn't occur/did things occur that you did not expect?
   What advantages did you anticipate? Were they realized? If not, why?
   What disadvantages did you anticipate? Did they come about? If not, do you know why?

Opportunities & Barriers:
What differences do you perceive between digital images and other visual resources?
Advantages/disadvantages of slides
Advantages/disadvantages of books, prints
Advantages/disadvantages of videos, CD's
Advantages/disadvantages of digital images online
Rank the following factors in your decision to use/not use digital images in teaching:
Image selection
Image quality
Text data
Cost of acquiring images
Delivery speed
Equipment/technical support
Tools
Expertise with the technology
Student opinion
Support
Copyright issues
Search functionality
Ease of access
Manipulability