



Art Museum Image Consortium
www.amico.org
Enabling Educational Use of Museum Multimedia

AMICO Annual Members Meeting Report
May 8-10, 2003

Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego
700 Prospect Street
La Jolla, CA



Art Museum Image Consortium
www.amico.org

Enabling Educational Use of Museum Multimedia

Attendance

Helen Abbott, Asia Society Museum
Leslie E. Abrams, University of California, San Diego
Kathe Albrecht, American University
Jacqueline Allen, Dallas Museum of Art
Nancy Allen ARTstor
Rachel Allen, Smithsonian American Art Museum
Daniel Amedei, National Gallery of Canada
David Bearman, Art Museum Image Consortium (AMICO)
Michael Brugnoli, The Cleveland Museum of Art
Maureen A. Burns, University of California, Irvine
Jeri Byrne, Beverly Hills Public Library
Charles Castle, Museum of Contemporary Art Sand Diego
Richard Cherry, Albright-Knox Art Gallery
Peter Cho, Luna Imaging, Inc.
Susan Chun, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Heather Cleary, Otis College of Art & Design
Eric Coburn, J. Paul Getty Museum
Michael Conforti, Sterling & Francine Clark Art Institute
Ann Copeland, The Pennsylvania State University
Anita Duquette, Whitney Museum of American Art
Mike Dust, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts
Ricky Erway, Research Libraries Group (RLG Inc.)
Cass A. Fey, Center for Creative Photography
Sofia Ganni, Art Museum Image Consortium (AMICO)
Tony Gill, ARTstor
Robert Hensleigh, The Detroit Institute of Arts
Andrew E. Hershberger, Bowling Green State University
Doug Hiwiller, The Cleveland Museum of Art
Sonia E. Janks, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
Michael Jenkins, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Kate Johnson, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts
Meira Josephy, Art Museum Image Consortium (AMICO)
Martha King, National Gallery of Canada
Diana Lada, Whitney Museum of American Art
Debra Lakind, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
Joanne Leese, Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego
Betty Marks, H.W. Wilson
Max MArmor, ARTstor
Meghan McQuaide Reiff, Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego
Marla Misunas, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
Emily A. Moerer, University of Virginia
Renée Montgomery, Los Angeles County Museum of Art
Dianne Nilsen, Center for Creative Photography
Cheryle T. Robertson, Los Angeles County Museum of Art

**AMICO Annual Members Meeting, May 8-10, 2003
Report**

Scott Sayre, Art Museum Image Consortium (AMICO)
Alan Seal, Victoria & Albert Museum
James Shulman, ARTstor
Tammy Sophinski Perlman, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts
Leonard Steinbach, The Cleveland Museum of Art
Linda Tadic, ARTstor
Terry Thiele, Luna Imaging, Inc.
Marcia Tiede, Center for Creative Photography
Jennifer Trant, Art Museum Image Consortium (AMICO)
Gretchen Wagner, ARTstor
Kris Wetterlund, Art Museum Image Consortium (AMICO)
William Ying, ARTstor
Anne Marie Zeppetelli, Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal



Art Museum Image Consortium
www.amico.org
Enabling Educational Use of Museum Multimedia

Annual Members Meeting
May 8-10, 2003

Museum of Contemporary Art San Diego
La Jolla, California

Final Report

Briefing Package: A package of background information was distributed prior to the meeting

1. Opening Plenary Session
10:30 am – noon

Following introductions, Jennifer Trant opened the meeting with a summary of AMICO's achievements in the past year. See the Briefing Package for a summary.

Trant then summarized the decisions of the AMICO Board meeting on Wednesday May 7, 2003. The Board met (with eleven of 13 Board members present or represented), to consider a proposal from Dr. Neil Rudenstine, chairman of the Board of ARTstor (an initiative of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation), for AMICO to fold the activities involved in building and distributing The AMICO Library™ into ARTstor by June 30, 2004.

To explain why the Board was considering such a proposal, Trant summarized the way that the landscape has changed, since ARTstor has become active (over the past two years.) ARTstor staff have visited many AMICO Members and other museums in the past year to explain what they see as the benefits of a documentation effort that goes beyond art in museums to art resources in libraries, archaeological sites, private collections, etc., and to describe the very large-scale and well-funded effort launched by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Understandably, many have found the idea of building such a broadly conceived resource in collaboration with the Mellon, especially with better funding than AMICO could ever get from subscription income, an attractive proposition.

ARTstor has also been active talking about its plans in the communities of library and university subscribers, where there is also considerable enthusiasm for a broader resource. The effect has been to reduce the enthusiasm of some AMICO Members to continue under the present arrangements. We've also had to scale back projections of future subscriptions to The AMICO Library, especially if such subscriptions are offered in direct competition with ARTstor. In short, The AMICO Library™ is seriously challenged as a product in a market with an as yet unseen, unscheduled and unpriced ARTstor resource. The current AMICO consortium is unlikely to survive in an environment in which some of its Members want to participate in ARTstor rather than AMICO.

There is much to be gained in working closely with ARTstor, to ensure museum content is available for education, to communicate that the concerns and values of museums, and to share the lessons we've learned in building AMICO. Therefore, in January, the Board instructed AMICO's executive staff to negotiate with ARTstor to find a form of collaboration of benefit to both organizations.

The Board discussed the proposal on its own, heard Neil Rudenstine present the proposal and discussed it with him and James Shulman, Executive Director of ARTstor.

Christine Steiner, AMICO's General Counsel, shared key aspects of the proposal letter with the AMICO Members present, so that all were aware of the offer.

Trant reported that the AMICO Board voted unanimously to accept ARTstor's generous offer with a few required elements, and asked to have all agreements needed to finalize this matter prepared by June 7, so that we could ensure a smooth transition between AMICO and ARTstor operations.

The points of emphasis in the AMICO Board's response were that:

- 1) AMICO Inc. will continue to exist
- 2) AMICO Inc.'s legal and financial obligations must all be fully satisfied
- 3) All works in ARTstor must be fully sourced.
- 4) The agreement must enable at least the current extent of K-12 distribution
- 5) AMICO Members would preserve the same terms of agreements with rights societies and the same terms for licensing their contributions of content for educational use
- 6) The agreement must provide assurance that subscriptions to The AMICO Library will be enabled to continue for full years from the time they are entered into throughout the period July 1 2003 to June 30 2004 through administrative arrangements that are as little disruptive as possible
- 7) Museums contributing to ARTstor must have free access to the resource, as they do to The AMICO Library™

The Board further voted to add an advisory opinion that the public access thumbnail catalog served an important function for museums, including that of directing requests for images to them and that they hoped this feature of rights requests would be preserved by ARTstor.

Trant reported that because AMICO expects that the negotiations will be pursued to a successful conclusion, ARTstor staff had been invited to join the AMICO Members meeting for the next few days to work with AMICO Members and staff to develop plans for the coming year. ARTstor staff present were introduced:

- James Shulman, Executive Director
- Gretchen Wagner, General Counsel
- Nancy Allen, Director, Museum Relations
- Tony Gill, Director, Metadata and Cataloging
- Linda Tadic, Director, Operations

Trant then invited ARTstor Executive Director James Shulman to introduce ARTstor to the group, outline its goals and explain why it was interested in working with AMICO.

1.1 ARTstor Presentation

James Shulman presented a short outline of ARTstor's organization, describing its goals, objectives and history. Those not present are referred to the ARTstor web site at <http://www.artstor.org> for background materials.

AMICO Members had many questions. Those of fact were answered by Shulman. Questions involving work methods or as-yet undetermined ARTstor processes were allocated to agendas for the committee meetings planned for Friday for further exploration. These are summarized below.

1.2 Questions raised by the ARTstor presentation

During the Question Period, Trant and Bearman collocated issues related to AMICO's various committees.

1.2.1 Rights Committee: ARTstor Related Questions

- How ARTstor will obtain licenses/permissions for contemporary works
- The quality of representations of artists' works
- The risks to participants, risk management, and potential benefits of collaboration
- ARTstor assisting with management of information about rights holders – a project being explored by AMICO
- Agreements needed with ARTstor to include Museum content
- The trust that artists have in activities and purposes of museums and how to maintain it.

1.2.2 Uses and Users Committee: ARTstor Related Questions

- The quality of copy-stand photography
- ARTstor's collection development strategy
- "Public Utility" responsibilities
- User testing and feedback loops for tools and technical approaches
- Architectures for multiple attributions including source data/authority
- Interfaces for different communities
- Content interoperation
- Subscription pricing
- K-12 community

1.2.3 Technical Committee: ARTstor Related Questions

- Trial access/functionality
- Technical characteristics of a public utility
- Tools- who is building/hosting – how will they be tested – will they depend on high speed networks
- Authoritative information from museums – how to show and privilege
- Distribution model and multiple interface tools
- Interoperability strategy
- How will contributing to ARTstor be the same as using AMICO's on CMS systems and standards including
- Open standards and processes
- Sharing mechanism – how to promote/support collaboration
- Publishing plans for ARTstor – standards and milestones
- Administrative metadata model + how used to track source of images

1.2.4 Editorial Committee: ARTstor Related Questions

- Metadata quality and sourcing

AMICO Annual Members Meeting, May 8-10, 2003 Report

- Standards for data/data dictionary
- “Correcting” or annotating data by object owner
- Choice of content to fund “collections development”
- Content interoperability with other content vendors
- Many collections model – does it scale? How is “collection” defined?
- Cross collection standards and metadata controls
- Role of ARTstor in enhancing metadata and the return of “enhanced” metadata to museums

1.3 Next Steps

In closing the morning session, Trant suggested that in light of the ARTstor proposal and its acceptance by the Board, committees should use the opportunity of the Members meeting to explore these issues with ARTstor Staff. Those present agreed.

Trant issued a challenge from the AMICO Board for the Members Meeting to help define ways that AMICO and ARTstor could integrate operations.

In adjourning for lunch, Trant noted that the afternoon session – focused on Users of The AMICO Library -- would be open to members of the public and that we expected guest from libraries and museums in California to attend.

2. AMICO User Presentations

2.1 Welcome

Jennifer Trant, Executive Director, AMICO, welcomed the visitors from museums and libraries in Southern California, and from AMICO Distributors RLG, Wilson and Cartography Associates. Trant noted that AMICO Members look forward to sessions such as this one, as they provide an opportunity to ‘look down the pipe’ and see what teachers, students and researchers are doing with the digital resources created in museums.

2.2 Dr. Andrew E. Hershberger, Assistant Professor of Contemporary Art History, Bowling Green State University, Ohio: “Teaching with AMICO Library Digital Images”

As an art history professor in Ohio, Hershberger presented from his experience using The AMICO Library through the OhioLINK Digital Media Center. He illustrated and discussed how he has incorporated The AMICO Library's digital images into all his lectures in a History of Photography course.

Hershberger decided to use PowerPoint to develop his lectures. As a young professor, he decided to “go digital” and not use slides at all. Using a specific course as an example, he analyzed the fundamental differences between teaching the history of photography course as opposed to teaching it digitally with The AMICO Library. With special emphasis on the importance that reliable high quality documentation plays in his instruction, he also praised the quantity and flexibility of AMICO Library images in a detailed review of their pedagogical value.

Dr. Hershberger's PowerPoint presentation is available at:
<http://www.amico.org/univ/docs/Hershberger.pdf>

Dr. Hershberger's Course website is available at: <http://personal.bgsu.edu/~aehersh/>

2.3 Ann Copeland, Special Collections Cataloging Librarian at Pennsylvania State University: The Visual Image User Study (VIUS) at The Pennsylvania State University

Penn State's Visual Image User Study (VIUS) is a large scale Mellon funded study conducting a rigorous needs assessment for a digital image delivery system at a large and complex university. Current and expected picture use in arts, humanities, and environmental studies (more than 70 academic departments) is being studied. A broad variety of measures have been employed.

Copeland referred to the interim report on the VIUS study available at:
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/crsweb/vius>

Findings to date emphasize to the following:

- The large number of people in a variety of disciplines using pictures in their work (75% of responding faculty and 55% of responding students)
- Content is their chief concern
- The widespread maintenance of picture collections by individuals (44% of the faculty and 44% of students who use pictures)
- The desire to use personal collections in combination with those supplied by a delivery system
- Searching preferences associated with researchers and independent learners as opposed to those associated with teachers

Ms. Copeland's PowerPoint presentation is available at:
<http://www.amico.org/univ/docs/Copeland.pdf>

2.4 Jennifer Trant and David Bearman, AMICO, Preliminary Results of the AMICO Online User Survey 2003

After a short coffee break, the group resumed to hear a preliminary report by AMICO Executive Director Jennifer Trant and David Bearman, (Director, Strategy and Research) on the Online Study of AMICO Users currently underway.

Bearman and Trant noted that this study was based closely on studies undertaken by the Museum Educational Site Licensing Project (MESL) in 1996 and then run again in the AMICO University Testbed in 1998/9 in order to ensure that longitudinal data would be available. They reviewed the responses to individual questions and presented a few cross-tabulations by distributor showing different responses to The AMICO Library by those receiving it from different sources.

In the end, Trant and Bearman asked AMICO Members for input on what follow-on analysis should be undertaken when the data were more complete.

Their PowerPoint presentation, summarizing preliminary results, is available at:
<http://www.amico.org/univ/docs/AMICOUsersSurvey030508.pdf>

3. Redefining the Agenda

The second day of the Members Meeting opened with a reminder that in light of the acceptance of the ARTstor proposal by the Board, committees should use the day discuss operational issues with ARTstor Staff. The AMICO Board has challenged the Members Meeting to help define ways that AMICO and ARTstor could integrate operations.

To facilitate discussions, each committee was asked to address four questions:

- 1) What have we learned/achieved?
- 2) What accomplishments would we like to take forward?
- 3) What would we change in the future?
- 4) What could we do with ARTstor in the coming year, and beyond?

The preliminary agendas that appeared in the Member's Briefing Package were put aside, insofar as they represented an immediate course of action, and the groups were to focus on the ways to implement collaboration.

The group spent the rest of the day in three break-out sessions:

- Rights, (joined by James Shulman, Executive Director and Gretchen Wagner, General Counsel, ARTstor)
- Users (joined by Nancy Allen, Director, Museum Services, ARTstor)
- Editorial/Technical (joined by Tony Gill, Director of Metadata, ARTstor)

AMICO Members expressed their thanks to ARTstor for hosting dinner for Meeting participants on Friday evening.

4. Committee Meeting Reports

The committees met for a full day on Friday. Reported on the morning of the final day of the AMICO Members Meeting.

4.1 Rights Committee Meeting Report

The Rights Committee was joined by James Shulman, Executive Director and Gretchen Wagner, General Counsel of ARTstor and AMICO General Counsel Christine Steiner.

In its morning session, the Rights Committee meeting did not directly address the questions posed by Jennifer Trant. Rather, Martha King (National Gallery of Canada), as the chair, called on each member to express their concerns and questions, and David Bearman (acting as scribe) recorded the points they made with respect to the four questions that had been asked.

4.1.1 What have we learned/achieved?

- Defined what we needed to protect and types of agreement
- Cleared rights for AMICO (but these are not transferable)
- Developed a rights request method – the on-line form
- Resolved rights issues in an internationally acceptable way
- Provided instruction in proper use of rights
- Enabled the administration of estates by those museums with rights
- Established widely accepted licensing terms for subscribers
- Created citation models
- Learned that some artists are still wary, but that we can leave these and come back to them later
- Created standard letters, forms of permission, etc. for the museums to use
- Determined that contemporary art is crucial to include Agreement we must invest in multimedia delivery and its rights
- We can create a legitimate way to acquire rights to works of art to use in digital libraries

- Agreed to protect moral rights in agreements

4.1.2 What accomplishments would we like to take forward?

- Means for preserving copyrights of museums and artists
- Relationships built up between artists and museums and the role of museums in protecting artists' interests
- Established price/rules for rights acquisition for educational use
- Rights to use works of art on museums' Web sites
- Payment to individual artists for educational publishing
- Equal standards of content, quality and treatment
- Models of relationships between all players in the process
- Terms of agreements: Membership (license for content inclusion) and Subscriber (for each institution type)
- Respect for Third party rights

4.1.3 What would we change in the future?

- Continuing negotiations begun with Canadian rights societies
- Pursue models and frameworks with other rights societies (Magma, Sound recording, etc.)
- Develop ways to continue to work with artists who have declined previous requests
- Expand the development and licensing of derivative educational material being developed by Museums
- Develop means of responding to slide library "bulk" rights requests as they move into digitization

4.1.4 What could we do with ARTstor?

- Maintain museums' relationships with artists (respect delicate negotiations in the past)
- State explicitly how we would expect rights to be cleared and managed
- Ensure control by museums over what works from the museums appear in ARTstor
- Museum role in content planned for ARTstor from secondary sources
- Create a process for clearing rights with museums and artists
- Find way to ask museums for permission to use content in secondary and tertiary sources once licensed to publishers
- Address problem of artists whose works in museum where there is some agreement but not digital/educational rights
- Share method and costs of dealing with those for whom rights have been cleared
- Find way for institutional priorities and workflow need to be enabled
- Explore ways to take on areas with complex copyright problems
- Agree on how non-copyright cleared works will be treated by ARTstor
- Establish a means to stage release of works within ARTstor for museum review.

Having made this extensive list of concerns, and heard James Shulman and Gretchen Wagner address some of them, the committee broke for lunch.

In the afternoon session, the group reflected on the many Intellectual Property barriers in the way of incorporating The AMICO Library into ARTstor.

- Agreements between museums and AMICO for content would have to be renegotiated to be between ARTstor and museums.

- Agreements between Rights Societies and AMICO for content would have to be renegotiated to be between ARTstor and the Rights Societies.
- Agreements between museums and artists would have to be reopened to enable works approved for The AMICO Library to be used in ARTstor. (This could be problematic if it was not possible to assure artists or their estates/representatives that all works in this resource would be cleared.)
- Many members present felt that they could not see how their museums could participate within ARTstor given these barriers.

As one possible scenario in response to all these concerns, the group discussed again the possibility of keeping The AMICO Library as an integral entity within ARTstor.

The Rights Committee continued its discussions under this assumption making substantial headway on the questions of taking its accomplishments forward.

4.2 Users and Uses Committee Report

The Users Committee was joined by Nancy Allen of ARTstor. Anne Copeland from Penn State, also participated for the morning session.

The committee addressed the four questions.

4.2.1 What have we learned/achieved?

To come up to speed on past accomplishments the Committee reviewed the AMICO Uses and Users Committee Web site (<http://members.amico.org/comm/users/users.html>). (There is also material to support users on the AMICO public web site linked from <http://www.amico.org/use.html>).

- **How to AMICO**
AMICO has also developed a “How to AMICO” guide for users of The AMICO Library, including teachers, librarians, and educators in Member Museums. Versions of the guide exist for users of the RLG interface (more detailed), and those using other interfaces. The Guide includes instructions on how to integrate images into PowerPoint, and how to search The AMICO Library.
- **User Feedback**
Users of The AMICO Library are encouraged to offer feedback to AMICO Members. There is an AMICO comment button in some AMICO Distributors’ applications, and a Comments Form attached to The AMICO Library Public Web Site that allows users to comment instantly on works of art in the Library or features and functions of the various distributors.
- **Suggest-a-Work**
Methods have been developed for users to suggest works for future inclusion in The AMICO Library. These suggestions are logged by AMICO and sent to Members on a regular basis. Where possible, AMICO Members have committed to including these works in future contributions
- **AMICO Update**
AMICO has been issuing a newsletter, summarizing activities and profiling Users and Members.

- **User Statistics**

AMCIO Members receive statistics regarding use of The AMICO Library. Some statistics are available from some distributors. AMICO staff is working on gathering statistics from all distributors in a consistent format and developing integrated reports.

- **User Sessions at Annual Members Meetings**

Presentations by users have become a regular part of the annual AMICO Members meeting, ensuring a venue for face-to-face interaction with AMICO Library Users. Yesterday's presentations carried on a tradition that began with the University Testbed, and continued with the report of the K-12 Testbed last year.

- **Users Group Meetings**

Regular meetings of AMICO Library users are now being held at professional associations where users gather. Meetings this year took place at the College Art Association (CAA), Visual Resources Association (VRA) and Art Libraries Association (ARLIS).

- **Textbook Survey**

Major Art History textbooks, including architecture and photography, have been surveyed and lists of illustrated works from AMICO Member museums developed. Lists were sent to AMICO Member Museums for inclusion in The AMICO Library. Most were then included in future AMICO contributions.

- **Model Assignments**

A series of model assignments have been developed to assist teachers with rethinking teaching methods to integrate resources such as The AMICO Library.

- **Model Uses of The AMICO Library in Museums**

Model uses of The AMICO Library in Member Museums are being gathered, beginning with using the Library to train docents at two member museums. Plans to share these models with AMICO Members are underway.

- **Awards for Use in Education**

Plans are underway to award exemplary use of The AMICO Library in the fora of the major professional organizations of AMICO Library Users: the College Art Association (CAA), Art Libraries Association (ARLIS), Visual Resources Association (VRA) and National Art Educators Association (NAEA). Current thinking is that AMICO will assist with conference attendance and award winners will present their uses at conferences in order to share ideas for using digital materials in the classroom.

4.2.2 What accomplishments would we like to take forward?

- **Maintain consistent access terms and conditions**

ARTstor users should receive the same access rights, restrictions and privileges that AMICO Library users receive, as specified in the current license agreements. The User Committee agreed that the current AMICO Library license agreements designated users in an appropriate manner that would also serve ARTstor users.

- **Maintain the User Feedback Loop**

ARTstor should maintain a user feedback loop, by collecting immediate feedback and through formal evaluation of users. Communicating the results of user feedback and

evaluation back to users and contributing museums creates a continuous loop of information, helping all parties to understand and use the resource to its full potential.

- Encourage the distribution of contextual information

ARTstor should support contributions of educational materials generated by art museums to provide context and interpretation for works of art. The User Committee has just begun work on soliciting contributions of education materials from AMICO Member Museums, and all agreed they'd like to see this initiative carried forward.

- Serving K-12

The Uses and User Committee determined that the primary and secondary school community is fundamental to the mission of AMICO Member Museums, and service to this community must be preserved. Much funding for education and technology in art museums increasingly requires that K-12 is served (cf. IMLS, Technical Opportunity Grants through the Department of Commerce, and the federal Department of Education).

4.2.3 What would we change in the future?

- Define the nature of a public utility

During James Shulman's presentation, ARTstor was referred to as a "public utility." The User Committee agreed to attempt to list the qualities desirable of a public utility in order to provide ARTstor a set of service goals that might be agreeable for both parties. The User Committee maintained that a public utility must be reasonably priced, accessible, inclusive, accountable, provide service (in this case to students, teachers, scholars and museum professionals) and provide products and services of a quality deserving of the public trust.

- Communicate sources of information

Members of the User Committee agreed that ARTstor should present records in a way that represents the authority of museums as the source. While specifics of this arrangement may be taken up by the Technical or other AMICO Committees, it was agreed that creating records that acknowledge the museum as the data source recognizes a scholarly hierarchy in information authority.

4.2.4 What could we do with ARTstor?

- Maintain current subscribers and users

Current Subscribers to The AMICO Library should be supported, and their access to museum multimedia preserved. We shouldn't go backwards.

- Subject indexing

Committee agreed that all user communities, and especially K-12, would benefit from an image library that supported searches by subject and theme.

- Recognize Exemplary Use

An award program to recognize exemplary use should be carried forward. This should include museum participation.

4.3 Editorial and Technical Committees (joint meeting)

The Technical and Editorial Committees met together to discuss issues in producing The AMICO Library. They were joined by Tony Gill, Director, Metadata and Cataloging, ARTstor.

4.3.1 What have we achieved?

- How to share data
AMICO has developed a sustainable contribution management system (<http://update.amico.org>). From the Members' side getting data to one central place works. Learning how to submit data was important. In the museum world nothing like this has been happening on an on-going basis despite many "projects". To do this needed to define:
 - a. How to format and process contributions
 - b. Feedback in-house
 - a. Improved local practices resulted from contributing
 - b. Clean-up data when sec it differently
 - c. Standards for digitizing images, describing works
 - a. Ripple through organization
 - d. Tools to support contribution
 - a. Structural validation
 - b. CMS Export
 1. pushed vendors (good thing because we want to get data out for other reasons)
 - c. Data validation
 1. Of record structure (are these really valid field tags used according to the specification)
 2. Of content in fields against particular term lists
 - d. Data separated into displays and indexing
 - e. Data Indexing and Parsing
 1. Display dates into indexing fields
 2. Names, Cultures indexed
 3. Materials, techniques and measurement possible.

The group then discussed each of these areas in more detail.

- Data exchange Format
Represents an agreement on the data structure. It's flexible and has changed when it needs to. It's been published continuously. Changes that have been needed have been immediately communicated to group.

The Transmission format works. It could be better, but it represents a practical approach that has held up over 5 annual cycles.

- a. Changing this is hard. We've all struggled to get to this point
Record format could be improved
Logical structure is sound. Some fields could be parsed further into components if necessary to support functionality (e.g. Related Documents)
 - b. XML is possible
Training needed for transition
Industrial tools could help
- Tools for Contribution and Data Validation
Creation of tools enabled data from multiple sources be integrated. Online access at <http://update.amico.org> to the Contribution Management System allowed Members to contribute, and to learn what was happening with their data once it was contributed.

These are of two types: Data Value validation and Data Structure validation.

Structural validation forced museums to look hard at their own data and to develop close relationships with CMS companies to produce appropriate export formats (AMICO pushed vendors for CMS export)

Data Value validation was built on the premise of separating data display and indexing, so we never changed curators' information, just improved access to it.

Object type, cultures and names and dates are subjected to data value validation (could do measurements, materials and techniques). Our goal is to enhance retrieval.

Tony Gill asked how current validation strategies work. Jennifer and Susan Chun explained that exporting data in a format consistent with the import format was difficult for even large museums. In general, AMICO's philosophy has been that museums are not forced to change internal processes, but over time it has encouraged museums to develop capabilities to export data from their systems. "Validated" values are index terms assigned to records that retain the display values assigned by curators. Jennifer gave an explanation of the how validation process worked in the parsing of dates, and highlighted some things which could be done.

The process allowed AMICO Members to look at the problems everyone had and explore ways to solve them. It was based on the proviso of that museums not be required to change their processes.

- Integration across departments.
Processes in institutions have to reflect global interaction and so standards ripple down throughout the organization. Workflow re-engineering is part of the challenge of getting better return from digital investments. We're now thinking about Collections Management Systems in a broader, more interactive way.
 - a. Reconsidering local practices such as abbreviations, documentation conventions, in a more global environment.
 - b. Have good data now to support internal functions
 - c. Value in seeing other collections recognized in many places in museum.
- Improved use and usability of collections
AMICO Library allows museum staff to use our own collections differently as well as provides access to other collections.
 - d. Museum staff use own collection in different ways
 - a. Exposure for unknown works
 - b. Visibility of collections enables other uses
 - c. Rights and repro looked after, so we can do real things
 - d. ARS and VAGA agreements make it possible to use material
 - e. Additional users find things in AMICO
 - a. Network of contacts and connections
 - a. Validation of strategies used at home
 - b. Input to process to be sure it works for all Members
 - c. Regular focus of activity in contribution process made the theory real.
 - d. Position with other organizations reinforced
 - e. Original high level commitment helped
- Benefits of shared product and development cycle
Being required to make a contribution has build a pool of skills that otherwise would not have existed.

- a. Quota is a driver for digitization
 - b. Commitment to contribute ensures continuity
 - c. Allows content of other departments (education, etc.) to be linked in and promoted
 - d. Curators who resisted in the clean up effort now have clean records
 - e. Museums are always thinking about reuse of media for AMICO (and other things)
- Ability to leverage your institution by contributing.
There are lots of projects competing for resources but the museum itself uses the resource so they are investing in it. Forces the museums to get stuff out in a regular organized fashion.
 - a. Increased the quantity of high quality digital images without watermarking, curatorial involvement
 - b. Coming across things not in the canon which are interesting and found interesting and things which would never have been published. Serendipitous learning. Finally a place to publish delicate or less popular works.
 - c. Built in distribution system
 - d. Can link exhibition titles which allow you to link this work to other works. Hyperlink allows you to connect things (this is a place for improvement as well.)
 - e. Historically museums have had to target an audience. With AMICO we can contribute information which is interesting to a range of audiences (MMA's Timeline of History which is educationally beneficial but is not scholarly in nature or teacher's packets)
 - Philosophical agreement is very strong.
Work hard to meet the deadline because there is recognition that this is a commitment which reflects on the group on the whole.
 - There are ways to collectively solve rights problems
The exposure in AMICO takes a burden off Rights and Reproduction departments since little questions which take up so much research time can be answered through this resource.
 - a. Secondary benefit is monetary as these works are exposed to the public who will want to see and use things.
 - b. Members benefit - VAGA and ARS agreements make it possible to use this material.
 - We can enable broad publication of our collections
As editors we are able to choose whatever we want to publish. It's a whole new method of publishing.
 - a. The publishing model allows you to put things which in other models you would not necessarily publish. (multiple titles, historical photos..)
 - b. Museums don't have to make hard choices of what to include as in a publication. There is room for - Depth, color, opinion -
 - c. AMICO extends the life of content and reaches public for a longer period of time as well as reaches a wider public.
 - d. The web makes people feel personally connected and so there is much more feedback.
 - e. Museum "private" websites probably wouldn't drive publication of as much data because they have other agendas too.
 - Information has many uses
Being involved in AMICO has allowed us to think about multiple uses when planning

any one type of resource. Forced internally to locate these resources in many departments. Workflow restructuring grew from this in some institutions

- a. Audio tours can be written so that they can be used as standalone audio features.
 - b. Bibliographic system links can be created in museum records. Library records/text can be related (like at Albright Knox).
 - c. While planning any data recording we already think about how it can be used in AMICO.
 - d. Discovering that users like links to other artists has made museums think about this. AMICO involvement has also led museums to think about links to artists info/content.
- Collaboration is a valuable strategy.
We've accepted the importance of international collaboration and with it realized the need for a program to deal effectively with content in multiple languages. Actual methods for this still under development.

4.3.2 What have we learned?

- It's possible!
- Developing new audiences, reached in untraditional ways, is an investment in the future of our Museums
- The annual contribution targets drive activity.
- Value in diversity. We discovered that everyone has a different system and ways of doing things, which was good.
- Big museums learned that small organizations sometimes have insight into the best ways of doing things
- Learn about different types of best practices. Processes can be adopted not invented.
- Technical skills can be shared/learned
- Need to improve in-house training, infrastructure, tools.
- Museums need to find out where all the information they create "lives" and how to extract/integrate it
- Strengths and weaknesses of our data. We have learned about weaknesses of data and how to straighten them out
- Data can be created with multiple uses in mind (for use inside and out)
- That secretiveness of museums is not necessarily a good thing
- Practical focus assures on-going activity
- Allows us to think of other consortiums which could be formed based on good experiences
- Need to care about copyright
- Discovered that people found value in AMICO and The AMICO Library. That was not something we were sure about at the start and is a great achievement. "People want it and more of it"

4.3.3 What would we like to take forward?

- Quality (How do we define it? We may not be sure, but we must continue to strive for it.)
- Image quality – the highest we can deliver is possible and valuable

- Museums need to have the ability to validate/edit the descriptions of their collections. It's part of their custodial responsibility.
- Requirements for ongoing contributions (useful motivator)
- The ability to preview works within AMICO's system, and review them as they appear to end-users in the subscription environment, is critical to building museum trust
- Maintaining standards is important. Having museums play a role in developing the specifications is a valuable learning experience. Publishing specs is a contribution to the field
- A system of periodic updating, allowing for enhancement of works and for the withdrawal if necessary of works with problems, is crucial (if necessary)
- A broad reach to the market is a major benefit. It would be travesty to lose the audience/user community we already have
- It is important that the museums have the ability to publish full range of content and to maintain control of what is published (audio, video, web links, related teaching materials)
- There is value in a variety of ways of viewing the data (interfaces); distribution should accommodate different types of users
- Maintaining separation between display and indexing content has vastly contributed to information quality. Seeing content in different environments makes people see it differently.
- Supporting committees and listservs has been valuable to maintaining momentum and sense of connection. Meetings face to face and committees support "cross pollination"
- The Thumbnail Catalog has proved valuable in many way and should be continued

4.3.4 What should be changed or improved?

1. Institutional Support for Data Management
 - a. Contribution system still needs work at the institution level
 - b. How institutions are keeping their records can always be improved
 - c. There are repositories in institutions which will never be parts of Collections Management; we need to find ways to mine this info (e.g. Quark files etc.) Tools are needed. We also need a broke rage for this information when its about other collections for this.
2. Extended data model
 - a. Information that not just about one work
 - i. Content, styles, artists, groups
 - ii. Wall labels from exhibitions with context.
3. Highlight Multimedia content and develop it
 - a. Ways to gather this information throughout the institution

- b. A distribution system that had better flagging mechanism so that users could more readily see changes and updates to records
4. Improved cataloging at the collective level that can be fed back to museums
 - a. Subject cataloging (fundamental for K-12, interdisciplinary but its very complicated because of how people use subject headings). THIS would be an interesting project to staff.
 - b. Need standards and priorities for their implementation, based on users needs.
 - c. Give enhanced data back to contributors
 - d. Indexing by styles movements and periods could be valuable
 - e. Funding for these things
5. Improved Contribution Management System
 - a. Implement enhancements proposed previously and put on hold (like Creator Reference File)
 - b. Support types of information which currently can't be submitted
 - c. Rolling contributions, more dynamically distributed and more instantaneously accessible (if this can be supported in rights and licensing terms).
 - d. More feedback about information quality (like miss-oriented images)
 - e. Contribution system connections to internal collection management with tools that allow you to control the mapping.
6. New Tools
 - a. Assess new technologies that might support museum processes. Fund exploratory studies, in areas such as Natural language queries
 - b. Develop data mining tools for publication files
 - c. Implement XML tools for data export, integration, enhancement

4.3.5 What could be done with ARTstor?

Support Contributions

1. All of the above things about contribution, update and enhancement of Museum documentation.
2. Finding a means to acquire information from print publications (e.g. Weston guide or Met publications). Tools to support this and link publishing information to the collections records.
3. Developing methods with/for museums using XML
 - How hard would it be to change to XML? Are willing, need tools, training. It would take a while for the museums to get everyone to that stage. Allow museums to use tools available and think of ways to contribute more. Commercial tools would need to be adapted and decisions made as to when these tools should be used.

Maintain momentum

- Define where we are going. It isn't clear that the museums would participate unless they have a clear idea of what is ARTstor going to do
 - a. Continue to contribute; regularly
 - b. Maintain a voice

- a. Find ways to keep a voice without membership and having a voice that matters
 - c. Include Museum Members in ARTstor testbed
 - a. Build agenda for testbed
 - b. Meet over time and learn from it
 - d. Maintain committees and have them have a voice on the advisory group. Have an advocate from each committee on the board. Ensure active participation of ARTstor relevant staff person on the committee
 - e. Formal development of mechanism for collections development projects
 - f. Process for defining, developing, and testing tools
- Define what next year will be like
- A commitment from ARTstor that there will be a 2004 contribution would show good faith on both sides

Support Museum distribution of data about their collections

- Identify methods to address UCSD slide collection (and Carnegie Survey)
- Museums would like to review and correct documentation about works from their collections represented in these sources. Assuming that ARTstor wished to support this, the following outline of the process was developed.
- a. Museums need to know which works are in these collections
 - i. Rough lists of works in the UCSD collection, taken from their public catalog, were circulated. The numbers seemed manageable to do in the next year.
 - ii. NEED TOOL for locating UCSD record and associate with accession numbers.
 - iii. Would AMICO members have access to the whole ARTstor database? This would be preferable, as there are also works not attributed to collections when published.
 - iv. Problem: Don't always have collection information in ARTstor.
 - v. Problem: Works often cited as in Museum's collections when they aren't.
 - b. Tony Gill noted that ARTstor wants to know what's the best way to match UCSD slides to museum collections?
 - i. Image matching technologies might work
 - ii. Could there be provision of tools to museums to review these?
 - c. Museums wish quality representations of works to be given primacy in the display for Users, to ensure that the work is represented in the best way possible.
 - i. Information in records should not be 'combined'. Source should always be discernable. Museum reviewed description and image should be found first. E.g. If a museum contributed an image for work shown in a slide in UCSD library this would be displayed before the image scanned from the slide taken from the book
 - ii. Other data would be available as supplemental information about the work.
 - iii. All data about a work would be sourced, so it is possible to know if information came from the museum or from a publication.
 - iv. All images should be sourced so it is clear image came from and if it represents original photography or a reproduction from a publication.
 - v. Additional information assigned by cataloguers (in the slide library) could also be sourced and integrated. Could Subject Cataloging, for instance, be given back to the museums?

- vi. Compound Record Structure Assumed, that enabled different sources of information to be merged in a single record about a work. A diagram was developed that mocked this up.
- d. Need to view review of outside data as a publication with internal museum editorial process
- e. Potential problems
 - i. Will there be financial support from ARTstor to update the images and information?
 - ii. Goal is not to have bad images. There should be a petitioning process for museums to ask to remove bad images. The possibility should extend to having things removed from the slide library
 - iii. When a museum hasn't reviewed a work that is in the UCSD collection, will there be an indication that museum is trying to do so? (NOTE: Catalog records which museums aren't willing to release yet whereas UCSD has some type of record. Might be a title that would never be used by the museum etc. Question of what's possible in institutional context.)
 - iv. IF UCSD has the wrong information will reflect badly on the museums. It will be the museums that the users contact for corrections. Need to be able to edit the records like in AMICO and you can see when you did it.
 - v. Need to be able to update information, with the old data when information changes (attributions, titles, dates, ...)

What might be lost if we don't articulate it now?

- Sense of commitment to on-going contributions
- Value of publication process in creation of collective work
- Responsibility for content
 - a. Control of Data Presentation
 - b. Trust in resource
 - c. Value of accuracy, fidelity
- Focus on description of Works of Art, not images (key to record structure, strategy for regular increments and enhancements)
- Museums saying we will take responsibility of the quality of the data.

5. Working Agendas for the Coming Year

Following the reports of the committees, the group as a whole reviewed the recommendations and defined an action agenda for the coming year.

We agreed to prepare agendas that assumed a close collaboration between AMICO and ARTstor throughout 2003/4 with the aim of making The AMICO Library™ available within ARTstor.

5.1 Rights Agenda

If The AMICO Library™ is made available within ARTstor, then the committee recommended a number of areas of common activity it could pursue.

1. Share information about rights holders and representatives. Develop a Rights Holders Database.
 - a. Opt in for representative's full contact information
 - b. Otherwise list only the museum representative that has the contact information
 - c. All information in the system should be dated and sourced

2. Continue to negotiate with artist/estates independently where they aren't represented by ARS/VAGA
3. Explore separate agreements with Rights Societies in Canada
4. Explore how the Independent Scholar Agreement might work for future alumni activities such as at Princeton
5. Make agreements for publicity use of AMICO works available to Members

If rights need to be renegotiated for ARTstor, the full effort of rights staff would likely be engaged in trying to obtain or clear rights for this new use.

5.2 Users and Uses Agenda

1. Add more educational materials to The AMICO Library
 - a. Content included in The AMICO Library
 - b. Content on Museum Web sites, linked to works in The AMICO Library
 - c. Each Member agreed to submit at least one example for the 2004 contribution
 - d. These examples might include works from other collections, to enable us to explore the potential inter-relationships.
2. Distributors should be urged to indicate the presence of multimedia in AMICO Library works, and provide direct access to multimedia files
3. Statewide initiatives should be encouraged particularly in relationship to the member museums in those areas. Different approaches might work in different places: OH, AZ, NY.
 - a. Teacher guides for use of The AMICO Library
 - b. General strategies for using art in many areas of the curriculum
4. Conference presentations, user training, featured uses all build constituency
5. Include AMICO Content in the ARTstor Testbed, so that we can study the relationship between museum content and content from other sources. Include AMICO Members as users.
6. Continue to study user needs and solicit user input.
7. Promote exemplary uses (for example, through awards).

5.3 Editorial Agenda

The following suggestions assumed a move towards full integration of AMICO processes within ARTstor production.

1. AMICO Members will ensure that the works in ARTstor (UCSD and Carnegie Collections) are in The AMICO Library (i.e. contributed in the next year if not there already)
 - a. Preliminary lists of works from UCSD were circulated. These were based on the public catalog, and are not definitive. Full lists and a process to support this work are needed.
2. Ensure consistent descriptions of Educational Materials
 - a. Develop guidelines for describing multimedia
 - b. Relate to other ongoing educational standards efforts (e.g. IMS if relevant)
3. Promote the "Suggest a Work" tool to ensure content needed by users is available.
 - a. Follow-up on History of Photography lacunae to fill in the gaps in this subject area
4. Enable incorporation of museum publications information into the digital record
 - a. Develop a "Publication harvesting" (print material to XML) tool
5. Rigorously index by Style and period (based on Textbook Survey)
6. Complete work on Creator Reference File
 - a. Creator Name

- b. Creator Culture
- 7. Explore Subject Cataloging with ARTstor
 - a. Share different strategies and approaches
 - b. Inclusive vocabulary that enables a range of uses
 - c. Collaborative implementation
 - d. Ensure data flow back to Museums
 - e. Consider automatic indexing tools?

5.4 Technical Agenda

The following suggestions assumed a move towards full integration of AMICO processes with ARTstor production.

1. Support museum contribution to and review of ARTstor data
 - b. Develop a tool to report material ARTstor plans to publish and to accept Museum input
 - c. Develop tool for temporarily removing problematic works from ARTstor (while they undergo museum review)
2. Continue to support the contribution process
 - a. Make CMS enhancements
 - b. Enable changes or additions to be made in the Contribution Management System to groups of records (without having to resubmit the entire record)
 - c. Develop a batch update tool (to change all values in one field based on a condition)
 - d. Develop tool to add one field of data (such as Related Documents Group) to many records, using a tab-delimited file as input
 - e. Develop functionality with ARTstor
3. Support Users integration content into local systems
 - a. Make an export to PowerPoint or (better) develop PowerPoint type of teaching presentation tools
4. Move to XML as an option for Data Transfer Syntax
 - a. Met, V&A, Albright Knox interested in participating initially in tests
 - b. Work with CIMI as basic DTD
 - c. Collaborate with vendors (Gallery Systems has expressed interest)
 - d. Explore process of import – transform – export
 - e. Examine available tools
5. Develop at least a second language interface (French?) with ARTstor
 - a. Musée d'art contemporain and other Canadians willing to assist

6. Submission Deadlines

AMICO Members agreed to adopt the same schedules for 2004 submissions as were in effect in 2003, assuming that ARTstor would welcome museum contributions. This would be confirmed as soon as possible. The group agreed that September would be the latest time notice should be given.

October 30, 2003: Contribution Lists

Feb. 1, 2004: Core Data

March 1, 2004: Final Data

7. 2004 Meeting

Members agreed to accept an invitation from the Art Gallery of Ontario (AGO) and to plan for a meeting in early June 2004 in Toronto, Canada. This meeting could be one that also included other contributors to ARTstor.