



**Art Libraries Society of North America
and the Visual Resources Association**

Joint Task Force on Collaboration

**Final Report
February 2008**

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Charge	3
Approach to Charge.....	3
ARLIS/NA & VRA: Commonalities and Differences	4
ARLIS/NA-VRA Collaboration: Past and Current Examples	6
Engagement with Affinity Organizations.....	8
Collaborative Prospects & Recommendations	10
Acknowledgments.....	12
Conclusion	12
Appendices	14
A: ARLIS/NA & VRA Structural Commonalities and Differences	14
B: Member Survey Results	22
C: Existing and Potential Affiliates.....	30
D: Minutes from the Meeting with Members at the 2007 VRA Conference.....	36
E: Minutes from the Meeting with Members at the 2007 ARLIS/NA Conference.....	39

**Art Libraries Society of North America and the Visual Resources Association
Joint Task Force on Collaboration
Final Report
February 2008**

INTRODUCTION

The Executive Boards of ARLIS/NA and VRA convened the Joint Task Force on Collaboration in response to lively discussions held on the listservs of both organizations in 2006. These threads initially appeared on the ARLIS-L as a dialog about the relationships between ARLIS/NA and its chapters. The topic quickly turned to the reciprocal membership privileges between ARLIS/NA and the VRA. Soon the discussion was occurring on both listservs, and evolved into a broader conversation about the nature of the two organizations and the potential for greater collaboration between them. The Task Force, comprising members Greta Bahnemann, K. Meghan Gross, Amy A. McKenna, Co-chair Elaine Paul, Brian P. Shelburne, and Co-chair Edward Teague began its work in the winter of 2007.

CHARGE

“To study the relationship between ARLIS/NA and the VRA, analyzing the overlap of interests as well as areas of uniqueness focusing on the organizational structures of the two associations and recommending collaborative possibilities. The Task Force will gather information from the memberships of the VRA and ARLIS/NA through open fora, surveys, focus group sessions, interviews, and other appropriate means. Finally the Task Force will look at other organizations with interests related to those of ARLIS/NA and the VRA to explore the concept of creating a federation of affiliated societies and associations. A federation would pull like groups together more often for conferences, workshops, or other appropriate joint ventures. Different than a merger, a federation provides opportunities for similar groups to work together more formally than is done now.”

APPROACH TO CHARGE

The Task Force used several mechanisms to collect data about the two organizations and current and potential affiliate organizations, as well as important feedback from the members of ARLIS/NA and VRA. We investigated each organization’s history, mission, bylaws, demographics, structure, and affiliations. Member feedback was gathered by monitoring both listservs, creating an online survey open to members of both organizations, holding open meetings at the VRA and ARLIS/NA annual conferences, directly communicating with chairs of committees and regional chapters, and engaging in one-on-one discussions with members throughout the year.

Existing Historical, Structural, and Demographic Data

The Task Force examined existing data about each organization’s history, mission, bylaws, demographics, structure, and affiliations. The *2006-2007 VRA Professional Status Survey*, with preliminary results posted on the VRA website, and the *ARLIS/NA 2004 Art/Architecture Librarians and Visual Resource Professionals Compensation Survey* both provided us with valuable information about the two professions (see Appendix A for a table comparing the structural commonalities and differences between the two organizations; see Appendix C for a table containing existing and potential organizational affiliates).

Member Survey

The Task Force created an online survey to solicit feedback from members. There were 95 respondents whose answers were anonymous unless individuals chose to identify themselves. While 95 self-selecting respondents do not represent a statistically valid cross-section of both organizations, their responses nevertheless echoed much of what the Task Force heard through other means of data gathering and provided strong anecdotal evidence that a majority of ARLIS/NA and VRA members wish to see more collaborative efforts develop in the coming years (see Appendix B for a table of Member Survey responses).

Meetings

The Task Force held open meetings at the annual conferences of both the VRA and ARLIS/NA. We met with VRA conference attendees in Kansas City on March 27, 2007 and with ARLIS/NA conference attendees in Atlanta on April 28, 2007. The structure of the two meetings consisted of an introduction of the Task Force and its mission, a

summary of the approach the Task Force was taking to its charge, followed by an open discussion. Both meetings were well attended, dynamic, and informative, with important and frank insights shared by longtime and new members alike (see Appendices D and E for the minutes from each of these meetings).

Communications with Regional Chapter Chairs

E-mail inquiries were sent to the regional chapter chairs of both organizations regarding the frequency and nature of joint chapter meetings and other activities between regional chapters of ARLIS/NA, the VRA and other affiliated groups. This is discussed further in the section below titled "ARLIS/NA-VRA Collaboration: Past and Current Examples."

What We Lacked

While ARLIS/NA has gathered data about membership in other organizations during the registration process for some time, it has not archived this information from year to year. VRA has just begun to collect this information during its registration process for 2008, therefore we lacked demographic data on the number of VRA members belonging to other organizations, except the data provided by ARLIS/NA (see Appendix A).

ARLIS/NA & VRA COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Organizational Histories

In 1982 Wolfgang Freitag discussed the two separate branches of art librarianship in his groundbreaking article "The Indivisibility of the Art Librarianship."¹ These two branches were described as the textual and the visual. These two branches of art librarianship have co-existed since the first visual surrogate was created. Written or textual communication has traditionally taken a variety of forms and has been the standard vehicle for communication for over one hundred years. There has been little change, aside from an increased proliferation, in this form of communication, which includes historical treatises, monographs, oeuvre catalogs, exhibition catalogs, auction catalogs as well as published books and scholarly journal articles.

On the other hand, the world of visual communication has progressed and evolved rapidly from the print reproductions of the 19th century to the early photographic processes such as glass plate negatives. Photography eventually surpassed the reproduction engraving in terms of offering a viable surrogate. The evolution of photographic surrogates continued with the advent of 35 mm slides, color photography, microfilm, holographs, etc. and most recently digital photography and digital images.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s there was an international movement to create a professional home for art librarians. In 1969 librarians in the United Kingdom created the Art Libraries Society (now known as ARLIS/UK and Ireland). This momentum was matched in North America in 1972 with the creation of ARLIS/NA. Visual resource curators began meeting at the annual College Art Association (CAA) conferences during the late 1960s. And almost from the inception of ARLIS/NA, visual resource professionals formed a similar professional group that met during the annual conferences.

In 1976 IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations) members created the IFLA Art Libraries Round Table. During the mid-1970s all three organizations professed a belief in a unified art library profession that embraced both the worlds of the printed word and the surrogate image. But the 1970s also witnessed changes within the field of art librarianship. Some librarians spent increased energy on the adoption of the MARC format and the implications associated with the creation of online catalogs. ARLIS/NA members spent increased time discussing the implications of the new format and the automation of the cataloging process. While at the same time, curators in visual resource facilities were engaged in other areas of professional development. The automation of traditional art libraries did not necessarily impact the daily workflow in visual resource facilities.

¹ Freitag, W. M. (1982). "The Indivisibility of Art Librarianship." *Art Libraries Journal* 7:3, 23-39.

Another area of debate was the question of qualifications for working within the field. Did visual resource professionals need an MLS/MLIS degree? And how did this relate to the value of holding advanced degrees in areas of subject specialization such as Art History, Architecture, History, etc.?

By the early 1980s, the two traditions of art librarianship were seriously grappling with the question: “Should there be two separate professional organizations?” One organization devoted to the interests of the “book librarians” and one devoted to the “visual resources professionals.” In 1980, after almost a decade of informal association, visual resources curators active in CAA and ARLIS/NA began the process of becoming a formal association. After polling professionals and holding discussions, the Visual Resources Association was formed in the fall of 1982. The first official meeting was held during the annual CAA meeting in Philadelphia in February 1983. Many visual resource professionals viewed the creation of VRA as a positive, proactive step. VR professionals created their own professional home and could therefore concentrate on the issues important to them. Still others saw the creation of a new professional organization as a fracturing of a single (yet multi-faceted) profession into two separate camps.

Since the creation of VRA in 1982, the two organizations have weathered some difficult times as each struggled to define itself within the context of the other organization. But by 2000, the two groups began to recognize the basic truths as articulated by Lockard and Whiteside in their article that appeared in *Art Documentation*.² The authors maintained that four things are certain for both ARLIS/NA and VRA members:

1. Libraries and visual resource collections will continue to exist.
2. There will continue to be a market for our profession.
3. The information explosion will continue unabated.
4. Change will always be a part of our lives.

With these thoughts in mind, many members of ARLIS/NA and VRA began to see the future as ripe for increased collaboration. Almost every current trend in Visual Resources management and Art Librarianship touches on one of the following issues: the need for art librarians and visual resource professionals to understand, integrate and adopt emerging technology, the art library/visual resource user’s demand for information delivered in efficient and convenient ways, and the desire for librarians and visual resource professionals to remain relevant within a rapidly changing work environment.

Demographics, Mission, and Governance

Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA)	
Founded:	1972
Demographics:	The membership includes architecture and art librarians, visual resources professionals, artists, curators, educators, publishers, image vendors and providers, and others interested in visual arts information.
Mission Statement:	The mission of ARLIS/NA is to foster excellence in art and design librarianship and image management.
Membership:	over 1,000 members
Governance:	Executive Board (includes President, Vice-President/President Elect, Past President, Secretary, Treasurer and Representatives)
Committee Structure:	See Appendix A

² Lockard, R. and Ann Whiteside (2000). An Unexpected Future: A New Century Dawns for Art Librarians and Image Curators. *Art Documentation* 19:1 (Spring), 6-13.

Visual Resources Association (VRA)	
Founded:	1982
Demographics:	International membership includes: information specialists; digital image specialists; slide, photograph, microfilm and digital archivists; art, architecture, film and video librarians; museum curators; architectural firms; galleries; publishers; image system vendors; rights and reproductions officials; photographers; art historians; artists; image vendors and providers; and scientists.
Mission Statement:	The Visual Resources Association is a multi-disciplinary organization dedicated to furthering research and education in the field of image management within the educational, cultural heritage, and commercial environments.
Membership:	over 800 members
Governance:	Executive Board (includes President, President-Elect, Vice President for Conference Arrangements, Vice President for Conference Program, Secretary, Treasurer, Public Relations and Communications Officer)
Committee Structure:	See Appendix A

It is important to note that, unlike most members of ARLIS/NA, some VRA members do not work with materials relating to art and/or architecture. In fact in recent years the VRA Membership Committee has been actively pursuing members in other fields. The *2006-2007 VRA Professional Status Survey* indicates a small yet not insignificant growth in membership among individuals working in archival, corporate, medical, publishing, scientific, commercial, and "other" environments since the last survey conducted in 2000. Many visual resources professionals are not concerned with the traditional bibliographic and reference duties of most art and architecture librarians. ARLIS/NA membership data collected during last year's membership registration process suggest that roughly one quarter of ARLIS/NA members belong to VRA (see Appendix A, ARLIS/NA Membership Demographics). Yet the *2006-2007 VRA Professional Status Survey* indicates that approximately 85% of VRA members are associated with art and architecture collections. Additionally, the number of VRA members who possess MLS/MLIS degrees has increased from 32% to 41.4% of survey respondents. Electronic resources in academia, many of which are licensed by libraries, have created new technical job responsibilities for librarians and visual resources professionals at the same institutions. Universities, museums, and other institutions are increasingly rethinking, reorganizing, and merging visual resources, libraries, information technology, and other units in response to digital initiatives. The commonalities and differences between our memberships and professions are in a state of flux. As one participant in an open meeting held at the Kansas City VRA conference put it, members should keep this evolving "Venn diagram" image in mind as we consider the future of these two organizations.

ARLIS/NA-VRA COLLABORATION: PAST AND CURRENT EXAMPLES

The past and ongoing collaborative efforts between ARLIS/NA and VRA are numerous and unusual among non-profit associations. While most members wish to see more, it is essential that we acknowledge the significance of past and ongoing collaborative work between the two organizations.

Affiliation

As affiliate members, ARLIS/NA members may register for VRA conferences at the VRA member rate. Likewise, VRA members may register for ARLIS/NA conferences at the ARLIS member rate.

Chapters

Regular collaboration between regional chapters of ARLIS/NA and VRA exists, but has been sporadic. Many VRA and ARLIS/NA chapters have held joint meetings in the past, but of 12 VRA chapters and 18 ARLIS/NA chapters,

only one group has established any sort of regular pattern for holding joint events. For several years ARLIS/D.C.-Maryland-Virginia has held its fall meeting as a joint effort with the VRA Mid-Atlantic chapter. To date, no other chapters of ARLIS/NA or VRA have ongoing regularly scheduled joint events with their counterpart chapters.

Other chapters of ARLIS/NA and VRA have held joint meetings in the past, and in at least one case, are planning an event for the future. Some of these meetings include:

- VRA New England & ARLIS/New England – 05/06, 05/07
- VRA Northern California & ARLIS/Northern California – 11/02, 12/03
- VRA Great Lakes & ARLIS/Ohio Valley – 05/01, 05/02
- VRA Midwest & ARLIS/Midstates – 05/98, 05/00
- VRA Midwest & ARLIS/Central Plains – 10/01
- VRA Greater New York & ARLIS/Western New York – Spring '03, Fall '08 (planned)

At these meetings, attendees from both organizations listen to a program, tour sites of interest, and socialize as one group. The event organizers schedule time for chapter business meetings, at which point the ARLIS/NA and VRA members meet separately. In a few instances, VRA and ARLIS/NA chapters have held meetings in the same location at the same time, but there was no coordination between the groups.

In the early years of this decade it appears that several ARLIS/NA and VRA chapters held joint meetings in the fall, and the spring was reserved for ARLIS/NA or VRA-only meetings. In most cases, this trend lasted only a few years and joint meetings became more infrequent. The reasons for this are unclear, though in its meeting minutes one VRA chapter expressed a desire to keep joint meetings infrequent because joint meetings “diluted our programming.” The results from the survey conducted by the Task Force, however, demonstrate a strong preference among respondents to hold more regional joint efforts between the two organizations.

Publications/Research Initiatives

To date, ARLIS/NA and VRA have collaborated on one official publication, Guidelines for the Visual Resources Profession, published by both organizations in 2000.

Other research initiatives have been designated as official joint collaborations between ARLIS/NA and VRA. Typically, the boards of both organizations charge a task force to explore a particular issue. The findings of the task force are approved by the boards and are presented as a document or lead to the development of a sustained effort by the organizations. Some examples of previous joint task forces and the results of their work include:

- **Joint Task Force on Visual Resources Professional Issues**
The work by this group resulted in the release of the document *Criteria for the Hiring and Retention of Visual Resources Professionals* in 1995. The group was asked to revise the document in 2002. This work provided the foundation on which the Guidelines for the Visual Resources Profession publication was based.
- **Joint Visual Professional Issues Task Force**
This group was established when it became clear that ARLIS/NA and VRA were planning to survey the members of their organizations. The Task Force was charged with developing and executing the survey and analyzing the data. The survey was conducted in 1999, and results were published in the *VRA Bulletin* in the Spring 2000 and Fall 2001 issues.
- **Joint Task Force on Continuing Education**
This group was formed around the idea of resurrecting the UT-Austin Summer Slide School. In 2003, the Task Force presented an unpublished report that led to the development of the Summer Educational Institute for Visual Resources and Image Management (SEI) program.
- **SEI Long Term Planning Task Force**

After SEI proved to be a success in its first two years, this task force was created to explore the future direction of the program. The Task Force was discharged in 2007 after producing a report for the ARLIS/NA and VRA boards.

- **Joint Task Force on Collaboration**
Responding to discussions conducted on the ARLIS/NA and VRA listservs, the boards of both organizations charged this group to examine similarities and differences between the organizations, recommend collaborative possibilities, and investigate other organizations with interests related to those of ARLIS/NA and the VRA to explore the concept of creating a federation of affiliated societies and associations. This document is the product of that group.

The North American Lantern Slide Survey is another research initiative deemed a joint project between VRA and ARLIS/NA. While it is not the product of a formal task force, the project was considered important and relevant to both organizations and was approved as a joint endeavor by both Executive Boards.

Conferences

ARLIS/NA and VRA have scheduled two past conferences in conjunction with one another. The first, the 1998 conferences in Philadelphia, were separate conferences located at separate hotels. The conferences were scheduled to overlap by four days, and one of those days included joint programming. Reciprocal discount registration fees were available, and registration for one conference allowed some degree of participation at the other. In addition, a joint social event was arranged along with an art exhibition featuring works by members of both organizations.

2002 marked the first true joint conference between the organizations. Both organizations shared registrations and one venue was used for all sessions, seminars, and workshops. Programming was strongly oriented to image management issues, but was meant for the dual audience. Special events, such as the convocation, the conference banquet, and the silent auction were open to members of both organizations.

Both organizations look forward to the next joint conference in 2011, to be held in Minneapolis. This will provide an excellent opportunity to capitalize on the successes and address the concerns that members have expressed regarding the two previous conferences. This Task Force hopes that by that time, new modes of collaboration will have become ingrained as part of the culture of ARLIS/NA and VRA, and will be reflected in the conference programming.

Summer Educational Institute for Visual Resources and Image Management (SEI)

SEI is one of the most exciting and successful collaborative ventures between ARLIS/NA and VRA. Now in its fifth consecutive year and consistently filled to capacity, this program seeks to provide standardized and sustainable visual resources training to meet needs that most library and information science programs do not currently address. Administered by co-chairs and board liaisons from both organizations, an Implementation Team provides and coordinates administration, local arrangements, registration, scheduling, fundraising, publicity, curriculum, instruction and teaching materials. SEI consistently receives high praise from its participants, and many have expressed the desire to see an advanced course of its kind in the future.

ENGAGEMENT WITH AFFINITY ORGANIZATIONS

Overview and Methodology

The Task Force on Collaboration investigated affinity organizations to explore the possibility of more interaction with like-minded groups. A list of affinity organizations was generated from groups featured on the ARLIS/NA, VRA, and CAA (College Art Association) websites. Each member of the Task Force selected organizations to determine the purpose, structure, and membership of the organization. Particular focus was directed toward the committees represented in the organization, and if the organization allows for formal affiliations with other groups (sometimes this was not obvious). See Appendix C.

Collaboration with Affiliates

The possibility of collaboration with other organizations was revealed by the commonalities that ARLIS/NA and VRA share, in structure or interests, with these affinity organizations. For example, many of the organizations have committees dedicated to professional development and/or education. Many groups also have research awards/support committees. Some smaller organizations do not follow a committee structure, but the intellectual interests of the group may make collaboration possible. The subject focus of an organization, however, should not be the determining factor for possible affiliation or membership in a federation. Those organizations with a larger focus, (i.e., American Association of Museums), could be targeted for collaboration because specialized groups exist within the larger organizational structure. A further examination of the similar committees within an organization could reveal more collaborative opportunities with affinity organizations, which may not warrant a formal affiliation.

Outreach Opportunities

Outreach opportunities exist between ARLIS/NA and VRA, as well as among these potential affiliate organizations and other like-minded groups. The key to outreach is determining a specific issue that is of concern to our organizations. Because so many of the organizations investigated have committees dedicated to professional development already in place, this could be the best opportunity to begin collaboration with a group. Another area in which collaboration may be possible with affinity organizations is through publications, perhaps as the fruit of professional development collaboration. Other subjects such as advocacy in copyright issues, metadata, and digitization standards may provide the occasion for alliances. Special invitations might be made to representatives of the affinity organizations to attend and present papers at our regional and national conferences.

Engagement with Affinity Organizations: Federation or Affiliation

Of the groups investigated by this Task Force, there are approximately two-dozen that could participate in an affiliation or federation with VRA and/or ARLIS/NA based on the focus, structure, and interest of the organization. Some groups may be better suited to affiliation rather than federation, and affiliations with other organizations are more immediately attainable. Affiliation entails a formal recognition that another organization has a similar or like-minded purpose. Memberships usually overlap between the affiliated organizations. Because both ARLIS/NA and VRA have formal affiliations with each other and with other groups, there is precedent for how to proceed. Several factors must be weighed in deciding how an affiliation will be structured, such as the benefits allotted to affiliate organizations, how much overlap exists between memberships, and whether the benefits will be reciprocal.

Organizations that offer noteworthy affiliation and/or federation possibilities, but with which neither ARLIS/NA nor VRA has created formal affiliations, include the American Association of Museums; the Association of Moving Image Archivists; the Museum Computer Network; the Society of American Archivists; the Special Libraries Association; the Theater Library Association; the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works; the American Institute of Graphic Arts; the Arts Council of the African Studies Association; the Association of Art Historians; the Association of Art Museum Curators; the Association of College & University Museums & Galleries; the Association of Historians of American Art; the Leonardo, the International Society for the Arts, Sciences and Technology; the National Art Education Association; the New Media Caucus; the Queer Caucus for Art; the Renaissance Society of America; the Society of Architectural Historians; the Society for Photographic Education; and the Southeastern College Art Conference. Each of these groups offers an area or areas of overlap with ARLIS/NA and/or VRA, which may include cataloging standards, digitization standards, image sharing, advocacy, copyright, conservation, etc. Informal agreements or relationships already exist between ARLIS/NA or VRA and some of these groups, while others offer intriguing opportunities for new relationships (see Appendix C).

A recurring problem is that one or a few individuals might represent an affiliation between organizations, and when those people leave the organizations the momentum and meaning of the affiliation may be lost. The challenge is to determine whether sufficient overlap in membership or other factors exist to sustain formal affiliate relationships.

More formal and complex than affiliation, a federation would require ongoing and considerable investment of time and resources. It would involve legal issues and necessitate changes in bylaws. The focus of a federation might be broad advocacy for our profession(s) and for professional standards. Or, a federation might revolve around more focused areas of mutual interest such as copyright, metadata, or digitization standards.

The Task Force investigated two federations with related interests: the International Federation of Library Associations and Associations (IFLA) and ARLIS/Norden (a smaller international federation supporting Nordic interests). These two federations could serve as models for a federation of organizations that might include VRA and ARLIS/NA. Perhaps the strongest form of collaboration would be a formal federation of the two organizations, a prospect that the task force was charged to explore. The group could identify only two substantive examples of federation among information organizations: the American Library Association and the International Federation of Library Associations and Organizations. In both cases, the federations thrive due to an economy of scale (ALA has over 50,000 members, for example) that makes less onerous the membership fees required to support the costs of an additional administrative infrastructure. As an example, membership in both ALA and one its larger divisions (for example, the Association of College and Research Libraries), was \$175 in 2007. That such savings could exist with a federation of ARLIS/NA and VRA is questionable. From legal and fiduciary standpoints, the complexities associated with formal federation are beyond expertise for this committee to consider and there seems to be little mandate from the membership that such an effort is warranted. Federation seems to be a solution for a problem not yet clearly defined.

COLLABORATIVE PROSPECTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Members of both organizations provided us with many excellent ideas for collaborative opportunities. While some would be relatively simple to implement, others would require long term planning and/or structural changes within each organization. A comparison of the structural and demographic elements in ARLIS/NA and VRA reveals that many analogous committees and interests already exist and provide logical opportunities for further collaborative projects (see Appendix A).

Demographic Data

Compiling demographic information each year, archiving it, and making the results readily available to members would be a positive step toward the long-term analysis of membership trends in ARLIS/NA and VRA. Aside from the current data regarding the organizations to which registrants belong, it would be helpful to collect data from members on the type of institution and disciplines in which their jobs (or studies) are centered. This might happen during the annual registration process, or perhaps through the MemberClicks profiles (VRA already uses MemberClicks, while ARLIS/NA has recently contracted with them). Of course, if this information were to be required the data would be more meaningful than if provided on a voluntary basis. Another way to gather valuable demographic data is through joint surveys; see the section on joint publications and surveys below.

Scholarly Communication (Advocacy)

- Author joint statements for public consumption (on wider issues such as intellectual property and metadata).
- Create joint policy statements in more specific areas concerning images and image management, such as competencies, digital imaging standards, digital image collection development, digital image collection management, and the retention of original slide and photographs as collections are digitized.
- Create awareness of our organizations through educational programs for students in MLS/MLIS programs and members of other professional organizations.
- Sponsor an arts information conference with other professional organizations.

General Communications

- Offer a joint listserv, mutual access to both listservs, and/or liaisons' blogs.
- Maintain shared, online career resource center with current job openings, sample job descriptions, and human resources publications.
- Lobby vendors for improved services and products.

Joint Publications and Surveys

80% of survey respondents would like ARLIS/NA and VRA to collaborate on publications.

Suggested Topics: cataloging, climate/emergency facility management, competencies, copyright, course management software, data sharing, digital imaging standards, digital preservation, human resources issues, mentoring, metadata, and teaching visual literacy.

The 1999 Professional Status Survey was a collaborative effort between VRA and ARLIS/NA, and was mailed to all VRA members and ARLIS/NA members belonging to the Visual Resources Division. In 2006, the VRA conducted an independent survey of its members.

- Take advantage of emerging formats including: streaming webcasts, podcasts, videoconferencing, wikis, and blogs.
- Establish print journal to serve both organizations.
- Revise Criteria for the Hiring and Retention of Visual Resources Professionals Document.
- Author policy statements regarding collection development and collection management of digital assets.
- Establish a pattern of regular joint surveys to gather and provide assessment and demographic data on the memberships of both organizations.
- Conduct a survey of digitization efforts.

Professional Education

- Invite VRA to collaborate with ARLIS/NA on internship and student paper awards.
- Offer joint scholarships to the Summer Educational Institute.
- Establish a joint mentoring program.
- Provide distance-learning opportunities that take advantage of new technologies, perhaps including advanced SEI modules.

Conferences, Meetings, and Events

83.5% of survey respondents think that ARLIS/NA and VRA should collaborate on hosting regional conferences.

68.8% of survey respondents would like to see ARLIS/NA and VRA have more joint national conferences.

- Encourage joint regional conferences and/or meetings to be hosted annually by local chapters, perhaps with some financial support from ARLIS/NA and VRA if feasible.
- Plan joint national conferences every 3-5 years.
- While joint national conferences seems have strong overall support, another proposal might be to periodically hold concurrent conferences in the same cities on a regular basis, as VRA did in the past with CAA, with some cross-over programming.
- Investigate the feasibility of providing webcasts of conference sessions to both organizations, perhaps with associated fees.

Liaisons and Joint Committees

76.4% of survey respondents think that VRA and ARLIS/NA should have more joint committees and task forces.

- Potential Joint Committees: assessment, awards, best practices, campus-wide digital initiatives, collection development, conference planning, copy cataloging, copyright and intellectual property, diversity, faculty education, image distribution, international outreach, internships, metadata, professional development and continuing education, professional status, publications, public policy, reference, standards, social computing, subject access, technology (emerging, integration, interoperability), user groups.
- Because the ARLIS/NA liaison to VRA has historically been a vital point of contact between the two organizations, consider adding an ARLIS/NA liaison position to VRA to complement and work with the VRA representative from ARLIS/NA. To echo the recommendation articulated in the December 2006 ARLIS/NA Assessment Task Force report, each organization would benefit from formal definitions of the purpose and function of liaisons to outside organizations.
- Liaisons already exist between ARLIS/NA and a number of other affiliated organizations; the VRA could consider creating reciprocal liaison positions with other organizations as more formal affiliations are created.
- Establish a standing Collaboration Committee to plan and execute collaborative efforts.
- Replace ARLIS/NA and (possible) VRA liaisons with board positions in each organization charged to oversee ongoing collaborative efforts.

- Offer travel awards to collaboration appointees/liaisons to attend other conferences and to submit official reports on the proceedings.
- Apply jointly for grants to fund special projects.

More Reciprocal Membership Benefits

While ARLIS/NA has created more formal affiliations with other organizations, the VRA Membership Committee is currently engaged in preliminary discussions regarding outreach opportunities with other potential affiliates to exchange membership benefit information and establish more formal relationships. The Task Force heard from many members that more reciprocal membership benefits, especially between ARLIS/NA and VRA, would be a welcome development. Reasons include economics, time commitments, and a more fertile environment for the exchange of intellectual and professional information.

- Create affiliate agreements at the VRA and ARLIS/NA chapter level, which might include equal registration fees for affiliate members.
- Offer VRA and ARLIS/NA reciprocal members' access to the *VRA Bulletin*, *Art Documentation*, and other publications online.
- Continue to explore increased affiliation membership benefits among ARLIS/NA, VRA, and other groups, perhaps facilitated by the Membership Committees within each organization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Task Force wishes to express its gratitude to members who have shared their ideas and opinions with thoughtfulness and candor. This endeavor has not lacked some controversy. While a few members are opposed to developing any further collaborative ventures between the two groups, others at the opposite end of the spectrum are in favor of an organizational merger, a scenario excluded from the Task Force's charge. Most members appear to fall somewhere in the middle--they are interested in ways that the two organizations can collaborate with, and complement and inform each other while retaining their individual identities. Many have cited the financial challenge and burden of time commitments in belonging to two international organizations and perhaps two local chapters, as well as attending multiple conferences and regional meetings each year; this was in fact the original impetus for the listserv discussions. The Task Force sought to identify the existing and potential collaborations that might leverage the ever-increasing commonalities, both between ARLIS/NA and VRA and with other organizations, and provide better cost-effectiveness for membership.

CONCLUSION

New technologies, particularly electronic resources, continue to blur many of the traditional boundaries between art librarianship and visual resources management, and also provide new means for collaboration between both organizations. Yet some compelling differences between the two organizations remain. It is crucial that both organizations continue to evolve and provide a relevant professional climate for the exchange of valuable information. At the heart of the matter is how ARLIS/NA and VRA can best serve the needs of members with limited resources in the face of rapidly progressing technologies.

While areas of uniqueness exist within both organizations, many members belonging to VRA and ARLIS/NA clearly wish to capitalize on the numerous opportunities for collaboration--for a variety of reasons. Those involving cost savings are of immediate concern to many, who find the investment of time and money associated with multiple memberships and conferences to be increasingly onerous. This is even more relevant with the presence of other organizations that address facets of professional circumstances such as those in museums or archives. Those with limited resources are increasingly finding themselves choosing between ARLIS/NA, VRA, and other organizations. Thus ARLIS/NA and VRA have good reason to maximize the reciprocal benefits of membership and formal affiliations with other organizations.

Aside from the immediacy of cost, many members would like to see a more fertile infrastructure for information exchange between the two organizations and a corresponding reduction in redundancy, while maintaining the individual identities of each group. Members have proposed many interesting ideas, as outlined in the preceding pages. As our professions change and diverge in many areas, and technology evolves to enable innovative methods of communications, the opportunities for new means of sharing knowledge abound.

The ARLIS/NA-VRA Task Force on Collaboration was charged with recommending collaborative possibilities. The next steps will be for the respective Executive Boards to determine how to best proceed with the information we have provided; there are many ways that these possibilities might be implemented. Some members have expressed concern that these efforts be sustainable rather than merely symbolic. In whatever form these changes are adopted, they will require ongoing coordination among many groups within and between each organization. The Task Force is confident that sufficient enthusiasm and support exists between ARLIS/NA and VRA to create ongoing and meaningful opportunities that will benefit members for years to come. It is an exciting and challenging time for us. The efforts put forth in the coming months and years will lay the groundwork for the possibility of an increasingly shared culture of exchange between these two dynamic and venerable organizations.

Respectfully submitted by the ARLIS/NA-VRA Joint Task Force on Collaboration

Greta Bahnemann, Curator, Knight Visual Resources Facility, Cornell University, ARLIS/NA member, VRA member

K. Meghan Gross, former Assistant Curator (2/18/2002 to 1/8/2008), Visual Resources Collection, Johns Hopkins University; current Media Cataloger, Newseum, Washington, DC, former VRA member (2002-2007)

Amy A. McKenna, Image Cataloguer/Specialist, Williams College, VRA member

Elaine Paul (Co-chair), Visual Resources Curator, Department of Art and Art History, University of Colorado at Boulder, ARLIS/NA member, VRA member

Brian P. Shelburne, Head, Image Collection Library, University of Massachusetts Amherst, ARLIS/NA member, VRA member

Edward Teague (Co-chair), Head, Architecture and Allied Arts Library, University of Oregon, ARLIS/NA member, VRA member

February 14, 2008

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: ARLIS/NA & VRA Structural Commonalities and Differences

ART LIBRARIES SOCIETY OF NORTH AMERICA (2007-2008)	VISUAL RESOURCES ASSOCIATION (2007-2008)
<p>Note that the organization is restructuring. See the members only web site for the December 2006 ARLIS/NA Assessment Task Force recommendations at <http://www.arlisna.org/arlismembers/assessment/recommendations.pdf> and the subsequent December 2007 <i>Proposed Revisions to the ARLIS/NA Bylaws</i> at <http://www.arlisna.org/arlismembers/07bylawsrevisions.pdf></p>	
ARLIS/NA History	VRA History
http://www.arlisna.org/about/history.html	http://www.vraweb.org/about/index.html
ARLIS/NA Mission	VRA Mission
<p>The mission of ARLIS/NA is to foster excellence in art and design librarianship and image management. We achieve this mission through our many activities, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting, networking, and sharing ideas in person at our Annual Conferences. • Publishing substantive articles of a practical as well as scholarly nature through our many publications, such as Art Documentation, Occasional Papers, and Online Publications. • Providing a forum for professional communication, via our listserv and web site. • Reaching out to future art librarians through numerous scholarship awards. • Recognizing excellence in the field through awards for research, service, and publication. 	<p>The Visual Resources Association is a multi-disciplinary organization dedicated to furthering research and education in the field of image management within the educational, cultural heritage, and commercial environments. The Association is committed to providing leadership in the visual resources field, developing and advocating standards, and offering educational tools and opportunities for the benefit of the community at large. The VRA implements these goals through publication programs and educational activities. The Association offers a forum for issues of vital concern to the field, including: preservation of and access to digital and analog images of visual culture; cataloging and classification standards and practices; integration of technology-based instruction and research; intellectual property policy; and other topics of interest to the field. Through collaboration, partnership, and outreach with the broader information management and educational communities, the Association actively supports the primacy of visual information in documenting and understanding humanity's shared cultural experience.</p>
ARLIS/NA Incorporation/Tax-exempt Status	VRA Incorporation/Tax-exempt Status
501 (c) 3	VRA: 501 (c) 6; VRA Foundation: 501 (c) 3
ARLIS/NA Strategic Plan	VRA Strategic Plan
http://www.arlisna.org/organization/admindocs/stratplan06-09.pdf (members only)	http://data.memberclicks.com/site/vra/stratpl10-7.pdf (members only)

ARLIS/NA Bylaws	VRA Constitution and Bylaws
http://www.arlisna.org/organization/admindocs/bylaws.html	http://www.vraweb.org/organization/bylaws.html
ARLIS/NA Formal Affiliations	VRA Formal Affiliations
Visual Resources Association (VRA)	Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA)
American Library Association (ALA)	
Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Kunst und Museumsbibliotheken (AKMB)	
ARLIS/Australia and New Zealand (ARLIS/ANZ)	
ARLIS/Netherlands (ARLIS/NL)	
ARLIS/Norden	
ARLIS/United Kingdom and Ireland (ARLIS/UK and Ireland)	
Association of Architecture School Librarians (AASL)	
College Art Association (CAA)	College Art Association (CAA)
International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA)	
Japan Art Documentation Society, Tokyo (members-only web site)	
Museum Computer Network (MCN)	
Society of American Archivists (SAA)	
Society of Architectural Historians (SAH)	
Sous-section des Bibliothèques d'art, Association des bibliothécaires français (l'ABF)	
ARLIS/NA Informal Affiliations and Liaison Organizations	VRA Informal Affiliations and Liaison Organizations
	Association of Research Libraries (ARL)
	DFC (Digital Future Coalition):
	CNI: Coalition for Networked Information
	MCN (Museum Computer Network)
	Educause
	Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC)
	Museum Computer Network (MCN)
	Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC)
	U.S. Library of Congress
ARLIS/NA Bylaws on Affiliation	VRA Bylaws on Affiliation
<i>ARLIS/NA Bylaws; Article XIV: Affiliation</i>	<i>VRA Constitution and Bylaws: Article VII: Affiliations with Other Organizations</i>
Section 1. Affiliation or disaffiliation with other organizations shall be authorized by the Executive Board, as provided for below.	Section 1. Affiliation or disaffiliation with other organizations shall be authorized by the Executive Board as provided below.
Section 2. Formal affiliation or merger with another organization must be approved by a two-thirds majority of those individual members voting by a ballot conducted in accordance with Sections 2 and 3 of Article XIX.	Section 2. Formal affiliation with another organization must be approved by a 2/3 majority of the ballots cast by those members eligible to vote in a process conducted in accordance with Article VIII, Sections 2-4 of the Bylaws.

Section 3. The Society may hold institutional membership in another organization.	Section 3. The Association may hold institutional membership in another organization.
Section 4. The President may appoint a member or members of the Society to represent the Society or to serve as liaison to another organization.	Section 4. The President may appoint a member or members of the Association to represent the Association or to serve as liaison to another organization provided the objectives of the organization are consistent with those of the Association and the activities of the organization are not in conflict with the Association.
Section 5. Formal affiliation may confer the rights and privileges deemed appropriate by the Executive Board.	Section 5. Formal affiliation may confer the rights and privileges deemed appropriate by the Executive Board.
ARLIS/NA Membership Demographics	VRA Membership Demographics
Number of members: "over 1000" (www.arlisna.org, home page)	Number of members: "over 800" (VRA White Paper, 2007)
ARLIS/NA members belonging to (2006 data from ARLIS/NA HQ):	VRA members belonging to:
VRA: 254	ARLIS/NA: 254 (2006 data from ARLIS/NA) (no data formally collected by VRA prior to 2008 annual registration process)
ALA: 558	
CAA: 150	
SLA: 132	
SAA: 113	
AAM: 83	
AASL: 56	
IFLA: 41	
MCN: 32	
ARLIS/NA Regional Chapters	VRA Regional Chapters
ARLIS/NA Canada	VRA Canada (see also "Pacific Rim"; includes British Columbia)
ARLIS/NA Montréal-Ottawa-Québec	VRA Canada
ARLIS/NA Ontario	VRA Canada
Midwest Region:	
ARLIS/Central Plains	(NA)
ARLIS/Midstates	VRA Midwest
ARLIS/Ohio Valley	VRA Midwest
ARLIS/Twin Cities	VRA Midwest
Northeast Region:	
ARLIS/Delaware Valley	VRA Greater Philadelphia
ARLIS/New England	VRA New England
ARLIS/New York	VRA Greater New York
ARLIS/Western New York	VRA Upstate New York
South Region:	
ARLIS/D.C.-Maryland-Virginia	VRA Mid-Atlantic
ARLIS/Southeast	VRA Southeast

ARLIS/Texas-Mexico	VRA Texas
West Region:	
ARLIS/Mountain West	(NA)
ARLIS/Northern California	VRA Northern California
ARLIS/Northwest	VRA Pacific Rim
ARLIS/Southern California	VRA Southern California
ARLIS/NA Executive Board	VRA Executive Board
President	President
Vice-President/President-Elect	President-Elect
Past President	Past President (Honorary)
Secretary	Secretary
Treasurer	Treasurer
Conference Coordinator (see Regional Representatives below)	Vice-President for Conference Arrangements
	Vice-President for Conference Program
Communications Officer (see Regional Representatives below)	Public Relations and Communications Officer
Regional Representatives	
Note: during the transitional period of 2007/2008, each Regional Representative is assigned a liaison role, in a functional capacity as indicated in parentheses. The December 2007 <i>Proposed Revisions to the ARLIS/NA Bylaws</i> suggests the formal adoption of these liaison roles, each of which may be assigned to any of the regional representatives in the future.	
Canadian Representative (Development Coordinator)	
Midwest Regional Representative (Conference Coordinator)	(see Vice-Presidents for Conference Arrangements and Conference Program above)
Northeast Regional Representative (Chapter Coordinator)	
South Regional Representative (Education Coordinator)	
West Regional Representative (Communications Officer)	(see Public Relations and Communications Officer above)
	VRA Foundation Board of Directors
	7 Directors elected every two years
ARLIS/NA Committees	VRA Committees
Summer Educational Institute (SEI) for Visual Resources and Image Management Implementation Committee	Summer Educational Institute (SEI) for Visual Resources and Image Management Implementation Committee
Awards Committee	Awards Committee (Distinguished Service Award and Nancy DeLaurier Award)
Conference Travel Awards Sub-Committee	Travel Awards Committee
Distinguished Service Award Sub-Committee	

Melva J. Dwyer Award Sub-Committee	
Internship Award Sub-Committee	
Gerd Muesham Award Sub-Committee	
Research Awards Sub-Committee	
George Wittenborn Memorial Book Award Sub-Committee	
Cataloging Advisory Committee	Data Standards Committee
Conference Planning Advisory Committee	(see VRA Executive Board)
Development Committee	Development Committee (includes VRAffle)
Diversity Committee	
Finance Committee	Financial Advisory Committee
International Relations Committee	
Membership Committee	Membership Committee
Nominating Committee	Nominating Committee
Professional Development Committee	Education Committee
Public Policy Committee	
Publications Committee	(see Publications Program Group in "Other Appointments")
Standards Committee	(see Data Standards Committee)
	Cataloguing Cultural Objects (CCO) Committee
	Cataloguing Cultural Objects (CCO) Advisory Group
	Intellectual Property Rights Committee
	Digital Initiatives Advisory Group
ARLIS/NA Appointments	VRA Appointments
ARLIS/NA-VRA Joint Task Force on Collaboration	ARLIS/NA-VRA Joint Task Force on Collaboration
ARLIS/NA Assessment Task Force	
Summer Educational Institute VRA-ARLIS/NA Joint Advisory Task Force	Summer Educational Institute VRA-ARLIS/NA Joint Advisory Task Force
ARLIS-L (Listserv) Moderator	Listserv Manager
ARLIS/NA Web Site Editor	VRA Website Editor
ARLIS/NA Web Site Webmaster	VRA Website and MemberClicks Administrator
ARLIS/NA Web Site News and Features Editor	Images Newsletter Editor, Associate Editors, Technical Advisor, Contributing Editors
Art Documentation Content Co-Editors	VRA Bulletin Editor
Art Documentation Copy Editor	VRA Bulletin Associate Editor
Art Documentation Reviews Editor	VRA Bulletin Assistant Editors
Bibliographic Notes Editor	
Professional Resources Editor	
Advertising Representative	
ARLIS/NA Conference Mentor Program Coordinator	
	Membership Services Coordinator
	Professional Status Survey Task Force
	Publications Program Group
	VRA Archives Archivist

	VRA Archives Task Force
	VRA Foundation Task Force (discharged 09/07)
	VRA Special Bulletins, Editor
ARLIS/NA Liaisons (appointed)	VRA Liaisons (appointed)
American Association of Museums (AAM) Liaison	
American Library Association (ALA); Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), Arts Section Liaison	
American Library Association (ALA); Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) Representative	
American Library Association (ALA); MARC Advisory Committee (MARBI) Liaison	Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) of the American Library Association Representative
American Library Association (ALA); Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) Liaison	
American Library Association (ALA); Office for Diversity Liaison	
Association of Architecture School Librarians (AASL) Liaison	
College Art Association (CAA) Liaison	
International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) Representative	
Museum Computer Network	
National Information Standards Organization (NISO) Representative	
Society of American Archivists (SAA) Representative	
Society of Architectural Historians (SAH) Representative	
Special Libraries Association (SLA) Representative	
Visual Resources Association (VRA) Representative	
ARLIS/NA Divisions (proposed as "Interest Groups" by the December 2006 ARLIS/NA Assessment Task Force recommendations; see the December 2007 <i>Proposed Revisions to the ARLIS/NA Bylaws</i> for further information)	NA
Academic Division	
Art and Design School Division	
Museum Division	
Visual Resources Division	
ARLIS/NA Sections (proposed as "Interest Groups" by the December 2006 ARLIS/NA Assessment Task Force recommendations; see the December 2007 <i>Proposed Revisions to the ARLIS/NA Bylaws</i> for further information)	NA
Architecture Section	
Cataloging Section	
Reference and Information Services Section	

ARLIS/NA Round Tables (proposed as "Interest Groups" by the December 2006 ARLIS/NA Assessment Task Force recommendations; see the December 2007 <i>Proposed Revisions to the ARLIS/NA Bylaws</i> for further information)	NA
Book Arts Round Table	
Decorative Arts Round Table	
Gay and Lesbian Interests Round Table	
Management Issues Round Table	
New Art Round Table	
Public Librarians Round Table	
Serials Round Table	
Space Planners Round Table	
Women and Art Round Table	
ARLIS/NA Discussion/User Groups (proposed as "Interest Groups" by the December 2006 ARLIS/NA Assessment Task Force recommendations; see the December 2007 <i>Proposed Revisions to the ARLIS/NA Bylaws</i> for further information)	VRA Discussion/User Groups
	IRIS
	MDID
	VireoCat
ARTstor Discussion Group	ARTstor User Group
	VRA Image Matchmaking Discussion Group
Avery/BHA/Getty Vocabularies Users Group	
Cataloging Problems Discussion Group	
Classics and Archaeology Librarians Discussion Group	
Collection Development Discussion Group	
Committee on Institutional Cooperation	
Interlibrary Loan Discussion Group	
Photography Librarians Discussion Group	
RLG Art and Architecture Group	
SCIPIO Users Group	
Solo Librarians Discussion Group	
Student Affairs Discussion Group (Art Library Student and New ARLIS Professionals: ArLiSNAP)	
Teaching Librarians Discussion Group	
ARLIS/NA Publications/Resources	VRA Publications/Resources
Art Documentation (ARLIS/NA Bulletin)	VRA Bulletin
Occasional Papers	VRA Special Bulletins
ARLIS/NA Reviews (available online)	
Bibliographic Notes (available online)	
Online Publications (available online)	
Joint ARLIS/NA-VRA Publications (Guidelines for the Visual Resources Profession)	Joint ARLIS/NA-VRA Publications (Guidelines for the Visual Resources Profession)
	Cataloging Cultural Objects (CCO)

"Other Publications" < http://www.arlisna.org/resources/otherpubs/otherpubs_index.html >	"Other Publications" < http://www.vraweb.org/publications/otherpubs.html >
ARLIS/NA Awards	VRA Awards
Conference Travel Awards	Conference Travel Awards (Tansey Fund)
Distinguished Service Award	Distinguished Service Award
	Nancy DeLaurier Award ("honors a visual resources professional for distinguished achievement in the field. "Achievement" is measured by immediate impact, and may take the form of published work, oral presentation, project management, software development, technology application, website creation, or other outstanding effort")
Worldwide Books Award for Publications (" to recognize outstanding publications by ARLIS/NA Individual members in librarianship or visual resources curatorship, and the arts")	
Worldwide Books Award for Electronic Resources (" to recognize outstanding electronic publications by ARLIS/NA Individual members in librarianship or visual resources curatorship, and the arts")	
H.W. Wilson Foundation Research Grant ("supports research activities by ARLIS/NA individual members in the fields of librarianship, visual resources curatorship, and the arts. The award encourages the professional development of the membership in their capacities as information intermediaries and as subject specialists in the arts")	
Melva J. Dwyer Award ("given to the creators of exceptional reference or research tools relating to Canadian art and architecture")	
Internship Award ("award will grant \$2,500.00 to support a period of internship in an art library or visual resources collection")	
Gerd Muehsam Award ("given annually to recognize excellence in a graduate student paper or project on a topic relevant to art librarianship")	
Robertson Rare Book School Fellowship ("annual award of tuition waiver for one course at Rare Book School (RBS) at the University of Virginia")	
George Wittenborn Memorial Book Award ("welcomes submissions of notable art books published in North America... This prestigious award is presented annually to publications demonstrating excellence in art publishing")	
ARLIS/NA Conferences	VRA Conferences
Annual conference (International North American)	Annual conference (International North American)
Planned joint VRA-ARLIS/NA conference, 2011, Minneapolis	Planned joint VRA-ARLIS/NA conference, 2011, Minneapolis
Joint ARLIS/NA-VRA conference, 2002, St. Louis	Joint ARLIS/NA-VRA conference, 2002, St. Louis
Concurrent ARLIS/NA and VRA conferences, 1998, Philadelphia	Concurrent ARLIS/NA and VRA conferences, 1998, Philadelphia

Appendix B. Member Survey Results

1. Do you think VRA and ARLIS/NA should have more joint committees or task forces?		
Response percent:	yes = 76.4%	no = 23.6%
Response count:	68	21
2. If yes, in what areas? If no, why not?		
<p>YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cataloging; metadata standards; authorities; subject access; copy cataloging; social tagging: 23 • Education; continuing education; professional development; SEI; advanced SEI: 12 • Best practices in visual research, instruction, and pedagogy: 9 • Copyright and intellectual property: 9 • Digital imaging standards, archiving: 7 • Electronic resources, digital technologies: 6 • Interoperability: 6 • Collection development: 5 • Personal contacts; general information exchange; networking: 5 • Cross-institutional resource integration: 4 • Professional status: 4 • Digital initiatives: 3 • Conferences: 3 • Assessment: 2 • Economic benefits: 2 • Organizations should merge: 2 • Publications: 2 • Service: 2 • Shared images: 2 • Censorship: 1 • Diversity: 1 • International outreach, international conferences: 1 • Institutional repositories: 1 • Internships, awards: 1 • Social computing: 1 • Various areas of art librarianship: 1 <p><i>“Digital accessibility of information, including images, has centralized and focused many concerns of both the VR and art library communities, including continuing education and training, copyright and intellectual property concerns, development and adoption of metadata standards, electronic resources management and the sharing of resources.”</i></p> <p><i>“It just seems so obvious that we should be addressing many issues together. Such as, campus-wide digital initiatives and how VRA and ARLIS professionals are involved.”</i></p> <p>YES/MAYBE, BUT...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only where applicable, while respecting organizational differences: 5 <p><i>“There is really not a “yes” or “no” answer to this question, in my opinion. I think if overlapping areas of concern come up--similar issues in both organizations that people want to work on--then it might make sense to work on them together, rather than separately.”</i></p> <p><i>“Only when necessary or issues warrant collaboration.”</i></p> <p>NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present levels are sufficient: 5 		

- Keep the organizations' individual identities intact: 2
- Need to accommodate the non-art VRA members: 2
- Too complex and off-topic: 1
- VRA should collaborate with other organizations: 1

"I think that our current level of activity with each other is sufficient. Two or three joint activities/committees per year is enough to manage for each organization. It also leaves enough time and energy for each organization to collaborate with other communities as well."

"There are many newer members of VRA who have nothing to do with "art". Why not move in their direction?"

3. Would you like to see ARLIS/NA and VRA have more joint national conferences?

Response percent:	yes = 68.8%	no = 31.2%
Response count:	64	29

4. Please explain why or why not.

YES

- Logistical and financial economy for those involved with both organizations: 27
- Increasing overlap in membership, job descriptions, and interests; we can learn from each other: 19
- Fosters collegiality, networking, professional cooperation, and cross-pollination: 8
- Opportunities to broaden knowledge base; even if no current "librarian" or "VR" duties, can stay abreast of trends; can communicate better with colleagues across an institution: 5
- Avoiding duplicate presentations: 3
- Licensed electronic resources and digital images are creating more shared interests: 2
- Would enable my organization to participate better: 2
- Would freshen content: 2
- St. Louis was successful: 2
- Need to work together to establish resources: 1
- Need to work together on standards: 1
- Can accomplish more together: 1
- More diverse group of vendors: 1
- Practical sessions at VRA are appealing: 1

"There should be many areas where conference sessions and workshops would be of interest to both memberships. But a primary consideration is that there are now so many conferences that convene annually, pulling on our diminishing institutional travel budgets and dictating time away from our libraries. A joint conference, at least every few years, would help many justify attendance at both and be more efficient financially and time-wise."

"Libraries that are most challenged to attend both conferences are probably also those where the same staff members are most likely to have both VR and traditional library duties."

YES/MAYBE, BUT...

- Not too often (ranging from "occasionally" to every 2 to 10 years): 17
- Conference session planning should occur strategically and cooperatively to maximize benefits: 7
- Organizing is challenging, financial aspects are difficult: 2
- Individual identities of associations need to be maintained: 2
- How about teleconferencing?: 1
- Big conference is a drain on energy: 1
- Prefers the VRA conference schedule: 1

"I think the differences between the two organizations are enough to justify two different conferences. Having joint conferences once every 7-10 years is good, but more frequently is not."

"I enjoy the joint conferences, but would like to try having each group plan a conference on alternating years."

"If joint, the program planning should be joint not simultaneous."

"The small size of the VRA conference is its greatest asset. Sessions, workshops, events, etc., should focus on visual resources interests and issues. Watering down the schedule to accommodate two interest groups would make it less beneficial to those who are not librarians."

NO/PROBABLY NOT

- Joint conferences are too crowded; programming is diluted; separate conferences are already full of programming: 7
- ARLIS/NA tends to dominate because of its size (sense of being VRA being unequal): 5
- Too difficult to organize: 5
- VRA meets my specific needs as an image specialist in a way that ARLIS/NA doesn't: 4
- Enough difference between the two organizations to keep separate conferences; keep organizational identities separate: 3
- Smaller size of conferences is better: 3
- The VRA conference is optimal as is (size, practical workshop programming): 3
- ARLIS/NA member who doesn't work with images: 2
- VRA member who works with images unrelated to art: 2
- Different motivations for conference profits and presenting conference sessions (i.e., tenure with ARLIS/NA): 2
- Enough affinity to keep in contact as it is: 1
- Joint conferences seem too oriented to images: 1
- Interested, but I want ARLIS/NA to focus mostly on my areas of concern: 1
- Not enough overlap in memberships: 1
- Would like to see VRA meet with other organizations (i.e., CAA): 1
- Would be less likely to attend: 1

"If members in both organizations want to attend both conferences, that is their decision. This is no different than anyone wanting to attend the ARLIS/NA or VRA conference as well as other conferences or symposia. Joint conferences tend to water down content for both, not to mention the complete nightmare of intermingled finances, meeting space, etc."

"I work with digital images that are not art images. When I see a strong focus on art I am less likely to attend the conference."

"Joint conferences, joint meetings seem to concentrate on VR concerns to the detriment of library and text-based interests."

"Our organizations have very different corporate structures. It is very difficult to coordinate a joint conference."

5. Would you like to see ARLIS/NA and VRA collaborate on publications?

Response percent:	yes = 80.0%	no = 20.0%
Response count:	72	18

6. What are some subjects for publication by both organizations?

- Cataloging standards; CCO, union catalog for images; data standards; authorities; implementing crosswalks; vocabularies; image indexing & access; copy cataloging (shareable metadata): 21
- Digitization standards; preservation standards; color management: 12
- Instruction; teaching visual literacy; tutorials: 10
- Copyright, intellectual property: 6
- Digital collection development and management: 5
- Teaching and technology; technical specifications for electronic resources used in teaching; impact of

technology on profession: 5

- Collaboration in the workplace; collaboration between librarians and instructors: 4
- Digital media/image delivery search and retrieval systems: 4
- Continuing education (especially regarding digital initiatives); professional development: 3
- VR curatorship, including reference duties: 3
- How different genres of art libraries (e.g., museums, academic) are transitioning to digital teaching images: 2
- Implementing digital initiatives: 2
- Organizational models for collection managements (art information and images): 2
- User engagement with content: 2
- Digital image buying/licensing and subscription guide (interdisciplinary): 2
- Art libraries as image repositories (both analog and digital): 1
- Competencies: 1
- Digital libraries: 1
- Disaster planning: 1
- Grant resources: 1
- Historical documents about each organization: 1
- Interoperability: 1
- Integration of standards and technology: 1
- Institutional Repositories: 1
- Library and VR collaboration: 1
- Mentoring: 1
- OPAC coordination with text and visual materials: 1
- Task force projects: 1
- Updating previous Occasional Papers: 1
- Updated Guidelines for the Visual Resources Profession: 1
- Web sites: 1

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES:

- There needs to be equal balance on VR and art library materials: 1
- More online publications: 1
- Whatever is applicable at a given time: 1
- Should be special, separate, peer-reviewed publications: 1
- Should work together to avoid duplication of topics: 1
- Collaboration should help maximize publication expenses: 1

7. Do you think ARLIS/NA and VRA should collaborate on hosting regional conferences?

Response percent:	yes = 83.5%	no = 16.5%
Response count:	76	15

8. What are the benefits or drawbacks of ARLIS/NA-VRA collaboration with regional conferences?

BENEFITS

- Logistical and financial economy for those involved with both organizations: 17
- Exposure to broader issues and expertise in general: 15
- Regional networking: 9
- Joint meetings helps critical mass of attendees in certain regions, promotes health of chapters: 6
- The existing joint meetings are popular; turnout is better; more of an "event": 3
- Easier to organize at local level: 3
- Smaller size means more in-depth coverage: 3
- Overlapping areas of interest; shared interests: 2
- More similarities exist at the regional level: 2
- With trend toward VRC duties in libraries and areas of overlap, when it happens should be with VR focus: 2
- VRA and ARLIS/NA should not be involved—this should be a local decision within chapters: 2
- Those who cannot travel to annual conference can stay abreast of issues: 1

- Better mutual understanding of classification and cataloging of images: 1
- More condensed programming means easier for people to attend: 1
- Can reach new people: 1
- Local university and museum resources and venues can be explored more easily: 1
- More useful at the regional chapter level than at the national level: 1
- Business meetings need to be planned separately: 1

“Benefits are cost savings, exposure to a broader spectrum of issues, ability of both librarians and VR curators to investigate/learn about issues related to their fields.”

“This is a great idea as a smaller more manageable group size could really tear into some deep issues while networking, also the potential for image and resource collaboration projects here is a major plus.

“Having regional chapters meet together is a good strategy to ensure the survival of both chapters within a region.”

“Many art librarians (myself included) are inheriting VR responsibilities whether we like it or not - we should be prepared for this.”

DRAWBACKS

- Funding; more regional conference attendance might mean less national attendance, or vice versa: 4
- Complicated planning; need to coordinate content, finances, and logistics together to maximize benefits: 4
- Procedural issues to resolve; greater level of coordination and work needed than for independent meetings: 3
- There may be too much emphasis for some VRA members on art images, as opposed to general images: 2
- Different priorities and needs for regional meetings: 2
- Diluted content; longer meetings: 2
- Equal representation of issues a challenge; more ARLIS members in a region means that programming and logistics favor ARLIS topics: 2
- Length of conference to meet needs of ARLIS and VRA members might be prohibitive: 1
- Would prefer to see VRA concentrate on encouraging annual conference attendance: 1
- Focus of chapter meetings tends to be more narrow, and perhaps of less interest to members of other organization: 1
- Would prefer to see this at the national level: 1

“I think the problem with collaborating on either regional or national conferences is that planning could be complicated, and the length of time a conference might have to go on, in order to serve the needs of both groups, might be prohibitive.”

“Regional conferences have costs, even if they are lower than national conferences, so it might discourage attendance or participation in national conferences if resources are used too often regionally.”

“Different focus within each organization- working too closely with ARLIS will limit our focus to art and architecture only.”

9. What are some other areas in which VRA and ARLIS/NA could collaborate?

- Continuing education; technology training; professional development; workshops: 10
- Mentoring & outreach to new professionals and students: 8
- Publications; discounts on publications; joint journal: 5
- Communications between two organizations; reciprocal listserv access; new joint listserv for members with interest in both organizations; blogs: 4
- Digital imaging; archival standards: 4
- Facilities & staffing standards: 4

- Professional standards, including MLIS degree programs: 4
- Student paper awards; internship awards and programs: 4
- Advocacy on public policy issues, such as copyright: 3
- Coordinating efforts between library and VR unit; reference/instruction in academic environments: 3
- Shared online resources on standards, copyright, reference, etc.: 3
- Using new technologies to share information, such as distance learning, e-SEI, videoconferencing, and podcasts: 3
- Institutional hosting of visitors to facilities for networking and cultural exchange: 2
- Metadata; cataloging standards: 2
- Organizational merger: 2
- Professional competencies: 2
- Standards and issues related to special collections: 2
- Affiliated society sessions at conferences, such as CAA, SAH, ALA: 1
- Chapter web hosting: 1
- Committee work: 1
- Group discounts on electronic resources: 1
- Job postings: 1
- Lobbying vendors for better services: 1
- Membership: 1
- Shared digital image resources: 1
- Sponsoring technical initiatives: 1
- Streaming video: 1
- Sustainability and the environment: 1
- Travel awards: 1
- User groups: 1

10. With what other organizations should there be greater collaboration with ARLIS/NA and VRA? What would be the focus of the collaborative effort?

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

- American Association of Museums (AAM): 1
- American Educational Research Association (AERA): 1
- American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA): 1
- American Library Association: (ALA): 14
- American Moving Image Association (AMIA): 6
- Art Libraries Societies (international): 3
- Association of Architecture School Librarians (AASL): 2
- Association of Art Historians (AAH): 5
- Association of Art Museum Curators (AAMC): 3
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL): 3
- Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT): 1
- Canadian Visual Resources Curators (CVRC): 1
- Coalition for Networked Information (CNI): 2
- Code4Lib: 1
- College Art Association (CAA): 18
- Computers and the History of Art (CHA): 1
- Digital Future Coalition (DFC): 3
- DIGIPRES [Listserv of the Preservation and Reformatting Section (PARS) section of the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS) division of the American Library Association (ALA)]: 1
- Distance Learning Assoc (USDLA): 1
- Educause: 1
- Foundations in Art: Theory and Education (FATE): 1
- International Association of Art Critics: (IAAC) 1

- International Association of Word and Image Studies (IAWIS): 2
- International Federation of Art Associations (IFLA): 1
- Japan Art Documentation Society (JADS): 1
- Library of Congress: 1
- Museum Computer Network (MCN): 17
- Museums and the Web (MW): 1
- Music Library Association (MLA): 2
- New Media Caucus (NMC): 1
- Society of American Archivists (SAA): 12
- Society of Architectural Historians (SAH): 12
- Southeastern College Art Conference SECAC): 2
- Special Library Association (SLA): 9
- Theatre Library Association (TLA): 1

FOCUS OF COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS

- Continuing education and training, workshops: 2
- Copyright: 2
- Cross-campus and cross-institutional communications about educational technology: 2
- Digital technology: 2
- Images: slides, photographs, digital imaging, visual reproductions, etc.: 2
- Joint conference programming: 2
- Preservation: 2
- Advocacy in areas of public policy: 1
- Arts information conferences: 1
- Collection development: 1
- Communication and collaboration about digital imagery: 1
- Connecting original materials to secondary literature and scholarship: 1
- Digitization (not just images): 1
- Digitization and sharing of museum collections: 1
- Historical societies or similar organizations with valuable materials to share and preserve: 1
- Leadership: 1
- Metadata standards: 1
- Shared content: 1
- Technology and the arts: 1
- The use of technology to better understand the humanities, across departments: 1
- Web research skills: 1

"I like the idea of more international collaboration. We live in global economy now; we need to get out of an Americo-centric mentality."

"With the current use of digital technology for instructional purposes, it is very important (in the university setting) to collaborate with teaching technology/instructional design professional groups - and not just librarians, artists & art historians, museums, and curators."

"As more and more museums loosen the chains regarding "their" images, the metadata needs to be VRA 4 and CCO compliant."

"ARLIS lags behind in addressing cutting edge technologies affecting its members. VRA has become too focused on metadata details and digitizing practices."

"There's always other orgs with overlapping interests - MCN, AMIA, ALA, SAA but I think for now ARLIS and VRA should focus on great collaboration between themselves first."

"I'd like to see more multi-disciplinary collaboration with "non-arts" people whenever possible. Academic libraries

are finally figuring out that cross pollination among disciplines is fruitful. It's a longer haul but a better result overall."

"Why can't individual members simply submit conference proposals (or other collaborative proposals) to whatever organization they want? Why does this always have to be organization-driven?"

11. Other comments?

- Thank you; glad to see this happening: 6
- Leverage our overlapping interests for the sake of economy and logistics: 4
- Preserve the discrete identities and structures of each organization: 3
- Collaborate where it makes sense, not necessarily all of the time: 2
- The two organizations should merge/ultimately merge: 2
- ARLIS/NA concerns a broad range of librarianship, of which VRA represents just one aspect: 1
- VRA deals with images (and not all art related), and the attendant issues are different than with books: 1
- Respondent belongs to both VRA and ARLIS/NA, and wants to see collaboration wherever there is overlap: 1
- Conferences in close succession make attendance challenging: 1
- Collaborate where still, moving, and 3-D images are concerned: 1
- Collaborate to create better mutual understanding between "image" and "word" people, to avoid losing information that may fall between the two groups: 1
- Let's address membership benefits--there is interest in doing so: 1
- Let's resolve past misunderstandings and look at the common goals: 1
- Problems concerning the two organizations' identities, which arise during joint efforts concerning images: the ARLIS/NA influence is larger in proportion to their number of participants and overall membership: 1
- Joint conferences can be hard on people who are involved in multiple organizations and therefore have to juggle: 1
- Hold joint conferences: 1
- Currently have to make difficult choices regarding memberships in regional chapters, larger organizations: 1
- People in technical and commercial fields should have a voice in this process: 1

"ARLIS and VRA should build on their individual strengths and collaborate in areas that make both organizations stronger. Collaboration must have a mission... not just collaborating for the sake of convenience."

"I feel that there are 2 cultures at play here and that there can be serious breakdowns in understanding and communication (and perceived goals) between librarians working in libraries and others in different departmental or IT scenarios--we need to learn to speak each other's language and understand the value of the diversity, rather than necessarily seek total homogeneity."

"ARLIS is a unique and powerful organization. It represents a broad range of librarians from different types of institutions and with different types of skills and orientations. VR issues are only one aspect of what we are concerned with in our jobs and our libraries. I am reluctant to give over too much of our time, energy etc. to this one aspect of our environment. The current issues of digitization have placed VR issues very much in the foreground, but they will not always be so prominent. ARLIS should proceed with some caution before changing our organizational/conference structure in ways that may not be at all useful in the future."

"While I think the VRA should certainly keep lines of communication open with all art and art library associated groups I fear it will become subsumed into the larger library associations. Images are not books or even recordings - their existence is varied and changeable and the ways in which they are accessed and used is very different from books and other materials that always maintain a consistent form. The professional status of the visual resource curator with a degree other than an MLIS also needs to be addressed formally as well as the benefit of experience, other skills and education."

"I need support and can't afford to join several professional societies. I feel cut-off from information instead of connected."

12. I am a member of		
Response percent:	ARLIS/NA = 70.2%	VRA = 60.6%
Response count:	66	57
13. If you would like further discussion with Task Force members, please give contact information.		
(Answers not provided to protect privacy)		

APPENDIX C: Existing and Potential Affiliates

Note: The organizations in <i>bold italics</i> were determined to be best suited for affiliation with ARLIS/NA, VRA, or both.		
I. Associations, North America	Affiliate Status	Task Force member comments
<i>Association of Architecture School Librarians</i> http://www.architecturelibrarians.org	ARLIS/NA is an affiliate	
<i>American Library Association (espec. the Arts Section, a section of Association of College and Research Libraries, an ALA division)</i> http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/aboutacrl/acrlsections/arts/arts.htm	ARLIS/NA is an affiliate	
<i>American Association of Museums</i> http://www.aam-us.org		Great potential for affiliation with both VRA and ARLIS/NA. I think that museums in general, have a natural affiliation with VRA and ARLIS, and reaching out to AAM, as an umbrella organization for museums, would be worthwhile. AAM recognizes 13 standing professional committees & several other professional interest committees. Some of the concerns of these committees deal with issues related to VRA and ARLIS/NA, though that may not be their sole focus.
<i>The Association of Moving Image Archivists</i> http://www.amianet.org		Without question, this association would make an excellent affiliate of VRA and ARLIS/NA. They mirror our associations in numerous ways with many of the same interests and committees applied to their targeted format of film/video. There are certainly many librarians/VR curators with film and video in their collections. This is also an area of great growth as we increasingly add digital video to our range of visual resources.
<i>Coalition for Networked Information</i> http://www.cni.org	VRA not formally affiliated with the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI), but has, since 1994, been invited to participate in CNI conferences. The CNI institutional membership fee has been waived for VRA (\$4,000 annually) to encourage VRA's input and participation	Organization for institutional members - not individuals. Focus is more the networking of technology rather than the content. Potential for collaboration is fair to good.
<i>Digital Future Coalition</i> http://www.dfc.org	VRA and ARLIS/NA are current members	

Note: The organizations in <i>bold italics</i> were determined to be best suited for affiliation with ARLIS/NA, VRA, or both.		
<i>Museum Computer Network</i> http://www.mcn.edu/index.asp	VRA has an informal agreement for annual conference cross-programming	The potential for affiliation with VRA and/or ARLIS/NA is very high. This group is very organized, has just completed a massive strategic plan for 2010-2013 and is interested in finding cooperative ways of working with other organizations.
Music Library Association http://www.musiclibraryassoc.org		Not lot of direct correlation that might warrant formal affiliation--the largest areas of overlap are cataloging and standards, preservation, and copyright. There is a Copyright Guide that does address fair use where videos, sound recordings, and album art are concerned.
<i>Society of American Archivists</i> http://www.archivists.org		High potential for collaboration. SAA is conducting ground-breaking work on the digitization of archival collections. I see the potential for collaboration as very high -- especially when thinking about museum/library collections as a whole (i.e. archival documents, photographs, works on paper, etc. from a single donor) and how users retrieve search results, etc.
<i>Special Libraries Association</i> http://www.sla.org		The potential for affiliation is medium to high. SLA encompasses many different types/forms of librarianship -- including business, law, etc. and I think there is some potential for sharing info. about visual resources.
<i>Theater Library Association</i> http://tla.library.unt.edu		Given that the TLA "promotes professional best practices in acquisition, organization, access and preservation of performing arts resources in libraries, archives, museums, private collections, and the digital environment," there seems to be a great deal of potential overlap with both the VRA and ARLIS/NA, probably more so with ARLIS/NA
Urban Libraries Council http://www.urbanlibraries.org		Not a prime candidate for formal affiliation with either ARLIS/NA or VRA.
II. Other Cultural Associations (memberships > 300)		
<i>American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works</i> http://aic.stanford.edu		The potential for affiliation is high. This group could assist visual resource collections in dealing with the conservation issues associated with analog and digital image collections. They work closely with museums and libraries to develop collection master plans.
<i>American Institute of Graphic Arts</i> www.aiga.org		There are potential overlapping interests among AIGA, VRA and ARLIS/NA, including copyright issues, image management, digital archives, etc. Not sure what sort of affiliation should be forged - perhaps a joint meeting or summit. Overlapping interests that AIGA seems to have with VRA and/or ARLIS include (based on committee list): Professional development/education, Research award/support, Diversity, International relations, Membership, Publications, Public Policy/advocacy, Standards. They have a fairly substantial membership (22,000+) and many regional chapters. Perhaps chapter involvement is the more worthwhile effort (as a start).
American Society for Aesthetics http://www.aesthetics-online.org		The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, which was est. the same year as the society, appears to be their raison d'etre. I'm not sure that there would be any benefit in an affiliation.

Note: The organizations in <i>bold italics</i> were determined to be best suited for affiliation with ARLIS/NA, VRA, or both.		
American Society for 18th Century Studies http://asecs.press.jhu.edu		"I would base the potential for affiliation at a medium level. Part of my hesitation: the website is fairly basic in design and it is hard to get a sense of the group and its professional activities from it.
<i>Arts Council of the African Studies Association</i> http://www.h-net.org/~artswweb/acasa/acasa.html		Good potential for affiliation.
<i>Association of Art Historians</i> http://aah.org.uk		The AAH appears to be the UK equivalent of CAA. In this respect, it would be just as beneficial for the VRA to affiliate with the AAH as CAA, as the VRA has international membership in the UK. Since ARLIS is focused on North America, perhaps an affiliation with CAA would be sufficient.
<i>Association of Art Museum Curators</i> http://www.artcurators.org		The potential for an affiliation would be high. As many of these art museums have visual resource collections and/or separate research libraries and might be interested in tapping into the larger world of visual resources and/or art librarianship. Membership in this organization is limited to Curators (from Assistant to Senior). This distinction makes the issue of job title especially relevant (i.e. librarians vs. curators vs. VR Professional, etc.). Something to be aware of when looking at this group -- as they seem to limit membership on the basis of job title vs. the type of work being completed by the individual.
<i>Association of College & University Museums & Galleries</i> http://www.acumg.org		This organization would be an excellent affiliate for both organizations. Many of our members work in academic or museum settings. In my daily life in a academic collection, I strongly benefit from a relationship with our college art museum. They also want to bring art into the classroom. We have an ongoing project to create Quick Time Virtual Reality files that allow one to move 360 degrees around museum objects. Professors use these "movies" to supplement visits to the galleries. Museums are also dealing with very similar concerns regarding digitization and database management.
<i>Association of Historians of American Art</i> http://www.ahaaonline.org		Potential for affiliation is fair.
Association of Historians of 19th Century Art http://www.arthistory-archaeology.umd.edu/ahnca		Potential for affiliation is low, as it is itself an affiliate of CAA (a special interest group).
<i>College Art Association</i> http://www.collegeart.org/	VRA and ARLIS/NA are affiliates	There's a lot of useful information to study on their website. They have very detailed information about their affiliated societies program. This could serve well as a model should we wish to develop more detailed guidelines of our own. We would probably want to tweak their model to reflect less of a parent/child relationship and more of a relationship of peers
Foundations in Art: Theory and Education http://www.foundationsinart.org		Not a lot of direct corollaries with either organization. Use of technology in teaching might be a growing area of commonality.

Note: The organizations in <i>bold italics</i> were determined to be best suited for affiliation with ARLIS/NA, VRA, or both.		
Glass Art Society http://www.glassart.org/default.html		The potential for affiliation is fairly low -- probably more of affiliation with VRA than ARLIS/NA. This organization is entirely focused on art glass and its production, sales, etc. The Society is for people involved in the Glass Art community -- not sure what the larger application would be. Or if there would be interest from the Glass Art community.
Historians of Netherlandish Art http://www.hnanews.org/hna/index.html		Hosts panels at the annual conference of the Renaissance Society of America. Also sponsors sessions at CAA conferences. Perhaps more closely aligned with ARLIS/NA? There seems to be more of an emphasis on scholarship, with less emphasis on pedagogy. Of course, it is difficult to determine what is contained in the members only section.
International Association of Art Critics http://www.aica-int.org		No great benefit in affiliating with this organization--not enough common interests
International Association of Word and Image Studies http://www.iawis.org		Potential for affiliation is fair.
International Center of Medieval Art http://www.medievalart.org/htm/about.html		The potential for affiliation is high -- especially given the organization's affiliation with the Met/The Cloisters and their tremendous digital resources.
International Sculpture Center http://www.sculpture.org		I'm not sure if an affiliation would be of benefit to our organizations. ISC is a very targeted group and I'm torn regarding collaboration with a group that covers such a small portion of the subject specialization of ARLIS/NA and VRA.
Leonardo, the International Society for the Arts, Sciences and Technology http://www.leonardo.info		Strong potential for affiliation
National Art Education Association http://www.naea-reston.org		Advocacy may be the greatest link between this organization and VRA and ARLIS/NA. Collaborative grant-writing also seems to be a possibility.
National Association of Artists' Organizations (a federation) http://www.nao.net/		
National Conference of Artists http://ncanewyork.com		The correlations are somewhat vague, other than both groups being art-related. Perhaps a partner in advocacy. Perhaps a partner in increasing diversity within both organizations.
National Council on Education for the Ceramic Arts http://www.nceca.net		The potential for affiliation is low, though a non-profit can become a member of the organization.
New Media Caucus http://www.newmediacaucus.org/nmc_organization.htm		The New Media Caucus is made up of artists and educators using digital media. We could benefit each other through discussions on archival practices for digital works.
Pacific Arts Association http://www.pacificarts.org		The potential for a formal affiliation is low, but I could see the value of PAA members participating at an annual meeting or VRA and/or ARLIS/NA with a session or workshop. Perhaps on the specific challenges associated with Oceania art?
Queer Caucus for Art http://artcataloging.net/glc/glc.html		Perhaps greater potential with ARLIS/NA, as the two are both disseminators of art history, theory, criticism, and studio practice. Perhaps joint publishing possibilities with ARLIS/NA? Perhaps advocacy for the arts and freedom of expression among all three groups.

Note: The organizations in <i>bold italics</i> were determined to be best suited for affiliation with ARLIS/NA, VRA, or both.		
Radical Art Caucus http://www.radicalartcaucus.org		Seems to be a special interest group (as do others in this list) to promote the development of art and scholarship in this area. Not a likely affiliate of VRA beyond any image needs.
Renaissance Society of America http://www.rsa.org		This group represents many disciplines related to Renaissance studies. I think that the possibilities of an affiliation are good, particularly with ARLIS/NA. They have a long list of "associated" organizations (and people), which according to the bylaws, ""shall be entitled to representation on the Council of this Society so long as they remain active, that is, so long as they hold meetings at least once in every two-year period (except where suspension of activities is due to war or other national emergency) and send duly one elected or appointed delegate to the annual meeting of the Council.
Society of Architectural Historians http://www.sah.org		The potential for affiliation is good - given the scholarship and image needs of architectural historians. They are in the process of coordinating an "image exchange" for members and other interested parties to contribute images of buildings for shared educational use. The group held a roundtable discussion at VRA conference in February 1999. They have a large international membership (3500+).
Society of North American Goldsmiths http://www.snagmetalsmith.org		Minimal potential for collaboration.
Society for Photographic Education http://www.spenational.org		The potential for affiliation is medium.
Southeastern College Art Conference http://www.unc.edu/~rfrew/SECAC		SECAC would make an excellent affiliate for VRA and ARLIS/NA. One might also approach an affiliation on the regional chapter level. I'm not sure exactly how the VRA affiliation works (VRC, Visual Resources Curators of SECAC, a chapter of VRA, Visual Resources Association)? I do know that they organize sessions every year at the SECAC annual conference. I'm sure that more involvement by ARLIS/NA would also be welcomed.
Southern Graphics Council http://www.southerngraphics.org		Possible connection with VRA through the existence of the SGA archives committee. The connection with ARLIS/NA might be the common goal of promoting awareness of and appreciation for art resources
Women's Caucus for Art http://www.nationalwca.com		I'm uncertain about affiliation with a group that promotes one gender. I guess this reflects my discomfort in general with movements, organizations, institutions, etc. that separate women. I would like to think that these types of organizations are no longer necessary. I am sure that every one will have a different personal view on the matter. We could simply look at the predominance of women in our professions and use that as a rationale to affiliate. This is a complex one...
III. Non-North American Organizations		
Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Kunst und Museumsbibliotheken http://www.akmb.de/web/html/wir/wir.html	ARLIS/NA is an affiliate	Members of the organization are engaged in digital projects and could offer international perspectives.
ARLIS/Australia & New Zealand http://www.arlis.org.au	ARLIS/NA is an affiliate	Already an affiliate of ARLIS/NA. Some of its conferences have dealt with imaging. Stronger relationship might be worthwhile.
ARLIS/Netherlands	ARLIS/NA is an affiliate	
ARLIS/Norden www.arlisnorden.org	ARLIS/NA is an affiliate	ARLIS/Norden is a federation, supporting Nordic interests, in which institutions and individuals can pay dues. Similar to IFLA in that way. Might be a model for federation.

Note: The organizations in ***bold italics*** were determined to be best suited for affiliation with ARLIS/NA, VRA, or both.

<p><i>ARLIS/Norge</i> (a federation of Nordic ARLIS groups)</p>		
<p><i>ARLIS/United Kingdom & Ireland</i> www.arlis.org.uk</p>	<p>ARLIS/NA is an affiliate</p>	<p>ARLIS/UK is an affiliate of ARLIS/NA, according to ARLIS/NA. The benefits of this affiliation (or costs) are not clear. There is a visual resources committee in ARLIS/UK, so more interaction with VRA might be worthwhile.</p>
<p><i>International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions</i> www.ifla.org</p>	<p>ARLIS/NA is a member</p>	<p>IFLA is a federation that is collaborative in nature. ARLIS/NA holds IFLA membership; VRA does not. IFLA can serve as a model of federation or an alternative. IFLA has global concerns.</p>
<p><i>Japan Art Documentation Society, Tokyo</i> http://wwwsoc.nii.ac.jp/jads/eng/index.html</p>	<p>ARLIS/NA is an affiliate</p>	<p>Already an affiliate with ARLIS/NA but it is not clear what that means since JADS has no affiliate category or description of benefits. Certainly, interest in Asia is ever increasing and Japan's approaches to art documentation should be further explored. What is the significance/result of ARLIS/NA's affiliation with JADS? When did it happen, on what terms?</p>
<p><i>Sous-section des Bibliothèques d'art, Association des bibliothécaires français</i> http://www.abf.asso.fr</p>	<p>ARLIS/NA is an affiliate</p>	

APPENDIX D: Minutes from Meeting with Members at the 2007 VRA Conference

**ARLIS/NA and VRA Joint Task Force on Collaboration
Discussion Forum at the VRA Conference in Kansas City
Tuesday March 27, 2007
5:30-6:30 p.m.**

Joint Task Force Members in Attendance:

Elaine Paul – co-chair
Greta Bahnemann
Meghan Gross
Amy McKenna
Brian Shelburne

Getting Started:

-Introductions
-Explanation of the Task Force and its mission
-Explanation of the “un-survey”
-Discussion of the concept of affiliated organizations and the Task Force’s ongoing assessment/examination of 45 affiliated organizations

Elaine then took a quick poll. Who belongs to an affiliated organization? The results included:

1. MCN
2. AAM
3. CAA
4. ALA
5. SAH
6. NERCOMP
7. ARLIS/NA

I. General Comments and Questions:

For the purposes of this report and to protect the privacy of the participants, identities have been masked.

Participant: What is the future relationship of VRA and ARLIS/NA? That is the Big Question.

Participant: Work with various committees, such as the VRA Membership Committee, ARLIS/NA Membership Committee, regional chapters of both organizations, the VRA Education Committee, ARLIS/NA Professional Development Committee

Participant: How has the mix between the two organizations changed over time? Where are we now vs. where we used to be? It is the responsibility of the new people in both organizations to forge the future and the relationships between the two organizations.

II. Discussion of the various issues associated with a large national joint meeting:

- Large size
- Overwhelming in scope
- Difficult to bring off/pull off from an organizing/coordinating perspective: perhaps scheduled every few years
- One chance to see “all the right people”
- A joint meeting with a specific theme or focus might be the most useful (e.g., Intellectual Property)

Past experiences with Large Joint National Meetings:

Philadelphia: **Participant:** Philadelphia was *supposed* to be joint, but actually two conferences with two overlapping days. **Participant:** there were separate registration fees.

St. Louis: a real joint conference, but some felt too big and too long. Also there were financial issues/difficulties between the two organizations. But have to make these kinds of choices and compromises. (Comment to Elaine from a member outside of the meeting: it's difficult to accommodate all of the conference traditions treasured by both organizations, such as the ARLIS/NA Convocation and the VRA Raffle).

San Diego: why did it fail? **Participant**: Prices for hotel rooms one significant problem; ARLIS/NA willing to reserve rooms at a higher rate.

2010 – proposed as a **possible** joint meeting of ARLIS/NA and VRA (note: this is NOT official)

III. Joint Chapter/Regional Meetings: What about joint chapter/regional meetings? Why aren't we doing more of this? Suggested answer: individual chapter politics and leadership.

Participant: chapters tend to be more personality-driven.
Slightly more manageable than a joint national meeting
Larger regional meetings might present local challenges for venues, etc.

Participant: Mid-Atlantic chapters have had joint sessions (at least one?).

Participant: ARLIS/NA and VRA Northern and Southern California chapters have had joint meetings. Why is this not happening more often? People are busy; logistics are challenging. But it should be encouraged.

Participant: What about a joint national conference with a one or two day overlap? This would be a repeat of the situation in Philadelphia. We should also note the problems of splitting the costs of a joint conference between the two organizations.

Participant: The cost argument is an important one. Attending both conferences is an argument for more affiliation opportunities. Most people simply cannot afford to attend the national VRA and ARLIS/NA conferences, the regional/chapter meetings of ARLIS/NA and VRA, and also maintain membership (with its associated travel costs) with other professional organizations.

IV. The Commonalities Between ARLIS/NA and VRA:

Digitization – has created MORE commonalities between the two organizations. Digitization and digital projects are driving the need for more collaboration. We now deal with the same issues/share the same space. Today there is more overlap between the two organizations than there used to be.

Participant: need for more collaboration from increasing commonalities. His library position is now merging with IT.

Participant: wears different hats every day in her job. ARLIS/NA's VRD exists, but now in question with the rethinking of committees, divisions, and round tables?

Participant: how do we work with the Venn diagram between the two organizations? How many VRA members are in art and architecture, and how many not? While the *most* are, there are members who are not, who bring unique perspective to the organization.

Participant: Venn diagram important image to keep in mind through this process.

Participant: There is very little new stuff happening in the world of art librarianship that ISN'T about digital collections and digitization projects.

Participant: images increasingly part of electronic resources licensed through libraries [i.e., ARTstor, Grove, Wilson, etc.]

V. Brainstorming on Specific Opportunities for Collaboration:

- Joint survey
- Internships/student awards

Participant: ARLIS/NA internship awards getting big (60+/year). 75-80% of applicants want to do something digital/usually involving images. Would be nice to see more awards. But do we need two separate committees?

Participant: VRA Education Committee saw the ARLIS/NA applicants; has asked the VRA Board for money for another scholarship.

- Joint student paper contest: **Participant:** Gerd Muehsam Award in ARLIS: What about a joint contest?
- Scholarships for SEI attendance: **Participant:** money from both organizations?
- Create some benefits for being a member of both organizations
- Joint committee work: where do committees overlap?

Participant: the “big” overarching organizations, such as ALA, share some infrastructure, such as legal teams.

Participant: One advantage of collaboration could be greater advocacy/public awareness/national awareness – some of this could be done through joint committees.

Participant: ARLIS/NA has lost some ground recently—visibility problem?

Participant: The criteria for hiring/retention of Visual Resources Professionals/Librarians should be re-done/re-worked. Could be a result of a joint committee/task force (i.e. professional status task force).

VI. Conclusion:

- Complete the “un-survey”
- Contact Task Force Members with any questions/concerns/comments
- More information will follow after ARLIS/NA (we’ll see some of you in Atlanta!)

APPENDIX E: Minutes from Meeting with Members at the 2007 ARLIS/NA Conference

**ARLIS/NA and VRA Joint Task Force on Collaboration
Discussion Forum at the ARLIS/NA Conference in Atlanta
Saturday April 28, 2007
5:00-6:30 p.m.**

23 attendees signed in, including task force members

Joint Task Force Members in Attendance:

Elaine Paul – co-chair
Ed Teague – co-chair
Greta Bahnemann

Getting Started

- Introductions
- Explanation of the Task Force and its mission
- Mention and promotion of the “un-survey”
- Barbara Rockenbach is the new ARLIS/NA-VRA liaison

I. General Comments and Questions:

For the purposes of this report and to protect the privacy of the participants, identities have been masked.

Greta Bahnemann: Just want to say that there is no pre-determined outcome for this group – we are here to listen and promote discussion. The members of the task force are not advocating for a particular outcome.

Ed Teague: The concept of collaboration is not a new idea – we are here to explore the value of collective opportunities, explore the two organizations’ professional relationship and our relationship with other affiliated organizations. Question: what can emerge from these live forums and the online survey? Answer: a valuable exchange of ideas.

Elaine Paul: I know some of you just came from the Visual Resources Division of ARLIS/NA meeting. Does anyone have anything they would like to share?

Participant: I will summarize the meeting for the group. We voted to accept the Task Force’s recommendation to re-form in a new way/as a new group. One area of conversation included the areas of overlap between the two groups such as metadata and cataloging. Members agreed that we should spend time on topics such as these – especially timely issues that both groups are concerned with. The group needs a new name – one that reflects the group’s efforts to move forward.

Participant: I’d like to pose a question to the group – Is there any impulse for VRA to disband and re-join ARLIS/NA?

Participant: No

Participant: If anything, it would be the other way [i.e. ARLIS/NA disband and join VRA].

Ed Teague: The recommendations/concrete suggestions of the Task Force will be produced for our June deadline and given to the Boards of both organizations. One question for the group: Where can we focus better?

Ed Teague/Elaine Paul: discussion of member demographics. Ed pointed out that the crossover membership of ARLIS/VRA was not large and most ARLIS people belonged to ALA among other organizations. Who belongs to what organizations? Need to better track how and where we all overlap (both VRA and ARLIS/NA as well as the other affiliated organizations).

Participant: professional status survey noted that between 83 and 85% of respondents were associated with art and architecture collections

Participants: discuss the phenomenon of how the two organizations and their members see each other – and all the accompanying baggage and stereotypes associated therewith. These perceptions need to be addressed.

II. Discussion of the various issues associated with a Joint National Conference:

Participant: yes, a joint conference would be great!

Participant: A joint conference is a great idea – it is a good use of time and resources and there are many opportunities for great conversations. Though St. Louis was excellent.

Participant: The time proximity of the two separate conferences – as they exist today – makes for real challenges in terms of time management, money, planning etc. given that they are so close to each other. Maybe a joint conference every three years?

Participant: It seems that with two separate conferences that one of the organizations is always missing out on great sessions, workshops, presentations, etc.

Participant: One solution to that problem is intentionally duplicating the presentations that are relevant to both organizations at each conference. But is that really efficient?

Participant: If we *knew* that we were getting together every 3 years or so, we could plan accordingly, to avoid duplication.

Participant: The boundaries between the two organizations are blurring. So why not greater interoperability between the two? We should focus on our commonalities and structure the time at a joint conference accordingly – including allowing for overlapping days in the middle that would address common issues, etc.

Participant: What about merging the conferences on an annual basis (vs. having a joint conference every three years or once in a while)?

Participant: I agree, what is the problem holding us back?

Participant: We should note that even combined we are a very small group, but we require a great deal of meeting space/meeting rooms combined with exhibit space. And we'll never be able to afford a convention center.

(San Diego was hard—couldn't find a hotel venue)

Participant: Both organizations have meeting locations and dates planned well in advance.

Participant: One thing to remember with joint conferences is the possibility that we might have to give up on some organizational traditions such as the raffles or baskets, etc.

Participant: That is just logistics. Those issues can be worked out. What we need is real buy-in from both organizations.

Participant: Don't forget – just because we have a joint conference doesn't mean we have to do everything together. There will be room and time for each organization to do its own thing. What we're talking about is PROGRAMS, GROUPS, TASK FORCES, COMMITTEES, etc. The important stuff.

III. Discussion of the possibility of Joint Publications:

Participant: Suggested to her that we should always do the professional status survey as a joint publication.

Participant: A joint professional status survey is a good way to track organizational demographics.

Participant: I think any joint publication should focus on the topics/subjects that are of interest to both organizations:

- Cataloging
- Copyright
- Competencies
- Metadata
- Digital Imaging Standards

Participant: I agree. I also think Policy Publications and Criteria for Hiring VR Professionals would be good. Also we need a policy statement about Collection Development and Collection Management of Digital Collections.

Participant: I am not opposed to publishing a very Visual Resources focused paper – as long as it falls out where the boundaries are blurring between the two organizations/two sides of the profession.

Participant: Is there a way to share the two organization's publications? We need to share – if you are a member of one of the organizations, could you get the publications of the other organization?

Solution: post publication on both listservs. This way we would know what exists at the other organization.

Participant: PDFs will now be available – we are bringing the affiliated benefits to the chapter level.

Participant: Reminder: ARLIS/NA online publications are free and open to all.

General Question: what are the benefits of affiliation?

Participant: to talk generally about resource sharing, I should note that I am mining this conference for the VRA folks.

Participant: Question – is it going the other way? Who is mining VRA for ARLIS/NA? and what about people outside of the two organizations? People need to know/want to know about organizing images, metadata, etc.

Participant: How do we make the content of the VRA conference available to those who don't attend both conferences?

Participant: The answer is in publication reciprocity!

IV. Discussion of Upcoming Retirements and Continuing Struggle to Remain Viable

Participant: Noted that there are many retirements coming up in the two organizations and we need to find ways to lobby/push for the full replacement of those retirees.

Participant: A timely reminder – any Visual Resources Collections will be entirely digital before any Art Library loses its book collection. This is especially true in academia – where librarians will become the administrators of visual resource collections. We need to look at what happens to space and people.

V. Liaisons Between ARLIS/NA and VRA:

Participant: Let's talk about the liaison role between VRA and ARLIS/NA. What can that person do/what role does that person fill? What are some concrete ideas? We should tell the liaison what we want and need. The need for joint publications, papers, conference content – we need to share these thoughts directly with the liaison.

Question: is there a VRA liaison to ARLIS/NA?

Participant: what about a blog for the liaison? The two separate list-servs do NOT work well for joint discussions.

Participant: how about the liaison facilitating communications about conferences?

VI. Joint Regional Conferences:

Ed Teague: Joint regional conferences - this was one of the most popular suggestions in the survey. How does the group feel about this?

Participant: Southern California is currently doing this. With MCN for example.

Elaine Paul: SE/VRA chapter is working with the SECAC. I also know that the ARLIS and VRA Texas chapters have held joint meetings

(Midwest groups have had side-by-side meetings; ARLIS/NA and VRA New England have met together)

Ed Teague: Should there be financial support from the two national organizations to support this?

Participant: Do a joint meeting at the regional level as that is where you deal with daily working life stuff (CCO Workshops, etc.). But from a legal standpoint would it be possible for the chapters to do more than that – we cannot legally combine/merge at the local and/or regional level.

Participant: The great thing about joint meetings is the influx of new people with different resources, new ideas, programs, etc.

Participant: So we just need to separate out the programs from the legal structure and not worry about a legal merger of the two local groups.

Participant: We need a liaison from both organizations – this would help things all around and especially on some basic emotion level where we would know that our two groups are really communicating with each other.

Question: Who goes to both meetings? -

VII. Other Opportunities/Areas for Collaboration:

Participant: What about the internship? We are trying to do more to work together – we are not steeped in the traditions of ARLIS/NA and VRA and can see the advantages of working together.

Ed Teague: Ed noted that visual resources has always been part of ARLIS/NA's mission (current wording: The mission of ARLIS/NA is to foster excellence in art and design librarianship and image management.) so that VR people aren't excluded from ARLIS internships.

Participant: How about an education program that is relevant to both organizations? SEI should be a beginning point – we need to move forward from that.

Participant: So what about SEI 2.0? People keep asking about it, but it's difficult for one team to pull off one— maybe we need two different groups?

Participant: What about an e-SEI? (little reaction)

Participant: What about awards? Travel awards that would enable someone to attend the “other” conference? How about something geared towards new professionals?

(Greta read examples offered by the VRA meeting participants. General agreement that they are great ideas)

Participant: What about user groups? (for example: a ContentDM user group).

Participant: I am concerned about the passage of time between the last joint conference and the next joint conference (if and when that happens). Question: where do our discussions go when the board changes? There is no joint meeting in the near future? What happens to our ideas, concerns, etc. How do we keep all of this stuff we've talked about on the front burner? All of this needs to be translated into the policies of both organizations; not subjected to Board-driven personalities that change frequently.

Participant: perhaps Board positions as affiliate liaisons could be created for each association, especially considering the ARLIS/NA assessment task force?

Ed Teague: This hints at the idea of federation. Is it too complex to think about right now? A federation is a more formal relationship than an affiliation.

Participant: What a bureaucracy! [sounds of agreement from the group]

Participant: Does this federation idea appeal? Would require by-law changes, legal issues, etc.

Participant: I'd need to learn more before voicing an opinion [sounds of agreement from the group]

Participant: It isn't all or nothing. We CAN work together and yet remain separate.

Participant: What about a federation based on a topic or shared interest? (for example: copyright, pedagogy, etc.).

Ed Teague: This can also be the work of a committee or task force.

Participant: Repeated workshops at both conferences. These could be developed to be presented at both conferences. There are lots of topics that would appeal to both groups.

Question: how many young/younger members of VRA have a MLS/MLIS degree? The demographics/makeup of younger members is a key consideration.

Participant: We've never done Educating the Educators at ARLIS/NA.

Participant: We should note that new graduates and library students have already merged our two groups in their minds. They don't see the separation between the two organizations. They haven't narrowed their career expectations by aligning themselves with one group or the other and aren't aware of the accompanying baggage.

Participant: Right! Excellent point. But we have to remember that there are real physical/emotional/intellectual limits of performing and contributing to both organizations – not to mention financial limits of attending two major national conferences.

Participant: regarding other organizations outside of ARLIS/NA and VRA—people are having to pick and choose which conferences they go to. MCN, Computers and Libraries, Digital Library Federation)—some of those people may not come back to ARLIS/NA or VRA.

Participant: I don't see our future in a very rosy light. You know what I would REALLY like to see? I'd like to see a single new organization emerge from the ashes of both organizations.

Group Response: Yes, wow, what an interesting idea, etc.

VIII. Conclusion:

- Complete the "un-survey"
- Contact Task Force Members with any questions/concerns/comments
- More information will follow

Footnote: at the annual business meeting, a student member mentioned that he would like to see joint student chapters between VRA and ARLIS/NA.