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Speakers

• Margaret Webster, Cornell University: *When Change Comes Knocking*

• Jolene de Verges, MIT: *The Ying and the Yang: Stand Alone Versus Integrated Visual Resources Collections*

• Katharine Keller, Stanford University: *Changing Course: Navigating in New Terrain*

• Gary Ginther, Ohio University: *VR Races Back to the Art Library and Makes a Speedy Recovery*
Our Current Environment

- Fannie Mae
- Freddi Mac
- Foreclosures
- Stock Market
- AIG
- Layoffs
- TARP
- Bail Outs
- GM
- Chrysler
- Wall Street
- Recession
- Stimulus Packages
- Layoffs
- Bail Outs
- Loss of Endowment
- Bail Outs
- TARP
# Cornell VR Collection Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative Control Group</td>
<td>Includes Beyond the Taj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of AAP</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Art</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Included in “other”</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Included in “other”</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Number of Digital Images</td>
<td>How Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVR Collection (KVRC)</td>
<td>Built and maintained by KVRF</td>
<td>28,435</td>
<td>Luna Insight; ARTstor hosting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archivision</td>
<td>Licensed Resource</td>
<td>28,658</td>
<td>ARTstor hosting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the Taj</td>
<td>Built and maintained by KVRF</td>
<td>6,682</td>
<td>Luna Insight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholars Resource</td>
<td>Licensed Resource (Funded by AAP &amp; FAL)</td>
<td>65,625</td>
<td>Luna Insight; ARTstor hosting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>129,400 + images available in ARTstor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARL Director Questions

• Is the VR/slide collection part of the library?
• If no, where does it sit administratively?
• If yes, has it been merged with an art library or has it remained a separate entity?
• What do you see as the pros and cons of such a merger?
Pros and Cons...

- **Pros**
  - Space savings
  - Multi-disciplinary use of images
  - Flexibility
  - Integrated access
  - Convergences
  - Better service/more expertise
  - Economies of scale

- **Cons**
  - Diluted support for traditional intensive image users
  - Loss of control over content selection & delivery
  - Copyright issues
  - Staffing implications
  - Lack of last minute service
  - Metadata issues
Visual Resources Survey

• Is your collection part of a unit (subject) library?
• Is your collection part of the “digital” library?
• Is your collection a stand alone unit in the library?
• Is the metadata for your collections supplied by your technical services department?
• Do you use a different approach?
Location of Visual Resources Collections

**Institution**

- Academic: 83.1%
- Museum: 8.3%
- Corporate: 5.2%
- Architectural Firm: 1.1%
- Archives: 1.0%

**Seat of Academic Institution Collection**

- Academic department: 40.1%
- University Library: 18.6%
- College/school within larger University: 17.4%
- University: 11.2%
- Independent College/school: 10.7%
- Institution archives: 2.1%
Level of Education

Master's Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Subject only</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLS only</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLS and Subject</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Subjects</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aging of the Profession

![Age Group Chart]

- **2007**
- **1999**
Do the dominoes really fall into place?