TO: Provost Shulenburger; Dean Bentley; Asst. Dean Rholes
FROM: Susan Craig

RE: Sabbatical Leave Report

The May 2002 memo on Sabbatical Leave Policies and Procedures includes the following requirement: "No later than 90 days after the end of the sabbatical leave period, a faculty member shall file a brief narrative account of his/her leave period with the Office of the Provost, with copies to the appropriate chairperson and/or dean or director." I am pleased to fulfill this requirement with this report.

My sabbatical leave of 5 months was divided into two periods so I was on leave from October 1-November 24, 2001 and from March 4-June 8, 2002. My project was to investigate current, best practices of art and architecture libraries specifically in four areas: library instructional programs; library space; incorporation of digital image collections into library resources; and changes in collection development and acquisitions due to e-commerce. I chose to use two methods of investigating the topics. First, I created a survey instrument along with a mailing list of 195 art and architecture libraries in the U.S. and Canada. My second method of research was to travel to selected libraries and have in-depth conversations with the librarians as well as tour the facilities.

I devised an ambitious schedule and at times, was scrambling to meet my deadlines. During October, I drafted the survey instrument, sent it out for review by colleagues as well as the university's Advisory Committee on Human Experimentation. While the reviews were underway, I prepared a mailing list drawn from the membership of the Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA), the Association of Research Libraries, and the Greater Western Library Alliance. One of the first challenges was trying to identify the specific person at each institution who was in charge of the art and architecture library collections. Extensive use of the websites for each institution as well as the ARLIS/NA directory allowed me to address the packets to individuals. After receiving approval for the survey and making some editing changes, I decided to color code the surveys by type-of-library. This decision meant I could easily tally the responses according to whether the response was from a library at an academic institution, an art museum, or an art and design school. I also numbered each survey so I could track who had not responded and a second questionnaire could be sent as required. Since one of my goals was to assure a high rate of return, I also included an addressed/stamped envelope in each packet. This was particularly challenging for the Canadian participants but with the help of a colleague, I acquired the appropriate Canadian stamps for my northern colleagues. The mailing was sent on Wednesday October 17 and was paid for with a research grant from the Library.

Simultaneously with the preparation of the surveys and mailings, I was finalizing plans to visit libraries in southern California. I had selected this area because of the abundance of academic art and architecture libraries as well as the Getty Research Institute which houses one of the largest and most important art libraries in the world. I flew to Los Angeles on Friday Oct. 19 where I rented a car and a Santa Monica apartment. Beginning on Monday Oct. 22 I visited the libraries at UCLA, UC Santa Barbara, UC Irvine, UC San Diego, USC, LA County Museum of Art, the Huntington, the Getty, and the Norton Simon Museum. I scheduled each institution for a single day except for the Getty which I visited twice. In some cases I met solely with the art librarian but more frequently I met with multiple staff members in various library departments. I began with a set of specific questions but the conversations usually expanded based on the special resources, services, and facilities at the individual library. Everyone was exceedingly generous with
their time, their expertise, and their printed documentation. I gathered annual reports, budget figures, organizational charts, brochures, and bibliographies. I had intended to photograph the facilities as part of the record but found it often was disruptive to the patrons using the libraries so stopped. By the end of my two-week stay I was a veteran of the LA freeways and awash in information about current practices in art and architecture libraries.

During the rest of my fall leave I wrote thank you notes, organized my notes and papers, documented my expenditures for reimbursement from the GRF and Murphy Travel Funds, and began recording the questionnaires that were returned. I resumed my regular duties after the Thanksgiving break.

In January I sent a second questionnaire to the 68 institutions that had not yet responded. I was pleased with the 65% response rate that had been achieved but wanted to raise it to 75-80% if possible.

In March I again went on sabbatical leave and my first act was to tally all the returns. I had surveys from 163 institutions or 84% of those sent. Since the ARLIS/NA conference was scheduled for late March, I knew that many of the participants would be interested in the survey results. This proved to be the case with curiosity from those who had responded, regrets from some who had not, and interest from the commercial vendors who had heard of the project.

Allowing only a short time for the conferees to return home and attend to the backlogs that developed in their absence, I left on April 9 for a three-week driving trip visiting art and architecture libraries throughout the Midwest. The Big 10 schools are particularly noteworthy for their excellent library collections so that formed the itinerary I followed. University of Illinois, Indiana University, Ohio State University, University of Michigan, University of Chicago, University of Wisconsin, and University of Iowa were all on my schedule as well as the libraries at the Indianapolis Museum of Art, the Cleveland Museum of Art, and the Art Institute of Chicago. Although I didn't visit the libraries at the Cincinnati Art Museum, the Detroit Art Institute, and the Milwaukee Art Museum I did stop at each to see the collections. Like the trip to southern California, I spent most of a day at each institution having made arrangements in advance with the art and architecture librarians. In some cases I also met with instruction librarians, digital librarians, visual resource curators, and heads of collection development. It was exciting to see so many facilities as well as collections and to talk with so many colleagues about issues of mutual interest. I returned home with bundles of notes as well as the papers made available at each institution.

To fulfill my obligation to share the information I learned through this project I have submitted and had accepted by the Journal of Library Administration an article about the survey results. This has already been edited and will appear in the fall issue. I have also proposed and had accepted a workshop on surveys for the 2003 ARLIS/NA conference in Baltimore. Because assessment is such a major focus of libraries and surveys are one of the primary assessment tools, I believe this will be a popular session at the conference.

This sabbatical leave fulfilled all my expectations and more. It allowed me the time to complete a research project that I believe will have a lasting impact on the profession. It provided an opportunity to visit multiple libraries and gather many ideas about practices and procedures that I'd like to implement at KU. It also gave me a time to reflect and plan for new services, changing collection formats, and an increased instructional program. I am grateful to everyone who helped make it possible.
My sabbatical leave of 5 months was divided into two periods so I was on leave from October 1-November 24, 2001 and from March 4-June 8, 2002. My project was to investigate current, best practices of art and architecture libraries specifically in four areas: library instructional programs; library space; incorporation of digital image collections into library resources; and changes in collection development and acquisitions due to e-commerce. I chose to use two methods of investigating the topics. First, I created a survey instrument along with a mailing list of 195 art and architecture libraries in the U.S. and Canada. My second method of research was to travel to selected libraries and have in-depth conversations with the librarians as well as tour the facilities.
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In January I sent a second questionnaire to the 68 institutions that had not yet responded and in March I again went on sabbatical leave and my first act was to tally all the returns. I had surveys from 163 institutions or 84% of those sent.

On April 9 I left on a three-week driving trip visiting art and architecture libraries throughout the Midwest. The Big 10 schools are particularly noteworthy for their excellent library collections so that formed the itinerary I followed. University of Illinois, Indiana University, Ohio State University, University of Michigan, University of Chicago, University of Wisconsin, and University of Iowa were all on my schedule as well as the libraries at the Indianapolis Museum of Art, the Cleveland Museum of Art, and the Art Institute of Chicago. Like the trip to southern California, I spent most of a day at each institution having made arrangements in advance with the art and architecture librarians. In some cases I also met with instruction librarians, digital librarians, visual resource curators, and heads of collection development. It was exciting to see so many facilities as well as collections and to talk with so many colleagues about issues of mutual interest. I returned home with bundles of notes as well as the papers made available at each institution.

The results of my sabbatical project were distributed in two forums. I presented the survey results in an article published in the 2003 Journal of Library Administration, v.31:1, pgs 91-107 and conducted a 1/2 day workshop on surveys for the 2003 ARLIS/NA conference in Baltimore which was attended by over 50 people. Informally, I have heard from a teacher of art librarianship at Indiana University that she regularly assigns her students the article since it is one of the few examples of quantitative data for the field.

Besides the expected results of becoming much better informed about current practices after the opportunity to visit several art libraries and to review the survey results, the sabbatical also created a new opportunity for me as I was asked to serve as the first Assessment Coordinator for the KU Libraries from February 2003-July 2004.