

David Greenfield

January, 2010

On Multi-Institutional Collaboration

ED 729, Dr. Kay Davis

- Abilock, D. (2004). Are ye-ew [sic] using the ri-ight [sic] tools to leverage collaboration?. *CSLA Journal*. 27 (2). 17-20.

Provides a selection of web-based education tools as well as examples of how they are used and by which demographic group (k-12). Abilock's premise is based on the theory of multiple intelligence and that not all teachers teach the same way. Hence, there are tools for sequential learner and teachers (such as for the sciences) and tools for more non-linear learners and teachers. An additional premise is that all tools operate more efficiently when set in a collaborative learning environment, such as partnerships between teachers and library media specialists.

- Besser, H. (2007). Collaboration for Electronic Preservation. *Library Trends*. 56 (1), 216-229.

Howard Besser promotes the importance resource sharing between different sectors that use similar media, arguing that the level of complexity to catalog and archive is more often than not too great and too costly for any one institution to manage by itself. Besser's basic premise, that collaboration is a valuable and important necessity of any institution that possesses a collection of media. His article focuses on pragmatic issues of institutional collaboration based upon the results from several successful collaborative projects he directed. He identifies 7 guidelines for successful collaborations: Partners need to understand their collective goals, select appropriate partners, commitment through shared goals, allocate resources, regularly scheduled communications, realistic targets, respect secondary goals of each partner.

- Buzzeo, T. (2008). Make the Move from Collaboration to Data-Driven Collaboration. *Library Media Connection*. 27 (3), 28-31.

This article focuses on instructional partnerships between librarians and educators, positing that they are natural collaborators. Describing the tension between the desire to inspire students to want to be independent, lifelong learners with the demands of high achievement on standards-based tests, she suggests that the most appropriate path is to partner educators and teachers with library media specialists. This approach promotes "team-planned, team-taught and team-assessed" collaboration where all active partners share common goals. Furthermore, she argues that collaboration is more than a one-time activity between similar disciplines, but rather an ongoing process involving two or more subjects. She argues that this is a model of cooperation to coordination to collaboration.

- Dow, E. (2008). Successful inter-institutional resource sharing in a niche educational market: Formal collaboration without a contract. *Innovative Higher Education*. 33 (3). 169-179.

Dow addresses the expanding need for education and training of new archivists. Education, identifying is as a “niche curriculum in campus based education” that is highly in demand. A solution to this niche market of limited and geographically distant schools is the creation of multi-institutional collaborative programs to share resources and classes through learning management systems and web-based video. She cites several examples of successful collaborative programs and identifies the participating institutional departments (library, information science and history). Dow describes the practical implications with an overview of distance education, its’ policies and governance, institutional policies and courses, faculty and marketing.

- Feldman, S., & Gonick, L. (2005). The dream of ONECLEVELAND: A new ultrabroadband network could transform the library's educational role. *Library Journal- New York*. 130 (14). 34-36.

Addresses the distribution of digital content to local communities through institutional partnerships that have taken advantage of the rapid growth of the web. The authors use the “ClevelandOne” project as an example of how to integrate and promote broadband technology platforms to all community partners- residents, schools, libraries, museum and corporation with the goal of promoting literacy (traditional and computer), community involvement for the improvement of life and to make “netizens” for the current century.

- Ogden, S. (2007). Understanding, respect, and collaboration in cultural heritage preservation: A conservator's developing perspective. *Library Trends*. 56 (1). 275-287.

Although not directly addressing technology-based collaborations, this article addresses some very important issues that can be applied to all types of collaborative projects. Ogden describes the tensions and struggles between cultural-history museum professionals and members of indigenous peoples whose artifacts are collected and archived in cultural history museums. She elucidates that this tension is caused by the museum professional’s approach is that objects are primarily cultural assets needing to be safe-guarded, cataloged and if put on display (almost as an art piece), then done so in a manner that will protect and preserve the intangible attributes of them (i.e. what the object represents). Experienced as a conservator at the Smithsonian Museum, she learned that it is possible to bridge differences between the two cultures by regular and open dialogue and defining mutually accepted nomenclature, practices and understandings, quoting curator at the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture Tony Chavarria: “By seeking dialogue rather than reparation, our interactions turn from

being between museum and tribal authority, to a quite talk of common interests.”

- Trant, J. (2009). Emerging Convergence? Thoughts on museums, archives, libraries and professional training. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 24 (4). 369-386.

Trant identifies similarities in the professional practices in museums, archives and libraries and then suggests several approaches that can be used to better bridge formal and informal collaboration with the goal to make stronger learning experiences for visitors of these three types of institutions. She advances the idea that libraries functions as a fulcrum to making changes that promote collaboration. Trant recognizes that the different natures of these three types of institutions has led to diverging professional practices, but calls for institutional leaders to recognize the similarities to enable and develop professional education programs that share information and processes. Specifically, she addresses the digital environment for promoting and developing these collaborative initiatives because the digital process is often more efficient to manage and support collaborations than face-to-face meetings (especially for geographically distant partners).

- Trant, J. (2006). Exploring the potential for social tagging and folksonomy in art museums: Proof of concept. *New Review of Hypermedia & Multimedia*. 12 (1). 83-105.

Documents a proof of concept research project of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York to develop nomenclature that bridges museum professional's formal taxonomies and thesaurus' with museum's (brick-and-mortar and web) visitors use of informal and colloquial terms. Primary research focuses on the web and the use of Social Tagging and Folksonomies in collection descriptions. These two terms represent a concept where there is “collective assignment of keywords” to describe objects and an “assemblage of concepts of concepts expressed in such cooperatively developed system of classification.” In other words, social tagging is the use of individual popular terms as descriptors and taxonomies are the collection of these terms. This allows untrained visitors can acquire the power to describe objects in populist terms that are understood by both professionals and non-professionals alike. Some see this tagging as a method to create collaboration between users and professionals.