

KRESS

DIGITAL RESOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ART GRANT PROGRAM

A Report 2007 – 2016

L.W. Schermerhorn
Deputy Director, Kress Foundation
December 2017

The Kress Foundation launched its Digital Resources for the History of Art grant program in 2007. This program reflects and embodies the Foundation's strategic commitment to enable and encourage engagement with digital technologies on the part of art historians working in both the academy and museums. The Foundation had observed that while digital technologies seemed poised to transform scholarly practice as well as teaching and learning across the humanities, the field of art history had yet to engage fully with the promise represented by new and emerging technologies. Kress set out to help change that.

With nearly a decade of funding data now at our disposal, it seems an opportune moment to reflect on the shape and impact of this grant program. An internal briefing for the Kress Board of Trustees was drafted earlier this year as part of a larger conversation about the future of the field and the Foundation's strategic priorities. We share a summary distillation of that report here, intended to reflect one committed funder's view of the evolving field of digital art history. We hope that our perspective might shed light on that field, and on the needs and aspirations of its growing ranks of practitioners.

Please note, the projects included here do not necessarily reflect future directions for the Digital Resources for the History of Art grant program.

The Samuel H. Kress Foundation, established in 1929, promotes the scholarship, conservation and enjoyment of pre-modern European art through its grants and fellowships programs. www.kressfoundation.org

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

It is now well accepted that digital technologies are transforming scholarly practice as well as teaching and learning. With online access to archives, image collections, scholarly publications, and teaching/learning tools, the way students and scholars – of all ages – learn and conduct research has forever changed. Yet the field of art history was not an early adopter of these innovations, despite its own history of being reliant on the “technology of the moment” – prints, photography, slide projection, and print publishing. But the Kress Foundation concluded ten years ago that the discipline of art history, including the field of pre-modern European art history, needed to pro-actively engage in the digital landscape. The Foundation identified a strategic need to create a funding program for digital technologies in art history, to meet innovation where it was, and support its continued development. The Foundation concluded it would: 1. work with a range of partners (including other funders) to build online resources and software tools designed to meet the needs of art historians as teachers, students and scholars; 2. provide widespread access to and training in the use of such resources and software tools; and 3. sponsor fellowship opportunities for prolonged engagement with new technologies and for rethinking traditional approaches to both teaching and scholarship. Tactically, this meant the Foundation would support the following: the digitization of visual and textual resources; digital publishing (broadly defined); and new creative approaches in teaching, learning and research in the history of art and related fields utilizing digital technologies.

By encouraging the digital engagement of the field of art history in these ways, the Foundation hoped it would not only support continued and expanded access to essential art historical resources, but also foster new kinds of scholarship, teaching/learning and professional development opportunities. Kress would also be engaging a younger audience, and by supporting a younger generation that has grown-up dependent on such technologies, Kress would ideally cultivate a pipeline of students committed to pre-modern European art history. The Board wholeheartedly endorsed the creation of a new Digital Resources for the History of Art grant program (GDHA) in 2007, making a deliberate commitment to encouraging the adoption of digital technologies throughout the field of art history.

With nearly a decade of funding data now at our disposal, this is an opportune moment to reflect on the shape and impact of the program. While the GDHA program was formally established at the start of a new five-year grant cycle in Kress’s 2010 fiscal year (FY2010), for the purposes of this analysis, we are including all such awards beginning in FY2008, the year Max Marmor became president of the Foundation, when a more concentrated effort was made to support the field in this way. (It should be noted that prior to 2007, the Foundation had in fact supported digital projects,¹ but those grants were, by and large, responsive to requests received “over the transom” and not part of any programmatic strategy.)

The original aim of this review was to evaluate whether the Foundation’s funding has been in alignment with the original intent of the program, and to consider whether there should be any course adjustment at this juncture. The analysis is based upon information the Foundation has received from grantees in their applications and final reports, via communications with Kress staff beyond the life of the grant, and through research the Foundation has performed. In addition,

¹ One such example is the support Kress gave to Artstor in 2005, an online scholarly library of visual culture, to have images of the Kress Collection included in the image library.

the Foundation is an active and visible member of this field and in the funding community, and has benefited from the shared intelligence this allows. Kress has not endeavored to conduct a more formal quantitative or qualitative review of the program, and so measuring our impact on this emerging discipline remains, at this time, largely observational.

II. OVERVIEW

From its fiscal year 2008 through 2016, the Foundation has made 193 awards to 95 grantees under the GDHA program, totaling \$7,125,935, and supporting 146 projects.² Because of the scale and complexity of many digital projects, large budgets are often required and 77% of all funding for this program was Board-approved (\$5,453,425 for 86 grants), while 23% of all GDHA grant dollars supported discretionary-level projects (\$1,672,510 for 107 grants). There were modest ebbs and flows in the total number of awards made each year, but on an average 21 grants were awarded annually (see Appendix I).

The applicant pool for the Digital Resources for the History of Art program reflects the entire range of grantees the Foundation has historically supported – art museums, colleges and universities, art history research centers, art archives and libraries, along with other art-related non-profits. The 95 grantees in the GDHA program can be roughly divided into thirds: colleges and universities (32); museums (31); and other non-profits, including art libraries, archives and research centers (32). This echoes the distribution of our support in other grant programs. The grantees were primarily distributed throughout the United States, with an unsurprising 50% concentration in the Northeast, but eleven of the grantees were European institutions, representing 12% of the total number (see Appendix II).

This is useful information to establish the basic framework of the program, but the more interesting details relate to the substance of the grants themselves. In an effort to understand patterns in the Foundation's support, each grant has been categorized, identifying the primary (and sometimes secondary and tertiary) intent of each project. This is far from a perfect system however, as many grants bridge multiple categories and the definitions of the categories themselves are inherently (and unavoidably) reductive. But identifying the essential character of the projects Kress has supported reveals the shape of the field Kress has entered. And one might argue, a field we have in turn influenced.

The five main categories are:

- Digitization & Access (DA)*
- Digital Publishing (DP)*
- Professional Development (PD)*
- Sponsored Research (SR)*
- Tools Development (TD)*

² A number of the awards in the GDHA program have supported multi-year/multi-grant projects, such as the Kress Collection database at the National Gallery of Art (5 awards), and the photo archives project at the American Academy in Rome (10 awards); hence the total project number, 146, is fewer than the total grant number 193.

Two secondary categories were established, applied only as a second or third category to a project:

Preservation & Conservation (PC)
Pedagogy & Education (PE)

These last two categories identify instances where in supporting the evolution of digital art history the Foundation simultaneously advanced other core commitments (in this case conservation and pedagogy) also supported through independent grant programs. (See Appendix III for full definitions of the categories.)

Of the 193 grants awarded, 75 (39%) were assigned only a single category. The remaining 118 grants (61%) were assigned multiple categories, reflecting the complexity and ambitious scope of many of the projects. This also reflects a strategic aim of the Foundation: to support multiple facets of its mission by leveraging a single grant. One such example was a grant to the non-profit Cultural Heritage Imaging to develop a series of case studies for digital conservation programs in partnership with the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco. This single award supported Sponsored Research, Preservation & Conservation, and Pedagogy & Education.

Digital Publishing (DP) was applied to 141 grants (73%) as either a primary or secondary category. The next largest pool was Digitization & Access (DA), which was assigned to 75 grants (39%). Continuing in descending order: 43 grants (22%) served Professional Development (PD); 25 (13%) supported the field of Preservation & Conservation (PC); 21 grants (11%) have helped develop curricula thru Pedagogy & Education (PE); 12 awards (6%) supported Sponsored Research (SR), and 8 grants (4%) were made to support innovation in Tools Development (TD).

Digital Publishing (DP).....141 grants (73%)
 Digitization & Access (DE).....75 grants (39%)
 Professional Development (PD).....43 grants (22%)
 Preservation & Conservation (PC)..25 grants (13%)
 Pedagogy & Education (PE).....21 grants (11%)
 Sponsored Research (SR).....12 grants (6%)
 Tools Development (TD).....8 grants (4%)

Please note that 61% of all grants were assigned multiple categories, hence the percentage totals above exceed 100% (see also Appendix IV).

The distribution of our support reflects both the Foundation's understanding of the field's needs and the ways in which we believe Kress can have the greatest impact possible with our relatively limited resources. (There is certainly more need than Kress is able to support in this area.) While the funding ratio (the amount requested versus the amount awarded) of the GDHA projects Kress has supported is high (79% in the aggregate over a nine-year period), nearly 100 proposals to the GDHA program, some of which arguably merited Kress' support, were not funded at all.³ There

³ During the FY2008 –FY2016 period, 96 applications to the GDHA program were not supported. Many of the unsuccessful proposals focused on content not closely linked to the Foundation's mission, or the grant product was intended to serve too narrow an audience. In other instances, the project was previously supported by the Foundation, and Kress wanted to distribute its limited resources to other grantees/projects. A lesser number of the applications merited support – at some level – but were part of an exceptionally competitive pool. These unsupported proposals included projects within each category.

are a number of fellow funders in the space, and while there is some overlap in our collective interests, the emphasis of each funder varies in alignment with their respective missions.

III. THE CATEGORIES

The grants cited below are representative of their categories, and have been included here to illustrate a range of grantee types and sizes, geographic locations, and project scale; but as selective examples they are not meant to define the complete scope of their category. (All grants awarded in the Digital Resources for the History of Art grant program may be viewed on the Kress Foundation website, http://www.kressfoundation.org/about/annual_reports/.)

Digitization & Access (DA)

The importance of digitizing resources is two-fold, ensuring both the (digital) preservation of the material as well as increased access to it. The Foundation has supported 75 projects (39%) in the DA category over the past nine years. One might suspect that there would be a diminished need for such support over time, but that time has not yet arrived; there remains a strong need for art historical resources to be digitized and made available online. In addition, as art historians, curators and conservators become more aware of the benefits of – and more comfortable working with – digital technologies, the call for having more images and textual information accessible online increases. Kress has sought to be judicious in the collections it has elected to help digitize, aligning our support with projects closely associated with Kress’ history and mission. *A significant number of these grants supported the digitization of primary source materials related to the history of collecting.* Examples include: the Duveen Brothers Archives, and the Knoedler Archives Stock Books (both at the Getty Research Institute); the Jacques Seligmann & Co. Archives (Smithsonian Institution, Archives of American Art); and the John G. Johnson auction catalog archive (Philadelphia Museum of Art).

Another cluster of grants were made to digitize the art historically important photo archive collections of established grantees of the Foundation. The photo archives at the American Academy in Rome is the most robust example, but Kress has also supported the digitization of the photo archives at Harvard University’s Villa I Tatti, in addition to the Fototeca Zeri (Bologna) archive of 16th Century Italian paintings, now available via Artstor.

We have also supported the digitization of collections whose subject matter is closely aligned with the Foundation’s core interests. Several examples include: the Master Drawings Collection at the Morgan Library & Museum, and the surviving manuscript versions of Leonardo da Vinci’s Treatise on Painting (University of Virginia). The majority of the paintings in the Kress Collection are already digitized and online (available via the Kress Foundation website and Artstor), but the *Foundation has supported the digitization of archival material related to the Kress Collection* through a series of grants to the National Gallery of Art for its Kress Collection Database Project. *Scale has also been a determining factor in deciding which digitization projects to support;* Kress has been more likely to support the digitization of and access to an important art historical resource even when it is not particularly well-known, rather than fund large scale projects that might potentially be supported by other funders, such as the digitization of museum

collections, a need that is vast and ubiquitous.⁴ The Cicognara Library project is one example of this strategic selectivity.

Eleven grants (of the 75) in this category supported *only* digitization. The other 64 grants supported digitization of a resource in addition to another facet of the project, most often either cataloging or the development of an online platform for the resulting digital collection.

Digital Publishing (DP)

Digital Publishing encompasses support for the development of online resources, platforms and publications, including born-digital scholarship. The largest percentage of GDHA grants (141 awards, 73%) fall into this category, and the grants cluster around several programmatic interests.

The first includes *support for the development of an online platform for primary source material*, which has sometimes (but not invariably) involved digitizing the material, and includes: the Royal Academy of Art's Winter Exhibitions Catalogues, the art dealer archives of the Duveen Brothers and Jacques Seligmann & Co.; the Knoedler Archive Stock Books and the Frick Collection's Image Searchable Database of Italian Art Historical Photo Archive Collections.

Another group of grants supported the development of online platforms with an explicit pedagogical component. One example is the award for Oxford University Press' collaborative project between Grove Art Online and the National Gallery of Art to create an online learning resource on the Italian Renaissance (<http://italianrenaissanceresources.com/>). Others include: Smarthistory, a leading online resource for the study and teaching of art history (www.smarthistory.org); Boston University's exemplary Mapping Titian website, which dynamically tracks the movement of Titian's oeuvre across time, continents and the hands of collectors through a mapping platform (www.mappingtitian.org); Tufts University's Digital Milliet: Greek & Roman Painting in the 21st Century, which has amassed all textual references in Greek and Latin to painting in the ancient world (<http://digmill.perseus.org/digmill/>); and the City University of New York's Art History Teaching Resource, a platform of teaching resources developed by and for art historians (<http://arthistoryteachingresources.org/>).

Other platforms support scholarly work through unique presentations of material. The recent award to the Carnegie Museum of Art for Art Tracks, the open source provenance resource is one example (<http://www.museumprovenance.org/>). Additional examples: a grant awarded to University of Virginia for digitizing and developing an online platform of manuscript versions of Leonardo da Vinci's Treatise on Painting at UVA's Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities (<http://www.treatiseonpainting.org/>), and a grant awarded to the Kacyra Family Foundation (Cyark) to support the digital documentation and virtual exhibition of the old master collection formerly residing at Houghton Hall (<http://archive.cyark.org/houghton-hall-intro>).

Professional Development (PD)

Professional development is an area the Kress Foundation has had an abiding commitment to via its fellowship programs for half a century, and professional development has also been a strategic

⁴ The Institute for Museums and Libraries Services (IMLS) has a funding program, Digitization Grants, which supports the digitization of large resources. Other examples include: the National Endowment of Humanities' Preservation & Access Program; and the Digitizing Hidden Collections program administered by the Council on Library & Information Resources (CLIR), funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

part of the GDHA program. The 43 grants (22%) in this area support the training of art historians, conservators, and art museum professionals in the methods and tools of digital art history (DAH), including fellowships and internships; support for travel to and the planning of such programs; and support for convenings related to DAH projects.

Fellowships and internships have included a multi-year post at the National Gallery of Art for Advanced Training in Imaging Science; a Wikipedian-in-Residence at the Brooklyn Museum of Art; digital resources management internships at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens; a Digital Assets and Research Assistant at the Art Institute of Chicago, who worked on the first online scholarly catalog produced by the museum as part of the Getty funded OSCI project (Online Scholarly Catalog Initiative); and a post-doctoral fellow at Princeton University's Index of Christian Art, among others.

A second focus of this category has been supporting workshops and institutes that offer tactical training in some aspect of digital art history. These projects have included a summer institute at Middlebury College that supported training art historians in digital mapping and visualization; a series of THAT Camps (The Humanities and Technology Camps), “unconferences” that explored the uses and methods of digital art history for members of the College Art Association; and workshops at the Portland Art Museum training curators and educators in how to create video content about their collection.

The Professional Development category has also *supported a range of symposia and summits related to digital technologies*: George Mason University's Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media convened art museum educators to better understand their needs for and uses of digital technologies, resulting in an influential white paper; Johns Hopkins University hosted a summit on “digital curation”; the University of Maryland's Institute for Technology and the Humanities (MITH) twice brought together a group of art historians and art curators to advance the uses of digital technology in the practice of art history and curation; and several grants awarded to the Council on Library & Information Resources and the Association of 19th Century Art Historians supported convenings on digital publishing in the field of art history.

The final area within PD includes travel support to conferences and symposia that focus on some aspect of digital art history. This category allows Kress to endorse a project without necessarily being its primary funder. Examples of such support include: an award to the Frick Collection funding the travel of an international cohort of photo archivists for a meeting intended to evaluate the role of digital technology in the photo archive; grants to the Council of Library & Information Resources to fund the travel of art museum professionals to the Digital Library Federation annual forums; and a grant to the American Institute of Conservation for a convening about “Conservation Online,” an online resource for conservators.

Sponsored Research (SR)

Within GDHA, Kress has awarded twelve grants for Sponsored Research (6% of all GDHA awards). This category includes studies and other research efforts focused on digital art history; it also includes exploratory studies and experimental applications of digital technologies, distinct from art historical research proper. *Nearly half of these awards have supported studies focused on the use (or the lack of use) of digital technologies within the fields of art history, art conservation, and art museums.* All of the studies have, to varying degrees, catalyzed change within these communities. One paper in particular warrants highlighting within the context of this report. In

2012, the study entitled *Transitioning to a Digital World: Art History, Its Research Centers, and Digital Technologies*, by Diane Zorich, was published on the Kress Foundation website, and it continues to circulate widely within the field. The paper examines the way digital technologies have impacted art history, and considers the “digital readiness” of the field and its institutions. It revealed ambivalence and disagreements among art historians as to the benefits and desirability of using digital technologies for their research, teaching and publications. Many read the study as a call to action, and it prompted a number of institutions to pro-actively support the use of digital technology in the field. A year after the paper was published, the Terra Foundation funded a two-day symposium at the Archives of American Art, *American Art History and Digital Scholarship: New Avenues of Exploration*. The symposium examined the ways digital technologies could be integrated into the study of American Art. The hosts indicated that the symposium was a direct response to Ms. Zorich’s study. While we can comfortably give the Kress Foundation some credit, it is also challenging to parse the paper’s influence on the field as it was published at a moment ripe for change, when many in the academy and museums were becoming “digitally ready” despite a vocal group who were not. In fact, by the time the Archives hosted their symposium, fifteen months after the Kress study was published, the landscape had already shifted. There were a greater number of digital projects being developed, a larger cohort of young scholars and curators using digital tools in their practice, and an alert group of senior professionals who understood the importance of – and their responsibility to use – digital tools, to lead by example and to make it permissible for their junior colleagues and students to embrace their use also.

The other grants made in this area supported projects where digital technologies were used in an experimental or novel way. One example includes a series of awards made to the University of Virginia’s Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities in support of creating 3D digital models of art historically significant antique sculptures (including the Laocoön Group) and modern casts that can shed light on lost originals (two pieces from the Dresden State Art Museums); another is a recent grant to the University of California, Riverside for pioneering the application of facial recognition technology to works of portraiture.

Tools Development (TD)

The final main category is Tools Development which *supports the development of software tools to advance the practice of digital art history and related fields.* With only eight projects in this category (4% of the total), it has not been a large part of work the Foundation supports, although it is an important one. By supporting the development of open-source tools to ultimately be used by a wide range of institutions and scholars, the Foundation’s grants extend well beyond the initial grantee and project. Examples of Tools Development include: an award to Duke University to build an open-source Adobe Photoshop software plugin designed to digitally remove “cradle artifacts” from digitized x-rays of Old Master panel paintings; a grant to the Frick Collection to help develop a computer vision analysis toolkit for use with digitized art historical photo archives; and a grant to George Mason University’s Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media in support of the development of a series of software plugins for the open-source web publishing platform, OMEKA, intended for art museums and mobile content projects.

Preservation & Conservation (PC) and Pedagogy & Education (PE)

These two secondary categories were often not the primary intent of the grants within the GDHA program. But Kress' fundamental commitment to art conservation and preservation, and to pedagogy and education, made us alert to potential synergies, where a single award would serve ancillary interests of the Foundation. Twenty five projects (13% of the total number of GDHA awards) supported the fields of conservation and preservation in some way, such as a white paper on the digital engagement of the conservation field (administered by the Foundation of the American Institute of Conservation) and the development of an online library of videos about conservation and collections care, Conservation Reel (now hosted on the Smarthistory platform; see below). Similarly, 21 projects (11% of the total GDHA awards), supported Pedagogy & Education. One such example is a website focused on a series of historical reconstructions of Kress Collection paintings created by conservators at the University of Delaware. The reconstructions are accompanied by teaching and learning resources for art historians, art curators and educators (<https://www.artcons.udel.edu/outreach/kress>). Other examples include a number of the projects already mentioned in Digital Publishing (DP): Smarthistory (www.smarthistory.org), Art History Teaching Resources (<http://arthistoryteachingresources.org/>), and Italian Renaissance Learning Resources (<http://italianrenaissancesources.com/>).

IV. SO WHAT?

In this relatively new area of practice in which a range of interests might be advanced by a single grant program, the Foundation has not identified a single evaluative framework that can be applied uniformly to all GDHA grants. In addition, because of the comparative newness of the field and of Kress' involvement in it, it may be some time before impact can be truly measured. But Kress is interested in identifying factors that would suggest whether a given grant-funded product/project has met or exceeded its ambition. Depending on the nature of the project/product, we are specifically interested in:

Usage: Online platforms (most of the grants in our Digital Publishing (DP) category) are often evaluated by their *usage statistics* (number of users, page views, time spent on web resource, etc.). The field of pre-modern European art history is, by its nature, not a field of large numbers, and the usage statistics from a website supported via GDHA might therefore not reveal as much as they would for a commercial enterprise or even a less specialized academic discipline. But they will remain helpful measures *over time*. We are also interested in *how* the resources have been *used* by scholars, or have been integrated into teaching from secondary schools to graduate studies; and in what ways primary source materials, made newly available online, have influenced research and been cited by students and scholars.

Sustainability: An essential question for many DP projects is whether the resource is sustainable beyond the term of Kress' grant. Projects initiated by museums or universities typically have a commitment from their home institution to host the web resource, but this does not necessarily ensure that the human labor required to update and maintain the site will remain secure or for how long. This is especially true when a single personality is the guiding force of a project, as priorities/interests might shift, or the individual might move to another institution or retire. And for those projects generated outside of an

institution, the question of sustainability is even more acute. Have the grantees been able to secure additional sources of funding? Or is there a term for the life of the project?

Lessons Learned: In this nascent field, the Foundation has been willing to support experimental efforts; and in the spirit of supporting innovation, the evaluation of some projects might be best measured by what the grantee, the field (and the Foundation) have learned, not by whether the project “succeeded” in a conventional or quantifiable sense.

Networks: One of the ways Kress has always asserted its influence is through the development of professional networks, particularly among the many Kress Fellows who remain in the field. But this is also true for other grantees of the Foundation. The GDHA grants that have supported professional development – symposia, workshops and conferences – are obvious examples of connecting established and emerging professionals. But we also consciously seek to connect grantees/colleagues to each other, and to other potential funders, both during and beyond the life of a given grant. We are interested in knowing how the relationships we have helped broker (through formal programs but also informally) have stimulated grantees/colleagues to develop their work and/or secure other sources of funding. This secondary effect is inherently challenging to capture in any systematic way but this review has highlighted both the need and value of attempting to do so.

Three abbreviated case studies illustrate in greater detail several types of grants and their outcomes to date.

Smarthistory [www.smarthistory.org]

In FY2009, Kress placed a little bet on two tenured art history faculty, Drs. Beth Harris and Steven Zucker, then at the Fashion Institute of Technology (State University of New York), with a small grant. Committed educators, frustrated by the standard survey art history textbooks, and eager to find more effective ways of reaching their undergraduate students, they developed a modest online platform of videos, which featured conversations about canonic art works. Kress’ initial support helped the Smarthistory team further develop the online multimedia web-book. Through a series of subsequent grants the platform continued to develop, improving both in content and design, and growing its audience. Now eight years later, the Smarthistory platform makes available more than 700 videos and 800 essays focused on art and cultural history. Importantly, they work with some 200 art historians and curators to create the videos and essays, which align with curricular needs. In addition they have partnered with a dozen museums around the world to develop content, including links from the Smarthistory platform to the museums’ websites, and in many cases, the reverse. The content is accessible on multiple platforms including Smarthistory.org, Khan Academy and YouTube.

Because the platform is designed to serve a wide audience – students and teachers from secondary to graduate school education levels, as well as an interested general public – the potential for adoption and usage is great. But the *actual usage* is greater still. In the past three years page views (a standard metric) have more than tripled, from just over 10 million views in

2014 to 35 million views in 2016.⁵ This represents the number of times content was accessed on the site from visitors worldwide. Harris and Zucker routinely hear from faculty who rely on the resource for their teaching and who have integrated the content into their curricula. They also hear from students, at all levels, who also have come to depend on their highly accessible presentation of the scholarly material. And while this evidence is largely anecdotal, the volume of “views” the site receives suggests that the resource has been well integrated into practice.

Kress’ early support assisted indirectly in the team being able to secure funding from other sources. As Smarthistory is currently an independent non-profit, it has sustained itself with support from a range of private donors and foundations including the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Google Cultural Institute, the College Board, and John and Ann Doerr. Additional private foundations and federal funders have expressed an active interest in supporting the platform. While this is very encouraging for the sustainability goals of the platform, it is hard to know what the funding landscape will look like in the more distant future. Harris and Zucker are committed to Smarthistory and are thinking creatively about ways to ensure the ongoing life of the resource.

Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution [www.aaa.si.edu]

In 2010, Kress supported (along with the Terra Foundation) the digitization of the Jacques Seligmann & Co. archive, to be made publicly available via the Archives of American Art website. For professionals and students interested in the history of collecting and provenance research, online access to this art dealer and gallerist archive was of immediate value. Two years later, in 2012, Kress further supported the development of online finding aids for ten smaller art dealer archives, and the creation of an online guide for collections especially relevant to World War II-era provenance research. The portal page aggregates all of the collections at the Archive relevant to WWII-era provenance research, including the Seligmann & Co archive, as well as additional resources for researchers. The Archives recently launched a new website, with an updated design and improved usability, making it easier to find and work with the Archives’ rich digital collections.

To judge from statistics gathered directly from the Archive, the usage of the WWII-era provenance portal page has remained fairly constant at just over 1,000 page views annually since its launch in 2014. The ten art dealer archives are modest in size, ranging from 1.6–10.1 linear feet, and since the online publication of the finding aids for these archives, the page views have at least doubled and in some cases more than tripled. The Seligmann & Co. archive contains 203 linear feet, and has averaged 16,000 page views annually, which is nearly four times as many page views as before the finding aid was published online. These increases can be explained, in part, by more researchers being able to access the material online. We do not have information about how this archival material has been integrated into scholarly products (articles, books, curricula), as the Archive is currently unable to track this information.

The Archives of American Art and their parent institution are committed to ensuring access to the collections via an enduring web presence. In addition to federal funds, the Archives also receives

⁵ For comparison, the Metropolitan Museum of Art published in their annual report that from 2014-2015 the Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History received 1 million visitors a month (12 million/annually); and the 2015-2016 annual report stated that the entire museum website had received 33 million visits.

support from private foundations and donors. There should be no question about the longevity of the Smithsonian Institution.

Conservation Reel [www.conservationreel.org]

In 2011, the Foundation was approached by a widely-respected museum technologist who had just become the director of a well-known museum collaborative. He and an informed group of peers (whom the Foundation also knew) were interested in developing an online platform of video content focused on conservation and collections care. Conceptually they were building on the recent success of other online initiatives, Smarthistory among them. They sought to serve a group of professionals and students the Foundation has long supported – art conservators and students of art conservation – and a group the Foundation recently began to serve, art historians and curators interested in technical art history. In addition, the director had a strong track record of accomplishment. Collectively, these factors all contributed to the Foundation supporting the project, Conservation Reel. But within a number of months, the project leader left the collaborative, and new leadership had different priorities. The development and stewardship of Conservation Reel stalled.

Leadership transitions and changing priorities were not the only challenge the project faced though. It became increasingly clear to Kress staff that the Conservation Reel team had not systematically engaged the conservation community – the community Conservation Reel was relying on to contribute content, as well as to use and to promote the resource. Unlike other resources that have been created based on identified needs and a standardized curriculum, Conservation Reel was created by well-intentioned outsiders, a savvy cohort of museum technologists who were very skilled at building things. The need it aimed to fulfill was not fully understood, nor were key stakeholders engaged.

While Conservation Reel was in stasis, without a “champion” in the community to lead or advocate for it, the platform remained online with limited content, no further development, and scant visitorship. Rather than asking that the lights be turned off, Kress understood the potential value of the idea and of the content that already existed. Through our own active network in the conservation, museum, educational and funding communities, we explored potential paths forward for the project. It was clear there was an interest in conservation-related video content as the field of technical art history was developing. It was also clear that conservators were interested in having their own practice and expertise made more broadly available for educational purposes. With the endorsement of the Board, the Foundation awarded Smarthistory a grant this past fall to migrate the Conservation Reel content to their platform, as well as to develop additional conservation-related video content. The technical infrastructure of Smarthistory, along with the organization’s established relationships to museums, a growing user base, and the strong commitment of its founders, all seem to suggest that Kress’ initial investment in Conservation Reel will be returned and improved with the content residing on this new platform. We will watch this transition closely.

V. FINAL THOUGHTS

Have the GDHA grants the Foundation has awarded to date aligned with and advanced the original aim of the program, as outlined in 2007? Without question, the awards have served the

initial goals of the program and several ancillary interests as well. Important art historical resources, both visual and textual, have been digitized and made freely available online; web-based platforms for research, teaching and learning have been developed and are readily accessible on the web; and through the training programs and symposia we have supported, Kress has fostered the professional development of a generation of art historians, art conservators and art museum professionals keen to work with the tools and methods of digital art history. We have also seen the growth of a networked cohort of digitally-engaged grantees – including both established and emerging professionals.

The landscape of digital art history is a dynamic one, and since the start of the GDHA program there has been a meaningful adoption of new digital technologies and methodologies in the fields we have supported. We may not be able to demonstrate causality, but we can assert significant influence, along with our peer funders, in promoting these developments. There may even be a time in the not-too-distant future when the digital is so integrated into the practices of art historians, art conservators and art museum professionals, that a dedicated program like GDHA will no longer be necessary. In the meanwhile, it seems prudent that we, along with our fellow funders in this evolving arena, remain committed to supporting and promoting this important work.

A P P E N D I X I.

SUMMARY STATISTICS

DIGITAL RESOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ART GRANT PROGRAM (GDHA)

Number of Grants:	193
Number of Projects:	146
Number of Grantees:	95
Total Requested:	\$8,989,546
Total Awarded:	\$7,125,935
Range: Low	\$1,500
Range: High	\$165,000

A P P E N D I X II.

GRANTEES: INSTITUTION TYPE AND GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

Grantees by Institution Type	
Colleges & Universities	32
<i>University/Colleges (US)</i>	27
<i>University/Colleges (International)</i>	5
Museums*	31
<i>Campus Museum (non-Kress)</i>	1
<i>Campus Museum (Kress)</i>	3
<i>Museum (non-Kress)</i>	16
<i>Museum (Kress)</i>	9
<i>Museum (International)</i>	2
Non-Profits	32
<i>Archive</i>	1
<i>Library (US)</i>	1
<i>Library (International)</i>	1
<i>Non-Profit</i>	25
<i>Research Center (US)</i>	1
<i>Research Center (International)</i>	3

*The Kress Collection – more than 3,000 works of pre-modern European art – was donated to a broad range of regional and academic art museums throughout the United States between 1929 – 1961. A museum in the table above is designated as a “Kress” museum if it received a donation of artwork from the original Kress Collection.

Grantees by Geographic Distribution		
Total Number of Grantees: 95		
United States (84 grantees, 88% of total)		
	Northeast Total	43 50% US
	Midwest Total	6 5% US
	South Total	22 28% US
	West Total	13 17% US
Europe (11 grantees, 12% of total)		
<i>Belgium</i>	<i>Antwerp</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>England</i>	<i>Kent</i>	<i>1</i>
	<i>London</i>	<i>3</i>
	<i>Oxford</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Germany</i>	<i>Heidelberg</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Greece</i>	<i>Athens</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Italy</i>	<i>Rome</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Netherlands</i>	<i>Amsterdam</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Scotland</i>	<i>Glasgow</i>	<i>1</i>
	Europe Total	11

A P P E N D I X III.

DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES WITHIN THE GDHA PROGRAM

Primary Categories:

Digitization & Access (DA)	<i>Support for the digitization of art historical resources for purposes of online dissemination (ideally on an open access basis), preservation, and/or print publication.</i>
Digital Publishing (DP)	<i>Support for the development of online resources, platforms and publications, including born-digital scholarship.</i>
Professional Development (PD)	<i>Support for training art historians, art conservators and art museum professionals in the methods and tools of digital art history (DAH), including fellowships and internships; support for travel to and planning of such programs; and support for convenings related to DAH projects.</i>
Sponsored Research (SR)	<i>Support for studies and other research efforts focused on digital art history; also including research studies and experimental applications of digital technologies. This is distinct from art historical research.</i>
Tools Development (TD)	<i>Support for the development of software tools to advance the practice of digital art history and related fields.</i>

Secondary Categories:

Preservation & Conservation (PC)	<i>Support for digital initiatives in the art conservation field; the focus here is on the field of conservation/preservation, versus preserving or conserving resources, which is implied in other categories, DA especially.</i>
Pedagogy & Education (PE)	<i>Support for digital initiatives that are focused, in whole or part, on education and pedagogy, influencing the development of curricula for art history and/or art conservation. This is distinct from projects involving digitization of primary source materials and other resources that serve educational needs. It is also separate from training opportunities, fellowships and internships, which are served in other categories, PD in particular.</i>

APPENDIX IV.

DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS BY CATEGORY

Total Number of Grants: 193					
Total Number of Grants in only one category: 75 (39%)					
Total Number of Grants in two or three categories: 118 (61%)					
<i>Note: Because 118 grants are in two or three categories, the totals below exceed 193 (and 100%).</i>					
CATEGORY	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL	%
Digitization & Access (DA)	75	0	0	75	39%
Digital Publishing (DP)	63	78	0	141	73%
Professional Development (PD)	40	3	0	43	22%
Sponsored Research (SR)	10	2	0	12	6%
Tools Development (TD)	5	1	2	8	4%
Preservation & Conservation (PC)	NA	18	7	25	13%
Pedagogy & Education (PE)	NA	15	6	21	11%