Southern Illinois University Carbondale
OpenSIUC

Articles | Morris Library

1-1-2011

What's Next for Collection Management and Managers? Changing the Organization of Collection Development

Jonathan Nabe
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, jnabe@lib.siu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/morris_articles
This is an electronic version of an article published in *Collection Management* Vol. 36 Issue 1, available online at: doi:10.1080/01462679.2011.529399.

Recommended Citation
Nabe, Jonathan, "What's Next for Collection Management and Managers? Changing the Organization of Collection Development" (2011). *Articles.* Paper 52.
http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/morris_articles/52

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Morris Library at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact jnabe@lib.siu.edu.

Changing the Organization of Collection Development

Abstract

There have been considerable changes in publishing and information dissemination over the last decade. However, the structure and process of collection development at many libraries have not kept pace. In 2006, Morris Library at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (SIUC) undertook a restructuring, in order to address the changing nature of collection development. This resulted in the creation of three new positions, more opportunities for planning and analysis, and new roles for liaisons. While there are drawbacks, the new structure has provided clear benefits, and may serve as a model for other academic libraries.

INTRODUCTION

Change is compulsory in collection management, especially these days, with the rapid transformation in how information is prepared, presented and packaged. For the last few years, there has been no better place to keep up with the developments that face collection management librarians in academic libraries than *Collection Management*'s "What's Next?" column. So it is appropriate to explore here the need for change in the organization and structure of collection management in order to address these developments, and to provide one example of structural change designed to do so.

Collection development is not what it once was. It has been vastly changed in the last ten years by changes in publishing, scholarly communication, technology, and budgeting.

Developments in these areas have redefined what a library collection is, how it is acquired, and how it is used. All this is of course obvious, but the extent of the resistance to change, and the attachment to the status quo, in collection management organization and procedures in academic libraries belies our acknowledgement of the obvious. This is reflected in the structure most commonly employed in academic libraries, a structure that has been in place for two decades or more.

There has always been some variability in collection management organization and structure in academic libraries. It may be the library function least susceptible to any particular model. In a 1987 study of ARL libraries, Sohn drew the conclusion that ARL members "have almost as many organizational patterns as there are ARL libraries." She attributed this to "restrictions of budget, personnel, politics, or innumerable other factors." (Sohn, 1987, 131).

Nonetheless, her own study indicates that the typical pattern is for a collection management librarian coordinating or overseeing the work of "selectors," who have other responsibilities. Place in the organization, rank, and supervisory roles were all variable for the collection management librarians, but the use of part-time selectors was overwhelmingly typical. Only three institutions were identified as having fulltime selectors. Usually, reference was given as a primary responsibility for selectors, and acting as a liaison to teaching faculty was "standard" (Sohn, 1987, 127-128).

Twenty years later, things had not changed much; according to a survey of ARL libraries for Spec Kit 301, *Liaison Services*, the typical model for collection development in academic libraries still centers on a group of subject specialists or liaisons, each of whom assumes responsibility for their particular areas. Each area more or less maps to a department or program,

and there is a defined budget for each area. In fact, 98% of respondents indicated that liaison librarians had collection development responsibilities (Logue et al, 2007, 33).

In this model, responsibility for collection development activities include ordering monographs and managing the suite of journal subscriptions for a given area. Additional responsibilities may include some degree of responsibility for subject-specific databases, including analysis of overlapping coverage between competing resources and usage statistics for acquisition and retention decisions. Typically, there is a collection development librarian or officer to oversee the collections related work of liaisons, and to manage the collection budget as a whole (Johnson, 2009, 35-37).

This comparison of the 1987 and 2007 surveys of ARL institutions reveals that despite the intervening years and the development of the Internet, electronic journals, Big Deals and other packages, and most recently electronic books, among many other changes, the organization of collection management has not changed much, and in 2007 was still structured using a model that pertained in 1987. It could be argued that this was due to politics and institutional inertia, rather than this model being adaptive for all times and circumstances.

This model has been bumping up against some external realities over the last decade that resist its continued relevance. While there is a dearth of recent reports describing the changes in *structure*, there exist many reports that enumerate the reasons and need for change in collection management *function*. They boil down to two major trends: library budget pressures and constraints, and the development of electronic resources and networks (Branin et al, 2000, 25). Stoffle reported that the inability to maintain the traditional print-based library in the face of continuing inflation had forced change at the University of Arizona (Stoffle et al, 1999, 4-6). As a result of budgetary challenges, Arizona moved to a team approach for their functions, from the

former structure which was hierarchical and organized around material formats (Stoffle et al, 1999, 7). Reduced staffing is a constant threat and a growing reality, and collection budget reductions are also forcing change (Colvin, 2009, 10). Many have indicated the increasing importance of cooperative collection management in the face of budget constraints and the development of technology infrastructure (Hazen, 2000, 830-831) and the need for involvement (and therefore time) of collection librarians in order to make cooperative efforts succeed (Jakubs, 1999, 73). The expansion of consortia has proved to be the most effective form of cooperation, and the unsurprising results have been reduced dependence and focus on individual institutional collections (Thornton, 2000, 849-851).

A 2004 survey of academic libraries provided evidence that the increasing need for electronic resources had resulted in control of a larger percentage of collection budgets by collection librarians (Dorner, 2004, 255-256). The nature of electronic resources requires input from librarians with skills and knowledge beyond those of most selectors or liaisons (Geller, 2006, 6-7). Packaged or bundled resources are particularly suitable to consortial deals, and Quinn described how publisher and vendor packages shifted collection management "from micro-selection to macro-selection," and at the same time increased the importance of more centralized responsibilities, such as negotiating licensing terms (Quinn, 2001, 58-59).

It is no longer just journals or databases that are subject to this switch to "macro-selection." Electronic books are quickly becoming almost as accepted as electronic journals, and are changing how monographs are acquired. Subscription models, subject collections and other bulk purchases, and consortial purchase opportunities all represent new ways of doing business that require broad oversight and management (Anson and Connell, 2009, 12-13). In addition, patron-driven acquisition (PDA) may significantly reduce the need for material selection overall

(Chadwell, 2009, 73). PDA removes the speculation from acquisition decisions, allowing patrons to indicate what titles they need. This can be done with electronic books, from a number of vendors, and even with print books. In this model, titles are loaded into the local catalog, as yet unpurchased, and when a patron identifies a title of interest, they are either given automatic and immediate access (for eBooks) or the book is ordered for them (print). It is only after this indication of interest that the library is charged for the book. Beyond this, the looming availability of Google Books licenses poses a challenge and an opportunity, which will further transform how we view our monograph collections. This will greatly expand the number of books available to patrons, and again reduce the need for title by title selection (Chadwell, 2010, 9-12).

The struggle to adjust to trends is ongoing, and efforts to change are always controversial. A survey of the ways 31 universities in the Greater Western Library Alliance addressed the acquisition of electronic resources noted that respondents indicated concerns with decision-making structure, among others (Kulp and Rupp-Serrano, 2005, 15-16). The survey also revealed tensions between "the traditional prerogative of the individual librarian to be responsible for his or her subject area(s)" and the need for higher level decisions (Kulp and Rupp-Serrano, 2005, 15).

While it is clear from the above that there are diverse pressures at play, the development of electronic journals and continuing journal price inflation can be said to have had the largest impact on collection management in academic libraries over the last two decades.

The advent of the Internet quickly led to the creation and rapid uptake of online journals, which are now the undisputed preferred medium for most researchers (Tenopir, 2003, 42-43). Further, publishers seized upon the opportunity to bundle these new online journals, offering

favorable terms that allowed extended access to libraries in exchange for a multi-year commitment with minimal or no cancellation allowance, which translated into a guaranteed revenue stream for the publisher. Also factoring into this trend was the accelerating role of library consortia, which provided participating members access to a more extensive title list than they had with individual institutional subscriptions (Johnson, 2009, 283-284). As a result, libraries - with very few exceptions - committed themselves to multiyear packages (so-called Big Deals) from diverse publishers, with an annual increase in expense, and little or no opportunity to reduce their spend over the life of the agreement (Best, 2009, 357-360). Some of these packages were, and are, huge, consuming individually 10% or even 20% of the overall collection budget, with the total impact of all publisher packages sometimes surpassing 50% of the library's materials budget (Botero et al, 2008).

Also, journal prices continued to increase at a rate well over that of inflation, as they had done before they went digital (Orsdel and Born, 2009; Ebsco, 2009). These annual rate increases were rarely if ever matched by increases in library budgets. On its own, this trend led to the only possible end it could lead to, a reduction in the purchase of books, and cancellation of journals that were not part of any package, and were hence unprotected.

These two factors, a multiyear commitment to online journal packages and unsustainable price increases, completely transformed the nature and makeup of library collections, and collection management procedures. No longer is it always possible to analyze titles strictly as discrete entities, keeping or cancelling based on their own merits. Instead, the package as a whole is the unit of analysis. In addition, largely as a result of the increasing cost of these discrete, untouchable packages, monograph budgets shrank, and continue to do so.

These changes raise important questions. In particular, the staffing and structure to address them needs reconsideration. Is one CDL enough to fulfill the oversight and planning role? The position of the liaison in collection development has also become more open to question. If the level of analysis for the greater part of the library's collection has to be done above that of any particular subject area, how can a liaison do it? Which liaison should do it? If a particular package is a good value for one subset of liaisons, but bad for another, how should an appropriate acquisition decision be made? Further, does the book budget become so low that at some point, it behooves the institution to seek a different way of selecting titles, and change the liaison's role? These are the questions Southern Illinois University Carbondale's Morris Library found itself facing as the aforementioned trends accelerated.

BACKGROUND

SIU-Carbondale is a Carnegie RU/H university, and has both a Law School and a Medical School. Enrollment is 20,350, including 4,800 graduate and professional students in 74 masters and 32 doctoral programs. Morris Library is an ARL Library, with over 3 million volumes and 51,000 serials. There are 28 professional librarians, who have faculty status. Included are twelve library liaisons, with outreach responsibilities including teaching, research support, and reference. Until 2007, liaisons also had collection management responsibilities, primarily for monograph selection, gift decisions, journal selection and retention, and database analysis and recommendations.

THE RESPONSE AT SIUC

At Southern Illinois University's Morris Library, a decision was made in 2006 to seek to address the trends discussed above, to acknowledge their impact, and try something new. Discussions were held between liaisons and administrators to identify alternatives, but the final decision was made at the administrative level. The opportunity to make a change arose as the result of the retirement of the collection development librarian, whose role it had been to oversee the activities of the liaisons, as well as manage all of the packages, databases, licenses, etc., to which Morris Library subscribed. Internal discussions led to the creation of new positions, new job descriptions - and a new structure for collection management. Three Collection Development Librarians (CDLs) positions were created to replace the overburdened and retiring Head of Collection Development, and given full authority and responsibility for all aspects of collection management. In conjunction with this change, liaisons' roles for collection management were significantly reduced.

New positions were created for Collection Development Librarians for the Sciences, Social Sciences, and Arts and Humanities. Since there had previously been only one CDL, this represented a significant commitment from the Library to collection management. It required taking a position from another department, and using a rare and precious new faculty position, as well as keeping the previous CDL position.

Because this development represented such a change in the structure of collection management activities for the library, a document was drawn up to spell out the responsibilities of the CDLs, and to clearly specify their role[i]. The key role for the CDLs was management in the area of policy development and long-term planning. These are the areas overburdened liaisons and single collection development librarians tend to overlook or sacrifice to day-to-day

activities. Long-term planning, in turn, depends heavily on data collection and analysis, so these were also identified as priorities. Thirdly, communication was deemed an essential function of the CDLs, both inside and outside the Library's walls. Within the Library, communication is important because collection management impacts directly on all other library services and functions. Outside the Library, it is crucial for establishing a coherent and consistent message to users regarding trends, challenges, new resources, and unfortunately, cancellation projects.

Along with the creation and definition of these new positions, there was a change in the role of liaisons in collection management. No longer would they be responsible for selecting books, managing journal lists, or making decisions on databases. Although they would continue to have an advisory role in collection management, it would no longer be a part of their job description or form a component of their evaluation.

There are a number of reasons why this direction was taken at Morris Library. At the heart is the transformation in library collections discussed in the introduction. In general terms, the motivating trends were the development of electronic resources and budgetary constraints. More specifically, the compelling changes were the increase in publisher packages, and the reduction in monograph funds. Morris Library had signed on to numerous package deals over the last decade. As a member of the Greater Western Library Alliance[ii] and the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois[iii], there had been no shortage of opportunities to participate in package deals. These complex deals, which include all of the major publishers, require a level of analysis that is beyond the capability of any one liaison to deal with - and perhaps, a level of agreement that is beyond the capability of any pool of liaisons to reach. These deals were also increasingly difficult for a single CDL to manage.

In addition, the monograph budget had reached the point where it was now feasible for each of the three CDLs to manage the identification and selection of titles for their given disciplines. By doing so, equitable and comprehensive coverage of the different fields within each discipline can be achieved. This was not always the case at Morris Library, due to historically uneven levels of attention and performance in collection management. This is likely true at most institutions. It is understandable that some liaisons have more responsibilities in library instruction, for example, or research support, and spend more of their time in these activities. Indeed, according to the nature of the academic program assignment, this may even be desirable for the library and the institution. However, it resulted in imbalances in the collection. The library collection did not necessarily reflect an equitable distribution of money and materials based on defined parameters, but rather was the result of individual idiosyncrasies and even level of performance. Obviously, this is less than ideal. It was hoped that the hiring of three CDLs would allow for a resolution of this problem, since spending the funds for monographs would be a primary responsibility for each.

Another of the shortcomings of the liaison model of collection management is that collection management is only one of many things that liaisons are required to do. In fact, as an activity with rather low visibility, it is often not even a high priority. Liaisons are much more likely to receive rewards and acknowledgement for achievement in higher profile activities such as instruction or outreach. Thus, excellence in collection management is de-emphasized; as a result, there is not a lot of incentive to spend time reading or researching about new and best practices in the field. This de-emphasis is exacerbated by the dispersed structure of liaison work, where each individual has responsibility over only a part of the overall budget.

Management of the approval plan was also a target for re-evaluation and restructuring. Historically, the plan achieved variable levels of success, depending on the subject area, but overall was deemed to be underperforming. Overall, only 20% of the titles added to the monograph collection came via the approval plan. The plan was inefficient, and was not saving the time needed for other activities, or achieving the goals established for it. This is an area where the liaison model also has limitations, because varying levels of time, attention and understanding among liaisons lead to an inconsistent performance outcome. It was hoped the CDLs could spend more time analyzing and adjusting the plan to achieve a higher and more consistent level of selection without increasing return rates.

None of these problems, likely common to many academic libraries, are alleviated by having a single CDL in charge, because the workload for such an individual is immense. They also, therefore, too often do not have the time to remain current with the latest in experiments and practices in the field, which could help improve local collection management practices and outcomes. Recognition of this shortcoming in the more traditional structure of collection management was one of the reasons for the decision to devote three faculty lines to this area.

Similarly, this lack of overall responsibility, incentive, and time, limits the amount of statistical analysis done in many academic libraries. The most important analysis for collection management targets collection use. The need for this type of analysis is widely recognized, but it is a time-consuming and staff-consuming activity. There is always more that could be done: more refinement, more analysis. While necessary for developing the most appropriate collections for users, for the overworked CDL, it is, understandably, often laid aside for more pressing matters. Further, because of the concentration of collection funds in large, often multi-disciplinary packages, analysis today often extends beyond the area of responsibility of any one

liaison – and so is left undone, or is done in a perfunctory manner only. Again, devoting sufficient staff resources is the only way to address this shortcoming, and was a motivating factor in moving Morris Library in a new direction.

A final motivation for the change was to give liaisons more time to focus on other activities. Liaisons at SIUC, and everywhere, are increasingly involved in instruction and outreach activities, as well as providing new services, such as chat reference. A complete description of the new roles for liaisons in academic libraries is beyond the scope of this article, but the ARL'S Spec Kit 301, *Liaison Services*, provides many examples and a good overview (Logue et al, 2007). Suffice it to say new functions and service demands are numerous. Piling new responsibilities on staff can only go so far before something has to give. At Morris Library, the decision was made to recognize these new needs and provide the opportunity to address them by removing from liaisons their collection management responsibilities. While not all liaisons were happy with this development, the change was to no small extent due to the concerns they consistently raised about an overwhelming workload.

RESULTS

It has been three years since the change described above was implemented. It is reasonable to ask, to what extent the change has resulted in improvements in the areas of concern previously identified.

First, in general, there is no question that there has been increased attention devoted to the overall planning of collection management at Morris Library. One conspicuous example of this focus is the creation of a new collection management policy (see

http://www.lib.siu.edu/abt/cdpolicy.pdf), the first in over twenty years for the Library. For the first time, the collection management policy addresses electronic resources. It is more current regarding many other areas as well, including withdrawals, GIS resources, duplicate copies, and reserves materials, to name a few. Without comprehensive planning, which a collection management policy encapsulates and encourages, collection management is no more than a continuation of practices that were implemented for a different time and in different publishing and information sharing environments.

This tendency towards moving along in a rut is often evidenced in approval plans, which remain unchanged year after year. With the new CDLs, Morris Library's approval plans were changed significantly, although not consistently in the way originally envisaged by Library administration. Ultimately, the decision was made to cease receipt of books on approval for the sciences, and later for the arts and humanities, while the social science plans were adjusted to a greater or lesser extent, varying by department. Again, with the appropriate staffing, it is easier to move away from an approval plan towards a process of title by title ordering. Having less money for books also contributes to the declining need for approval plans, something all librarians can understand.

The most significant change, both for the library's budget and for Morris Library users, has resulted from detailed analysis of "Big Deals." Upon the arrival of the CDLs in July 2007, Morris Library had package deals with each of the Big Three, Elsevier, Springer, and Wiley. The packages from these three publishers represented just over 35% of the entire collections budget in 2008. With journal cancellation projects in 2001, 2003, and 2008, it had reached the point where it was increasingly onerous to leave the titles from these publishers protected from cancellation decisions. All other publishers, or almost all, had been disproportionately affected

by the protections offered to the Big Three by virtue of SIUC's long-term deals with them. This was exacerbated by other, smaller deals SIUC had, and by untouchable, expensive resources[iv]. A thorough review was due.

The first review was of the Springer package, which SIUC had via a consortial arrangement with the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA). This was the first package reviewed simply because the contract was set to expire first. The review was labor intensive. Data from multiple sources had to be collected and compiled, calculations (such as cost per use, departmental impact, and potential impact on Interlibrary loan) made, and proposals developed. These latter had to be taken to the faculty, explained and justified. The package was at the time SIUC's second most expensive, and with the shared access received via SIUC's GWLA consortial membership, it included access to over 1,100 titles. These titles cross all three areas of the CDL divisions (science, social science, and arts and humanities). For all these reasons, the review was not within the scope or capabilities of any particular liaison, and the political issues attached to dropping or keeping the package were unappealing to anyone. The process therefore required a broader perspective from someone with the entire collections budget in mind. It required the work of collection development librarians.

Eventually, the painful decision was made to leave the deal. While the benefits were real, ultimately, in view of the long-term outlook of the Library's collections, it was determined that the terms and conditions were unsustainable. While it would have been possible to simply sign an extension – and indeed, most GWLA institutions did – such an act would have been imprudent for SIUC. The subsequent economic meltdown of late 2008 underscored the need to step back from such deals. It is highly unlikely, however, that Morris Library would have

stepped away from this deal without the CDLs to provide the necessary analysis and leadership. Inertia is powerful in collection management as it is for other non-moving objects.

Lastly, and, despite all the furor and anxiety that was produced by the change in structure, least, there has been more consistency when it comes to selecting books for the Library. Previously, some underspent funds would give money to overspent funds towards the end of the year; now, each fund is spent out according to its allocation, with only minor exceptions. "Least," because as is the case for most academic libraries, the book budget shrinks every year. It may occasionally increase, as it did in 2010 for Morris Library because of a journal cancellation project, but the long-term trend for book buying is inevitably and irretrievably downwards. At Morris, monograph expenditures declined from $937,000 in 2002 to $628,000 in 2008. One indication of this trend at the national level can be found in the percentage of library expenditures of ARL libraries for monographs. In 2000, the median figure was 24.67%; in 2008, this had dropped to 20.59% (ARL, 2000 and 2008, "Selected" worksheet).

A more interesting development for SIUC in the area of book buying has been an experiment with a patron-driven acquisition plan for electronic books via MyiLibrary. This required the agreement of the CDLs to give some of their book funds for a general deposit account, against which purchased titles are charged (a title is purchased when it has been accessed a defined number of times, starting with two, and eventually moving to three, in the case of Morris Library). Because there was no way to know what titles from which fields would be purchased beforehand, this type of agreement required a leap of good faith on the part of each CDL, and is something that would have been much harder to achieve if the consensus of each liaison had been required. There can be no doubt that the plan has been successful, and that the electronic books have been of real service to SIUC users (Imre and Nabe, 2009).

REVIEW

The new structure for collection management at Morris Library has its pros and cons. It certainly has some positive aspects going for it, as described above. The enhanced focus on collection management in general has led to some definable and definite advances in collections and services: more planning and review, more statistical analysis, a broader perspective so necessary in a time when most academic libraries have engaged in large package deals, and exploration of new collection types and methods of delivery. It allows an opportunity to escape the rut of doing things the way they have always been done, just because that is how they have always been done. With the vast and rapid changes in publishing and information dissemination witnessed in the last decade, this ability to change is essential. If collection management is to be more than a sad relic of the past, or a reactive function with a declining future, some leadership and broad oversight is required. The structure and process at Morris Library is one way to address this need.

Further, the liaison's role in the academy is also changing, and the new structure at Morris also allows liaisons to address the need for the changes in the other areas of their responsibilities as well. However, one of the negatives expressed by some liaisons has been that the loss of collection management responsibilities has meant a loss of entrée with their faculty. Some argue that without the ability to offer new resources or the need to respond to faculty requests, there is that much less reason for faculty to interact with liaisons.

Another area of concern is the sheer workload that CDLs assume when they are responsible for the selection of all the materials for the institution. The impact of the workload is

directly related to the size of the book budget; the larger the budget, the more time must be spent on ordering books. This limits the amount of time that can be spent on the other activities described above. It can also be difficult to identify personnel with the necessary knowledge across disciplines to do a good job for each and every department; not many librarians can boast expertise in mechanical engineering, chemistry, and zoology, for example. Sharing the load has its advantages.

Finally, there is the issue of oversight. Previously, Morris Library had one CDL, who had ultimate authority for every decision regarding collections. This structure led to an overwhelming workload, but the concentration of power in one person's hands allowed for timely and definitive decision-making. In contrast, with a team-based approach of three CDLs, and no one particular librarian in charge, decision-making can be hampered or slowed. While analysis can be done, there is not always agreement over the implications. Further, a counter-productive territoriality may develop, impeding decisions that need to be made for the organization as a whole. Designation of a final authority, on a rotating or permanent basis, should alleviate this problem.

Back to the Future?

Some will say that the structure described here is actually a return to the past, to the heyday of the bibliographers – say from the 1970s or earlier. While superficially true, this depiction misses the point. For the role of bibliographers in the past was quite different than the role of the CDLs in Morris Library and elsewhere today. Notably, bibliographers in the past had comparatively much larger book budgets; they spent their time poring over publisher catalogs,

bibliographies, and other lists of titles. More fundamentally, their focus was in fact still rather limited, did not extend to systematic review of resources beyond the scope of their own assignments, and did not include the diversity of issues facing collection managers today, including a much more varied array of formats and platforms, discovery tools, and licensing. There were no packages as there are today, and there were no use statistics, at least in the sense collection librarians understand today, to review.

For today's CDL, facility with spreadsheet software is more valuable and relevant than a pile of catalogs or weighty bibliographies. Use statistics have changed the balance in how assessments are conducted, as they provide a new empirical grounding for decisions. With the prevalence of Big Deals and consortial purchases, detailed examination of the value of non-subscribed content is now required. As a result, faculty input and self-declared librarian expertise do not carry the same weight they used to. If a journal has received 20 downloads over the course of a year, the case can be made for cancellation, regardless of its status or the importance attached to it. This kind of analysis, however, requires a broader viewpoint than that of an individual liaison or an overworked collections librarian.

CONCLUSION

Libraries have restructured considerably in the last decade, in many areas and departments. Electronic resource librarians have been hired, metadata positions have been created, institutional repository coordinators assigned – all in recognition of the changing structure and process of information dissemination. Other positions, such as that of liaisons and reference librarians, have been fundamentally altered. Yet, collection management in academic

libraries often continues under the same structure established before the changes so evident in today's information environment.

The move to the current structure at Morris Library at SIUC represents an attempt to address the major changes faced by libraries today: the development of electronic resources, and budgetary constraints in the face of materials that continue to increase in cost. In fact, the creation of three Collection Development Librarians along discipline-based lines has allowed unprecedented planning and review of policies, processes, and results. While there are drawbacks, this structure provides distinct benefits and opportunities to address contemporary challenges and needs in collection management, especially for larger academic libraries.

NOTES

[i] Requests for this document may be made to the author at jnabe@lib.siu.edu.

[ii] See http://www.gwla.org/.

[iii] See http://www.carli.illinois.edu/

[iv] All of this, of course, was predicted by Ken Frazier, Director of Libraries at the University of Wisconsin; see Frazier, Kenneth. 2001. "The Librarians' Dilemma: Contemplating the Costs of the 'Big Deal'." *D-Lib Magazine* 7, no. 3.

REFERENCES

Anson, Catherine, and Ruth Connell. E-book Collections, Spec Kit 313. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2009.

Association of Research Libraries. 2000. ARL Statistics 1999-2000. Available at http://www.arl.org/stats/annualsurveys/arlstats/statxls.shtml (accessed August 17, 2010).

Association of Research Libraries. 2008. ARL Statistics 2007-2008. Available at http://www.arl.org/stats/annualsurveys/arlstats/statxls.shtml (accessed August 17, 2010).

Best, Rickey D. 2009. Is the "Big Deal" Dead? *The Serials Librarian*, 57(4): 353-363.

Botero, Cecilia, Steven Carrico, and Michele R. Tennant. 2008. Using Comparative Online Journal Usage Studies to Assess the Big Deal. *Library Resources & Technical Services* 52(2): 61-68.

Branin, Joseph, Frances Groen, and Suzanne Thorin. 2000. "The Changing Nature of Collection Management in Research Libraries." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 44, no. 1: 23-31.

Chadwell, Faye A. 2009. What's Next for Collection Management and Managers? User-Centered Collection Management. *Collection Management* 34(2): 69-78.

Chadwell, Faye A. 2010. What's Next for Collection Management and Managers? *Collection Management* 35(1): 3-14.

Colvin, Gloria. 2009. Budget Cuts Impact Florida's Academic Libraries. *Florida Libraries* 52(1): 10.

Dorner, Daniel G. 2004. "The Impact of Digital Information Resources on the Roles of Collection Managers in Research Libraries." *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* 28, no. 3: 249-274.

EBSCO. 2009. Five Year Journal Price Increase History (2004-2008). Available at: http://www2.ebsco.com/en-us/Documents/customer/OVERVIEW-2008.pdf (accessed October 26, 2009).

Geller, Marilyn. 2006. "Managing Electronic Resources." *Library Technology Reports* 42, no. 2: 6-13.

Hazen, Dan. 2000. "Twilight of the Gods? Bibliographers in the Electronic Age." *Library Trends* 48, no. 4: 821.

Imre, Andrea and Jonathan Nabe. 2009. MyiLibrary and Patron Driven Acquisition at SIU-Carbondale. Available at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/morris_confs/2/ (accessed November 3, 2009).

Jakubs, Deborah. 1999. "Staffing for Collection Development in the Electronic Environment: Toward a New Definition of Roles and Responsibilities" *Journal of Library Administration* 28, no. 4: 71.

Johnson, Peggy. *Fundamentals of Collection Development and Management*. 2nd ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 2009.

Kulp, Christina, and Karen Rupp-Serrano. 2005. "Organizational Approaches to Electronic Resource Acquisition: Decision-Making Models in Libraries." *Collection Management* 30, no. 4: 3-29.

Logue, Susan, et al, *Liaison Services*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2007.

Quinn, Brian. 2001. "The Impact of Aggregator Packages on Collection Management." *Collection Management* 25, no. 3: 53.

Sohn, J. 1987. "Collection Development Organizational Patterns in ARL." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 31, no. 2: 123-134

Stoffle, Carla J., and Janet Fore. 1999. "Developing New Models for Collection Development." *Journal of Library Administration* 28, no. 4: 3.

Tenopir, Carol. 2003. Use and Users of Electronic Library Resources: An Overview and Analysis of Recent Research Studies. Available at http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub120/pub120.pdf (accessed February 26, 2009).

Thornton, Glenda A. 2000. "Impact of Electronic Resources on Collection Development, the Roles of Librarians, and Library Consortia." *Library Trends* 48, no. 4: 842.

Van Orsdel, Lee C. and K. Born. 2009. Reality Bites: Periodicals Price Survey 2009. *Library Journal*, 134(7): 36-40. Available at: http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6651248.html (accessed October 26, 2009).