What's Next for Collection Management and Managers?
By Faye A. Chadwell,

Associate Professor/Associate University Librarian for Collections & Content Management,
Oregon State University Libraries,
121 The Valley Library, Corvallis, OR 97331,
Faye.chadwell@oregonstate.edu

WHAT'S NEXT FOR COLLECTION MANAGEMENT AND MANAGERS?

Faye A. Chadwell

Nothing in my crystal ball suggests that libraries will not continue to collect materials in the coming years. What will change is the amount and availability of resources, the type of materials, the method of acquisitions, and the way in which these collections are used.

What will affect the amount or availability of materials is what has always affected the amount or availability of materials--our funding. We will need to be creative and strategic about how we deploy our budgetary dollars. We may not talk in polite company about journal cancellations or budget reductions, but many of us still wrestle with serial inflation demons. Many of us will play a bigger role working with donors and library development officers to augment our budgets and bring in some financial support for building collections. These days some of us manage gift funds that represent a substantial portion of our buying power. Unfortunately no matter how successful your library's capital campaign may be, to my knowledge none have yet managed to cajole a donation big enough to endow a library's complete serials budget.

At the 2006 Charleston Acquisitions Conference, Ray English, the keynote speaker from Oberlin College Libraries, said there is no evidence suggesting that open access has weakened commercial publishing (English 2006). I would add that there is no evidence yet. Consequently, it is imperative that we continue to develop new and appropriate business models for journal acquisitions rather than perpetuate or support the one size fits all model. Tools like Eigenfactor, developed at the University of Washington by biologist Carl Bergstrom and others, provide intriguing possibilities. Eigenfactor "ranks journals much as Google ranks websites" and it "measures journal price as well as citation

influence" (Eigenfactor.org). It is also completely free. In February 2008, SCOAP³ (Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics) will hold a meeting in Berkeley, California, to discuss a new and emerging model to fund open access publishing for high-energy physics journals. How will this work? SCOAP³'s basic premise is: those organizations like libraries and research centers that subscribe to high-energy physics will aggregate the funding dollars they now spend on journal subscriptions to cover the costs of open access publishing for high energy physics research. With their costs covered, publishers will agree to make their content freely available to anyone, and authors will not be assessed publication charges. (SCOAP³). The model has gained numerous supporters in Europe, but several questions remain: Will U.S. libraries and consortia will be persuaded to participate? Will collection managers be prepared to play new roles within their institutions that emerging business models and tools like Eigenfactor or SCOAP³ might create?

Though journal inflation coupled with requisite cancellations make it seem like we have lost content or the ability to acquire the content we need, fortunately the ongoing content explosion on the Web is mitigating the loss of our buying power. Think Wikipedia. Think Google Scholar. Think Flickr. Think open access publishing. It's terribly ironic that the wonders of technology and free access to information that our profession has always tauted are making some library professionals feel like dinosaurs and our collecting efforts seem irrelevant. However, it's incredible that our users are able to get their hands (and their mp3 players, cell phones, pdas or smartphones) on more and more stuff. I remain convinced that we will still play a role in helping our users discover, use, organize, manage, and preserve content. More than ever, we will also help with content creation.

For librarians, one of the most exciting developments of Web content in recent years has been the establishment of institutional repositories (IRs). Several recent articles suggest that IRs are

floundering. Cat McDowell, a librarian at UNC-Greensboro, provided some useful stats to follow Clifford Lynch and Joan K. Lippincott's earlier survey. Basically, "faculty output is not finding its way into institutional repositories in the U.S. in large numbers, except at some of the largest, most research-intensive universities." On average McDowell found that most of the content hosted within IRs is being generated by students, including electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs) (McDowell 2007). Dorothea Salo's article, "Innkeeper at the Roach Motel" to be published in *Library Trends* in 2008, bemoans the lack of support within academic libraries for IRs and their managers, focusing on the "innovationunfriendly" nature of the architectures of various IR software packages as they address faculty's promotion and tenure needs (Salo 2007).

Both Salo and McDowell confirm the need for this new breed of collection managers to articulate exactly how and why IRs might capture, preserve, and disseminate the intellectual capital of a research university, and what exactly IR managers should concentrate on capturing. These core missions could be communicated via collection building strategies and clear collection development polices, complete with materials statements including pre-prints, peer-reviewed articles or post-prints, monographs, teaching or curricular materials, conference papers, electronic theses and dissertations, gray literature such as technical reports, and/or data sets and other supplementary research material.

Open access mandates like the recently passed NIH mandate could help librarians breathe new life into IRs. SPARC'S efforts to gain passage of this landmark legislation are only the beginning. Collection managers will need to be increasingly involved as their home institutions work with faculty to comply with more open access mandates. Our knowledge of publishing alternatives, publishing contracts, copyright, and the procedures for depositing in open access venues will be key to the successful implementation of more governmental or organizational directives to make research freely accessible. If we devote time and energy in this arena and IRs really take off, will the new

breed of collection manager be positioned to handle the flood? What are the operational costs for marketing, managing, maintaining, preserving, and expanding institutional repositories on our campuses? Collection managers, especially those managing IRs, need to follow up on research like McDowell's to determine how to best build and manage the new library collection.

In addition to published research, more and more academic libraries are contemplating the prospect of managing and curating research data. Centers like Purdue University's D2C2 may become de riguer five or ten years from now. What policies and procedures need to be in place to make such endeavors successful? What are best practices? What staff will be involved and how will we meet the training needs for this kind of collection manager?

As mentioned earlier, there is a lot of interesting free content becoming available on the web. Who among us hasn't frittered away some of our valuable time watching videos of skateboarding bulldogs or baby pandas sneezing? Yet such free Web resources won't completely satisfy all of our users' information needs and a substantial amount of information is still not available on the Web. While exciting, open access and free Web resources will take time to shape and change traditional collection management.

Faced with the never-ending need to remain relevant and stretch our budget dollars, many of us will intensify our cooperative collection development efforts. Future cooperative efforts will continue to broaden access to content while avoiding duplication between and among libraries. The Holy Grail for cooperative collection development is to establish shared purchasing plans and there will be an increase in such plans, especially related to monograph acquisitions. The Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL) established a pilot shared purchase plan in 2006 that could serve as a model for other library consortia (Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries). Plans such as CARL's seek to identify areas of overlap where cooperating libraries can avoid unnecessary duplication thereby giving collection managers the ability to focus our attention and budgetary

dollars on more unique and specialized materials that our scholars need and will use. How will collection managers prepare themselves to administer these growing shared collections? What are some recent successes or even abysmal failures from which we can learn?

Consortia also will continue to seek to establish guidelines for how they might collaboratively deselect and store shared resources. Space in our buildings is valuable real estate these days. Using that space primarily to house print collections is no longer the sole consideration. Some browsability will be lost to library users but how are we employing new technologies to provide our library users with new methods of discovery? Could we cost effectively offer digital samples of what's in storage? Might we increase the links from the catalog to useful table of contents or to book reviews or implement social tagging so that users can help us manage our collections?

There is also a new generation of library users enamored of reading works via Kindles or BookGlutton or Sony's The Reader. How will collection managers build and manage these collections? What device is the best to purchase and how do we fund, administer, and maintain a collection of these devices? The development of e-book readers coupled with an upsurge in e-book publishing make it plain that we will continue to collect books, albeit in a different format. In general, we will continue expanding users' access to electronic or digital resources, including a growing focus on digital audio and video. Because so many libraries are already at the tipping point regarding the cost, in time and dollars, spent on managing e-resources, it follows that e-resources will continue to challenge us. Managing and accurately communicating the digital rights we have negotiated will become increasingly important. Everyday, we are moving closer to establishing and instituting standards for expressing license terms thanks to the work of NISO (National Information Standards Organization), the Digital Library Federation, EDItEUR, and the Publishers Licensing Society.

Libraries' growing investment in digital acquisitions and in the creation of our own digital assets

means not only that we must be concerned with hosting and providing access to these collections but also that we need to focus energy on preserving these resources for future use. How we will migrate the multiple formats forward--thousands of digital images, hundreds of XML copies of reference books, millions of bytes of GIS data plus the prospect of adding more digital music and video files? These acquisitions demand that we be prepared with adequate workflows and sufficient training for staff to handle and document the new formats, to manage and/or create metadata, and to design discovery tools so users can find and access what they need seamlessly. More libraries paying attention to keeping our digital assets safe will begin to create positions that focus exclusively on digital preservation. More importantly, we must think a lot more about the long-term access and preservation needs at the point of selection or acquisitions or ingest--more than we have in the past when we just ordered print materials and sent them to the shelves. There have been a crop of conferences and meetings that address this major challenge. The Persistence of Memory Conference, held in Seattle on November 28-29, 2007, and the Sun PASIG (Sun Microsystems Preservation and Archiving Special Interest Group) meeting, held in Paris, France in November 2007, are two examples. The conversations begun at these events, as well as projects such as the MetaArchive Cooperative, need to persist and grow.

In the immediate future, the influence of Web 2.0 sites will see a proliferation of resources and tools that support interactivity and collaboration among our users. The ways our users teach, learn, play and interact socially are demanding these types of resources in libraries. There are already resources that allow users to customize create playlists, generate reading lists, make notes in electronic books and image databases, and save and format citations so they display according to the rules of a particular style manual. Both public and academic libraries have begun to let users tag library materials with their own descriptors or to add their reviews to heighten resources' visibility to other users. Consider PennTags which integrates users' social tags with the more formal structure

library professionals know as cataloging.

These types of resources will demand more of our staff to manage collections as well as the various levels of access that users might have. As users build collections for themselves within such resources, we will spend more time helping them to develop personalized resources. Consider a resource such as Smithsonian Global. This online audio resource provides users with streaming access to speeches, sound effects, music from all over the world, as well as classical music recordings so typical of many libraries' music collections.   Smithsonian allows librarians to establish various levels of user access through course folders and customizable playlists. Collection managers can organize and share music with users or set up access for professors and teachers to manage selected audio resources for specific courses.

We may also need to change the way in which we prioritize and administer our budgetary dollars. In the case of Smithsonian, a library's subscription allows users to gain streaming access to available tunes. For deeper access or for ownership a user can buy a tune. Will there be an emergence of library accounts that librarians need to manage and possibly budget for—a pay as you listen scenario comparable to the pay per view familiar to electronic journal publishers. How comfortable will collection managers or their library administrators be distributing material budget dollars in this way? Can librarians live with the increasing likelihood that we may have expended "book funds," but that the only concrete or tangible item we have to show for that particular expenditure is perhaps a satisfied user? How will we assess or determine satisfaction in such a way as to compel our funding sources to continue bankrolling such efforts?

These are just some of the foreseeable issues for collection managers in the coming years. Obviously, digital resources and their issues of access, discovery, rights management, and preservation will be center stage, as well they should be. In this first appearance of "What's Next for Collection Management and Managers?" I hope to have provided some sense of the enormous sea of

change we are experiencing and the potential in terms of collection management and building for helping libraries cope with these changes. Likewise I hope to have tempted you with a glimpse of how *Collection Management* can help practitioners face all the overwhelming, dizzying, and exciting challenges and concerns that lie ahead.

Faced with the future and the changes it inevitably brings, it is important to remember that "to collect" means not only to gather and assemble; "to collect" also means to gain composure. It is the goal of *Collection Management* to move our profession forward as we collect and manage resources but also to help us collect our thoughts and ourselves as we move forward.

REFERENCES

Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries (CARL). Shared Purchase Plan Subcommittee.
http://www.coalliance.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=51&Itemid=118.

Eigenfactor.org Why Eigenfactor? http://www.eigenfactor.org/whyeigenfactor.htm.

English, Ray. Unintended Consequences Of The Profit Motive: Or Why the Open Access Genie is Out of the Bottle.
(Keynote presented at the XXVI Annual Charleston Conference: Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, Charleston,
South Carolina, November 8-10, 2006).

Lynch, Clifford and Joan K. Lippincott. 2005. Institutional repository deployment in the United States as of early 2005.
D-Lib Magazine 11, no. 9 (September) , http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september05/lynch/09lynch.html (accessed January
20, 2008).

McDowell, Cat. 2007. Evaluating institutional repository deployment in American academe since early 2005
Repositories by the Numbers, Part 2. D-Lib Magazine 13, no. 9/10 (September/October).
http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september07/mcdowell/09mcdowell.html (accessed January 19, 2008).

Salo, Dorothea. 2007. Innkeeper at the Roach Motel in Minds @ UW, http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1793/22088

   (accessed January 20, 2008).

SCOAP3 (Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics). About SCOAP3.

   http://www.scoap3.org/aboutus.html