

AFMC Libraries Group

Transforming Collections:
challenges and opportunities for the
academic medical library

By

Pamela Morgan

Information Resources Librarian

Health Sciences Library

Memorial University of Newfoundland

Well the topic I was given, transforming collections, is a pretty broad topic, so I think we need to start by situating ourselves. From clay tablets and papyrus, animal hides, bone, wood, silk, parchment, and paper... In the Beginning, libraries would have consisted of fairly unique collections of scrolls. Gradually copies made their appearance, acquired scrolls and books being laboriously copied by hand, by scribes and monks.

Then of course we had the invention of the printing press. Now books could be mass produced, particularly with the later introduction of the steam engine to power the presses. Multiple copies of books proliferated; every library that wanted a copy could have one.

Fast forward to the invention of computers and the introduction of the electronic book and other electronic resources. Copies readily accessible to all at the click of a button. And then consortia agreements so everyone has access to everything. Just to make sure you are all still awake after lunch, let's ask the **Question: What makes one library different from another library when all have the same packages?** Thanks to big deals and bundled packages, library collections have become more and more homogenized.

As the format of the collection changed, so too did collection development. From grabbing every copy of every book or scroll you could get your hands on, librarians then became selective. Academic librarians became subject experts or bibliographers. Few libraries today have dedicated collections librarians. You may have reference librarians who handle everything from liaison to instruction to collection for one subject. And so we come full circle in some ways as librarians are not so much choosing titles as they are packages, acquiring everything they can afford. Or maybe individual selection of monographs is left to the patron through PDA programmes. Even interlibrary loan has changed from a library to library service to Document Delivery, where a library will obtain a copy, even if buying limited rights from the publisher or a commercial supplier. No longer concerned

with having a copy, the concern was getting a copy to the user. And so collection development also changed into collection management. And single libraries banded together into consortia to increase their buying power.

Besides collections librarians, other changes in staffing and duties arise. There is, of course, less processing of physical materials. Catalogue or Discovery records for packages can generally be obtained from the vendors and/or handled through a Central Knowledge Base. Licenses are negotiated by one library for the entire campus rather than handled by individual branches. There will likely be an increase in the skill set needed as well as increased collaboration across traditional library divisions such as serials, acquisitions, cataloguing, etc. as the boundaries between them blur. Acquisitions is Acquisitions, regardless of the format.

As I was jotting notes for this session, I came up with a lot of Dichotomies or “Versus”:

- Serials vs. monographs
- Ownership vs. Access (also known as Just in time vs. just in case)
- Print vs. electronic
- Bundled vs. stand-alone
- Individual titles vs. packages
- User selection vs. librarian selection
- Open access vs. pay per view
- Research vs. teaching
- Interlibrary loan vs. document delivery
- Collection development vs. collection management

I was told a few topics that you specifically wanted covered in today’s session, and we’ll start now to look more closely at these, as well as touching on some of these dichotomies as we go.

So where do we start ... what about with user expectations? Presumably our users and their needs should be our primary focus. **Q: But what do they want and what do they need? Are they the same?** Another dichotomy?

A paper a colleague and I presented at APLA in 2011 detailed the results of a survey of e-books at Memorial.

Users wanted both formats, for differing reasons. And we know that budgets aren't allowing for duplication. Ultimately, what users want and need is the content, whenever they want it. The container is merely the tool and they want to use whatever tool is most convenient to them at their point of need. Those who liked and wanted electronic wanted to be able to download it to their e-reader or mobile device, to be able to keep it forever, and for there to be no simultaneous user limits.

And so we have records in our catalogues or discovery services, and point to resources. And thanks to IP registration, users can even access our resources via Google. Once users got used to remote access, 24x7 access, anything less became a frustration in today's society. People want it now. Document delivery ... wait 24 or 48 hours, cross the street, go across town, no way. And so users push the movement to electronic for the convenience and not because they necessarily prefer to read it that way. Even given a choice between pushing the print button or walking to the stacks for a print version and photocopying ... we know what they are going to choose. I've done it myself ... sitting at the reference desk with my own lit search in front of me and printing off the articles... until I hit one that we have in the stacks and sigh because I have to get off my chair and walk around the corner, and then actually stand over a photocopier and turn pages! Users want the discrete information and no longer even know if it is a book or an article or whatever ... if they ever did understand the difference - they just want it. However, publishers want to maintain brand identity and grow their profits to appease the corporate office and the holdings companies, and so they bundle their content into exclusive packages, bigger and bigger packages that contain highly used titles with low use and /or highly specialized titles that would never have gotten off the ground if they weren't part of a bundle.

When libraries consisted entirely of print collections, the focus of the librarian was on building a physical collection. Expectations of users was that they had to come

to the library and see what the library had. If they were lucky, a library could obtain a title that was not owned from another library and a patron was happy to have this service. And so libraries shared resources. Each purchased what was core to them and could borrow from another to extend their collection into more peripheral or specialised areas. But when collections switched to electronic, so too did user expectations and particularly **their definition of available**. Instead of coming to the library, users expect the resources to be available to them at the click of a button, anytime and anywhere. Neither students nor faculty are content to wait, but have determined that they need/want it now. It doesn't matter the turn-around time; instantaneous is the only time that is acceptable.

Of course, one way that libraries have used to overcome this “instantaneous” expectation is with desktop delivery of articles. The changes in copyright and, particularly within Canada a shared document delivery system, allow libraries to send articles direct to their user's email. Thus even if a library doesn't own material, its user can still request and receive the needed material without setting foot in the library. Desktop delivery of article has greatly improved turnaround times and appeased many users. But there are other options for desktop delivery besides traditional interlibrary loan. If another library cannot supply the item, Pay per View direct from the publisher may be an option but it is much more expensive. Mediated PPV as a supplement to ILL, is workable. But as a replacement for licensed materials, the literature has shown that it is not sustainable except for small college libraries. I have not, however, seen a study specifically about PPV and academic medical libraries. Whether the focused aspect of a medical collection would allow it to work unmediated is questionable. I do not believe it would be sustainable or controllable, but perhaps if it were targeted to specific publications only such as peripheral journals or highly specialised titles required by a select few. However the growth of PPV options has led to a change in the terminology within libraries, from Interlibrary Loan to Document Delivery, meaning we will deliver this document to you, even if we have to buy it for you. Indeed there are some libraries where a librarian intercepts every ILL request for a book and if it meets certain criteria redirects it to Acquisitions as a RUSH order. But there are other options that our students and faculty are using, that completely bypass the library altogether. We are all familiar with personal networking, and I know there are times I have even suggested from the Reference Desk that a user

might want to email the author for more information. I have had a person at the reference desk, when told we didn't have an article, say "that's okay, XX university has it, I'll email my buddy to send me a copy. But now the technology is really taking off for this kind of peer to peer interaction. At the NLHLA meeting last week, I was introduced to #Ihazpdf

This twitter feed consists simply of requests from people for others to supply them with a copy of an article. Ethics? Legality? It is happening. And people don't understand that they aren't allowed to do it. Users post their request and when they get it, they delete their tweet. They claim it is faster and easier than going through their library ILL. Taylor and Francis has been on warning people about it. Nature has taken the opposite tack of allowing users to share via ReadCube. There will be a poster session on this at CHLA 2015. So what are they getting from this that they aren't getting from the library? Convenience? A guerrilla movement against the broken scholarly communication? Are they even aware the library could do it for them?

This works for articles, but what about books? Enter PDA/DDA. Many academic libraries are using or testing the Patron-Drive or Demand-Driven Access model for electronic books. Memorial has been running a pilot for about a year and a half. It is an excellent way to merge the concept of Pay per View, desktop delivery, and entire books. Load an entire e-book collection in your discovery service and pay a short term loan fee whenever someone uses the book, with "use" being strictly defined and not including the table to contents. After a certain number of short term loans, you buy the book. It is great for users, who do not know what we own or do not own; it is great for collections librarians who are debating the value of a particular title or choosing between two similar titles; however our acquisitions department is finding it increasing difficulty as publishers are constantly changing the price for the book and for the short term loan without notice (thus we are withdrawing the book when the price reaches our threshold) and as publishers withdraw their titles from PDA availability. Publishers want to sell the books and not rent them out; they don't seem able to deal with the philosophy of rental monies rather than the sales figures they are used to; many are seeming to opt for making a library pick a book to buy (buy mine and not my competitors) rather than sharing the STL fees. Between withdrawals from PDA and jacking up e-prices, publishers seem to be on track to push themselves out of the e-business.

And then we have the open access movement. In its conception, a great idea. The academics who are doing the research, the peer review, the editorial work put the research out there and their institutions don't have to pay to access it. But this movement has been taken over by the publishers. From collaborative networks of scholars and wholly open journals we have a variety of flavours ... green open access and gold open access and author fees. The best role for open access is only if it is truly open access. Author fees are no more sustainable than Big Deals or PPV.

So from the user's definition of available, let's turn to the librarian's view ...where a library still uses the premise that if we don't have it, we can get it for you. Resource discovery tools and the internet have increased the user's ability to identify materials they may want. With the growth in publishing and the ease of searching, no library can afford, either the dollars or the space, to own everything that the user might come across. Thus libraries have to share what they do have.

The benefit of resource sharing are easy to talk about - a shared virtual collection, where every library doesn't have to purchase everything. A sharing of the cost burden, an ability to focus collections on specific needs and supplement with peripheral titles.

But there are limits to resource sharing. These include :

License restrictions. Most users licenses that mention interlibrary loan do so in terms of "own country" if they allow it at all. Journal licenses tend to be much more accepting of ILL than book packages and other types of databases. Thus the more a library goes electronic, the fewer resources that are available for sharing. Libraries need to take a stand to ensure that ILL is included in all their licenses, or at least that it is not forbidden thus allowing copyright law to preside.

Collusion. Deals for reciprocal arrangements to increase turn-around time and ensure reliable access risk opening the library to charges of collusion. Publishers most definitely frown on any kind of deal that says I will buy Package or Title X if you buy Package or Title Y. This leads to a Question – how can we share without collusion? The only way is to have the evidence that the title not held is not a core title for your institution. A strong collection development policy? Usage? ILL requests?

Electronic Format. While ILL can work for journal articles or specific pages of a book, it does not work for anyone who would like to read the entire book. At least not in the academic market. There is no technical way for a library to lend its e-book to another library or even to a non-primary patron. An example of a situation our library is dealing with is the issue of hospital personnel. Although part of the university, our library is housed in the hospital on the edge of campus. We are contracted by the health authority to provide some library services for those hospital personnel based in that hospital – why have two libraries in the one building. And yet, all our electronic resources are licensed for the university, not the health authority. Thus, any hospital employee who is not cross-appointed with the faculty must physically come to the library to use any of our electronic resources. The more we buy electronically, the smaller a collection they are able to readily use.

Storage. Libraries with space issues have moved titles to off-site storage. Once a library has moved an item to off-site, it costs money not only to house it but also to retrieve it from storage whether for your own patron or for another library. Dalhousie and Memorial discovered these costs the hard way, when Dalhousie was making ILL requests from Memorial that Dalhousie had in storage as the reciprocal borrowing agreement was cheaper than the storage retrieval fee, not realizing that Memorial was pulling the material from their storage unit to fulfill the Dalhousie request.

Unique Titles. The more big deals or packages that libraries are involved with, particularly on the national consortia scale, the fewer resources that are unique. The majority of libraries money is tied into packages and big deals, in our case close to 80%) leaving little monies left over for individually selected titles. There is less resource sharing as everyone has the same generic collection.

Time. We already mentioned user needs & wants for instantaneous delivery of their materials and how they are going around the library to obtain what they want. Can we compete with this? The music business with Napster and other sharing facilities couldn't.

So what are our opportunities for collaboration? There are two types of collaboration that we need to consider: Internal and External.

By internal, I mean within your institution. This is not just the usual liaison model with librarians consulting with faculty members on collection needs. It goes much broader. NLHLA had a sneak peak at a presentation coming to CHLA 2015 on the role of the library in student learning and student achievement. Furthermore, the more that libraries go electronic, the more that education goes electronic, and thus the more the library needs to develop its relationship with other departments in the university. These include computer communications departments, distance learning departments, instructional technology sections, copyright offices, research offices, publishing divisions.... The technical infrastructure is a large part, but there is so much more now. Who is responsible for such matters as institutional repositories, digital archives, electronic theses, electronic reading lists, single-sign-on (one of our students biggest complaints), open journal systems, open author funds, EDI, EOD? Take the example of Open Access Authors' Funds. CIHR and now the Tri-Council require OA publication of research funded by their grants. The investigators can include monies in the grant to cover the costs of OA publishing. But any library that has set up an OA Authors' Fund, that has paid memberships or arranged automatic billing to help their authors are finding it difficult to recoup any funds or contributions to their Authors Fund. Clifford Lynch said (p. 66) "So much of the new content is outside of the library and outside of the entire system of publishing that it is unclear how much responsibility the libraries can or should take for this material or how they should go about taking that responsibility." **Q: How much should the library be involved or take the lead on these kinds of initiatives?**

On an external basis, libraries can develop collaborative efforts in bilateral, regional, national or in our case subject-focused collection building. Establish cooperative collection policies, not as a type of collusion but as a type of preservation and resource sharing. We need to ask ourselves questions (and find answers) like: Who is collecting comprehensively in an area and who is selective? Who is preserving the last print copy? The last electronic copy? Who has digitized it? Who is specializing in what area? Or maybe first we need to determine whether there still a need to "collect", to preserve or is the need simply to get what is needed? If there are no subject specialists, can we outsource selection ... isn't that really what blanket orders, approval orders, standing orders were all about.. are we going to a homogenous collection? One common collection development

technique, particularly for new programs, is to measure your holdings against those of an established program and/or subject bibliographies. So perhaps one opportunity for collaboration might be to share the expert subject bibliographers that most libraries no longer have. If one library is designated THE library for a particular subject and has The Expert Collection Development librarian, can that librarian order the “core” titles for the other libraries that don’t have bibliographic specialists? The biggest barriers to cooperative collection development is protection of one’s turf ... for faculty is often “my title” must be here for me; for librarians, is often “my library” is not spending money to benefit others. Other barriers include loss of autonomy; the cost to implement (including time, meetings); accrediting bodies. There would be a definitely need to have strong communication.

Opportunities for and benefits of collaborative collection development include: budget constraints which lead to increased cooperation; systematic collection development planning, union lists and agreements on last remaining copy; digitization projects; strong collection policies; libraries with great insight into their own needs; strong local collections in both breadth and depth.

Another area for external collaboration is in relationship building with the vendors; not treating them as adversaries but as partners. It is only through long-term relationships that libraries can acquire the flexibility to see them through the tough times. Having your vendor agent in your corner when it comes to dealing with the head office is worth gold. But we also need to develop relations with publishers to help them understand academic publishing models, to deal with new technologies, and work with libraries to benefit all.

We also have opportunities for collaboration and cooperation across library working groups; Cooperation within consortium and regional networks for collection development, licensing, new services, standards, and best practices such as the U of A’s statement on non-disclosure clauses.

Unfortunately the Canadian market, and especially the Canadian academic health market is very small and cannot exert great pressure, but we can influence. We need to be more careful about the licenses we sign. We need to develop best practices for licenses, including such things as ability to disclose pricing, to

disclose usage, and to ensure worldwide document delivery. Many publishers consider your usage statistics to be their proprietary information. Most journal licenses allow document delivery, but only within your own country. Most e-book licenses say nothing about document delivery – maybe the assumption is that you can't lend an e-book, but we can print and scan. Same for content databases like e-therapeutics or Natural Standards, or Clinical Key. If it doesn't say anything, can I print and scan under copyright law?

What about cooperative funding? In one sense, that is what Consortia are. CRKN allows opt in or opt out of various national deals. Is there a difference in an association, regional or provincial deal? Are there opportunities for Subject focused, or bilateral agreements; The creation of smaller partnerships to take advantage of specific needs rather than the broad interdisciplinary offerings that CRKN tends to offer. We have an example of this with the AFMC agreement for BMJ publishing group, and I know that LWW always offers Memorial the “same deal” that it offered Dalhousie, and presumably the reverse is true. But Memorial and Dalhousie have never gotten together to negotiate a joint deal that may have more favourable terms. As medical libraries, should we join with the health authorities and push for regional coverage for the same price, since many of our faculty are also members of the health authorities? How would it be accomplished? And how close can we come to true cooperative sharing? Why didn't the CVHL succeed? Is it a pie in the sky dream?

You wanted me to talk about cancellations, but we can't talk cancellation without talking about collection assessment. Decisions to add titles are relatively easy and are really only monetary decisions. But decisions to cancel are fraught with minefields. You must have some evidence behind your decision, some unbiased criteria, and even then, you will face the wrath particularly of faculty members as you cut their favourite title. I can tell you the story of a biology professor who emailed me last year, wanting access reinstated to a medical journal that was vital to his research, it had stopped working. When I looked it up, we had cancelled the title for lack of use the year before. When I contacted him to ask when it had stopped working (thinking maybe the publisher had been late cutting us off), he informed me he had been on sabbatical last year but this title was very vital not only to him but to all his graduate students and to the entire Pharmacy school. Yet his was the only complaint in over a year without access. It reflects an article that

was written by Bill Birdsall back in 1998 entitled “I am read, therefore I am” where he said that it wouldn’t matter how much evidence you had, a faculty member would not accept it because it calls into question their *raison d’etre*. They cannot accept that their journal is not being used because of the implied criticism of their scholarship. His conclusion was that cancellations can only be dealt with through economic discussions. I think he is on the right track. As librarians we need to make the decisions using our best evidence, but the discussion with faculty will have to be centered around economics.

Of course one of the pros of The Big Deal was that collections librarians no longer had to do the time consuming task of selecting, reviewing, and weeding each and every title to which a library subscribed ... the library now has pretty well everything by a particular publisher so why bother. While some libraries may have regularly gone through the assessment exercise, done swaps when permitted, and so forth, the fact remains that this review would take a large amount of time - and even longer now with the multitude of titles in the packages – with little real, noticeable gain. Time is at a premium and this is one thing that was easy to stop. So on the Pro side ... finally something we could give up. But on the Con side ... in a time of economic stress, the review has to be done from scratch by people who are no longer used to doing it and have no baseline with which to work.

Assessments are more important than ever; the need to assess the Big Deal, the need to develop a strategy for perpetual access, the need to assess books that have turned into continuations. The need to balance maintenance or access fees against the do it yourself loading versus the weeding of the platform. This last one, maintenance fees, is something that may not always be considered but it is an unspecified amount written into every contract. Let me give you a small example: my library bought the approximately two dozen books on platform x over 10 years ago. The books were bought outright and we pay a platform maintenance fee. Of those books, only one is being used to any extent. The rest may get a couple of uses every few years. But this one book, it is required reading for a distance nursing course and usage is **extremely** high, as in over 2000 uses per year. However the maintenance fee is over \$1000 per year and the book is not available on any other platform. If it were not for this one title, I would drop this platform. If I do a cost per use, it is very cost effective ... less than fifty cents. But I bought the book! I own it! Yet I am still paying \$1000 per year for it. Should I continue to pay

the maintenance fee, beg the instructor to find a new text, commit the systems time and hardware to take on hosting it ourselves? Buying an ebook or ejournal comes with its own set of hidden costs, another type of overhead to parallel the shelving and repair of print books.

One thing to recognize is that these reviews of resources take a lot of time. But they are essential for having data to hand when push comes to shove. And continuing resources are no longer just journal subscriptions and standing orders, they now include journal packages, ebook packages, databases, and maintenance fees. We can hope that the 'next gen' library services platforms provide this analysis capability as part of their analytics, but librarians will still need to make the final decisions.

At Memorial this year, we are looking at having to cut several of our Big Deals as well as several branch specific resources. For Health Sciences Library decisions, I can pull the statistics, do the evaluations, and write up recommendations based on the numbers. Then this goes to our HSL Librarians' Forum for input and discussion. But Big Deals are tricky, and this brings back into play the concept of Collaboration. The HSL can't buy a Wiley package or a Springer package on its own. Informa Healthcare yes, JAMA Network yes. But multidisciplinary packages require a multidisciplinary approach across all branches in order to purchase unless the main library decides to be nice. For Memorial, we may be in a slightly different situation than you, in that the HSL is part of the Faculty of Medicine, which receives its budget direct from the provincial Dept of Health (all part of the politics around the creation of a medical school to improve health in the province). The rest of the university gets its money from the provincial Dept of Education (and the library gets whatever the President of the University assigns it). You can imagine then, that when it comes to interdisciplinary materials involving large sums of money, there is consider to'ing and fro'ing. And so these interdisciplinary packages were assigned a percentage that was medical, that HSL was interested in, and this percentage is then applied to the purchase price and all subsequent renewals. And I do my assessment as to whether or not the HSL is getting its money's worth on our share or if I want to try and renegotiate the percentage with the main library. At the same time, the main library is doing its assessment of whether the package is still of value to them. And here you can see a problem with Collaboration on a small scale within one institution— what happens if I want to

cancel Package A and the main library wants to cancel Package B. Thus Memorial this past year, knowing what we were facing in terms of deficits, exchange rates, and publisher inflation, created a Cancellations SubCommittee (known by virtue of a typo as the Sob Committee). I sit on this committee with a number of main library collections librarians, representing the HSL interests and needs. I can openly state that the HSL needs to save X dollars, and that the only way we can do it is to cancel a package (in reality, withhold our share of a package) unless we can all come to an agreement on what package to cancel. Fortunately, we were able to do so. Now expand this out to consortia deals and multi-institutional partnerships.

Question: So how do you decide what to cancel, what factors should be considered?

Criteria that Memorial used included:

- High cost
- Higher than average rate of inflation in the cost over the last two years
- Low return on investment (e.g., low use statistics; thus, document delivery is a more economical option than a subscription)
- License terms (e.g., too restrictive or too complicated); includes perpetual access
- Duplication of content available in other Library resources or elsewhere; aggregator databases or embargoes
- Subject coverage
- Costs for all libraries involved
- Issues with discoverability (e.g., no records or poor quality records)
- Index versus full text content

Further Criteria which are quite time-consuming and we will look at doing after we do consultations and determine how many titles faculty say are essential and that we will contemplate buying back:

- Ability to negotiate for a 'smaller' package
- researcher citations
- use in reserve readings

Other criteria that I have seen mentioned in the literature include:

- comparable (but not the same) resources available
- usability of their e-resources / ease of use / functionality
- scope of audience
- other good solutions available (downgrade, ppv, etc)
- not required/not a 'must have'
- recommended by a faculty member
- supply model
- track record
- vendor support

Some sample analyses...

Another analysis I have done involves the 80-20 rule...

The ERIL listserv recently had a discussion on the cyclical review of e-resources. There were very few libraries indicating that they do this on a regular, cyclical or rotating basis but several indicated that they needed to go back and institute it. The value was seen not just in the economic, but also in the evaluation process as a

process/concept. All evaluations include gathering both quantitative data (usage, DD) and qualitative (faculty consultation). In many cases, titles are ranked/tiered.

My recommendation would be to develop a program of assessment and to repeat it periodically, whether there is a budgetary need or not. It is always helpful to have the numbers to hand, allows people to gain experience in non-critical times, and provides baselines for comparison. Never look only at one year's usage. We look at the past three years' data and averages, usage trends, and cost per use. I don't tend to go too far back, as I figure that specialities and research interests will change over time.

Another factor to look at with cancellations is the Interconnectedness of resources, and not of the monies. When talking to our Dean a few weeks ago about the budget and potential cancellations, our AUL brought up the idea of Access Medicine as an example of how things are tied together ... If we want Harrison's in electronic format, we have to buy the entirety of Access Medicine as McGraw Hill makes it available no other way beside print. Well print was fine for Harrison's, he didn't see a problem, as that's more a text for the first year students. Residents and physicians like him need the Lange books electronically; we weren't going to cancel those, were we? He finally got it when Janet explained that they go together, we can't pick and choose.

Another example would be the whole SuperSize Me concept. Remember MD Consult? Elsevier insisting that we had to switch to Clinical Key ... it was so much better, it had way more journals, way more books, all these wonderful videos and patient handouts, it was just fabulous, how could we not want it? Well, yes, it was double the price but they were sure we could work something out. The publishers don't seem to get that if I go into McDonalds and dredge through my pockets to come up with the 8.99 (or whatever it is ...) for the combo, the fact that I can be supersized for an extra 1.99 is immaterial if I don't have the money in my pocket. Ah, but try and cancel it ... because MD Consult (and Clinical Key) contain a number of Clinics titles, they say I was receiving a discount for the overlap with TheClinics.com package. So planning not to buy CK, I asked for a stand-alone quote for my Clinics renewal ... it was three times the price of what I was currently paying – in other words, it was cheaper to buy CK than to subscribe to TheClinics package without it.

The math makes no sense to me: **CK + Clinics.com < Clinics.com**. Now, I have to do a full analysis of The Clinics.com package and all my Elsevier packages and titles and try and disentangle the mess and determine exactly what Elsevier titles Memorial really needs and how much we are willing (and able) to pay for them.

A lot of the literature I have read have indicated that document delivery doesn't increase as substantially as one might expect when cancelling a big deal. Students with their "just push the button, so long as I have AN article on my topic" will usually simply print out and use whatever article we have access to that pops up on their screen first. The concern is with faculty and researchers who need, not AN article but THAT article. This is not quantitative data, this is qualitative: who is using it. It is one of the things I want to know but can't find out. This means that the biggest issue with cancellations is communication with faculty. At Memorial a lot of our discussions are centering on how to consult with faculty, how to convey to faculty what we need to do and how to get their feedback, without causing a crisis on campus. We're in the midst of a survey asking faculty to identify their essential titles. Most of the literature talking about cancellations indicates that it goes smoother with the more notice given and the more consultation that occurs. Getting buy-in from faculty is never easy. The literature also points to the benefit of having a strong collections policy which can provide the ground on which to stand.

But there is another group with whom communication is important – the deans of medicine, the directors of finance. They have to understand the difference between a library purchasing a journal or package and a laboratory purchasing a microscope. For libraries, monies are committed long before some budget decisions; and by the time it is nearing fiscal year end, there is nothing left to cut. It may be a consortia deal that has been six months in negotiation; it may be a multi-year deal; it may be a vendor contract with a sixty day cancellation notice period; and don't forget the timing of when renewals occur – it's not like we can defer renewing a subscription for a few months. In our case last year, by the time the Director of Finance got his budget and distributed it out, we had 80% of our budget spent or committed. It was no good for him to tell me then that we needed to adjust

the budget. This concept of lead time for library purchases or cancellations seems foreign to them.

And we can't forget the vendors – we already talked about them under collaboration and relationship building, working with them to obtain a solution that benefits both sides.

And then, is the next concern ...if we cancel it, do we get to keep the stuff we already had? And how much are we paying to access that for which we have perpetual access. Clifford Lynch noted that “Having access to a publisher’s online service for the duration of a license agreement was very different from taking possession of printed journals that could be loaned to other libraries and could be kept in perpetuity.” Lynch (P. 65) There is a cost to perpetual access, and the problem is that we don’t know what it is ... unless we want to take possession and set up our own infrastructure. And maybe we should. Maybe here is a good opportunity for collaboration between institutions, regionally, or consorcially. Would it be cheaper to pay an infrastructure fee to ourselves or to pay the maintenance fee? Perhaps libraries need to do more work with LOCKSS, which promises “An institution’s LOCKSS Box delivers content to authorized readers only when the publisher’s website is unavailable (and specifically mentions subscription canceled).” But how well has that worked with the demise of Swets and the Learned’s package? There are some titles now available, but perhaps a more concerted effort is needed by libraries, both to participate and to ensure their publishers participate.

Of course somewhere in this talk of evidence I need to put a CAVEAT ON STATISTICS. Usage statistics are only one factor in determining whether the library should subscribe to a title or not. They provide the quantitative evidence; it is faculty consultations that drive the qualitative. And any quantitative evidence must be balanced against the context.

- For example, smaller departments or even highly acclaimed research units simply do not have the numbers of faculty and students so that high use on their most important journal would not compare to a title used irregularly by a large faculty.

- Title changes and publisher changes affect usage. An established title with many years of backfiles will always have higher overall usage than a newer title with little to no backfiles.
- Different platforms impact usage – does a publisher drop you into an abstract page where you choose PDF or HTML versions or does it drop you automatically into the HTML version and so selection of the PDF version causes double-counting of the PDF versions of that article.
- And as already mentioned, we don't know who is using the articles and whether another one would have sufficed if this journal were not available.

Terry Bucknell in 2012 wrote a paper entitled “Garbage in, gospel out: Twelve reasons why librarians should not accept cost-per-download figures at face value” that details why you need a caveat on usage statistics.

So on to the Big Deal. You folks are probably as up on budgets if not more so than me. We've been doing well if library budgets have remained flat for the past few years. Even if a library received an increase, it is at most cost of living increases. Is any library getting a 5-10% increase in their materials budget? We got by on a good Canadian dollar for a few years, but even leaving aside the exchange rate, we are dealing with Commercial Publishers and they are not in it for the good of academia, they are in it to make a profit. The Ebsco pricing report estimates journal inflation for medical libraries at 4-6% for this year. Many publishers keep their eye on this report and price accordingly....most of my invoices last year came in around 5%. There are a couple of publishers that I have to argue with to get anywhere close to 6-8%. Depending on the particular Big Deal, you may be able to lock in at 3-5%. But is your budget going to increase by that much this year? And next year? And the year after? **Q: Where is the library to find the funds to accommodate publisher increases year after year?** Besides the break we had seen on exchange rate, libraries have taken other steps such... changed the percentage of spend on monographs versus serials, curtailed binding, cut duplicates across branches, eliminated standing orders, cut the small publishers, and perhaps even run deficits and used staffing vacancies to achieve zero-based budgeting...all to try and maintain the big deals. But somewhere it has to stop. Even if the dollar

hadn't dropped as it did this year, it could not continue because everything has already been trimmed. So, no, I don't think it is sustainable.

And publishers continue to grow and consolidate ... who didn't shiver in horror when the announcement was made in February of the merger of Springer and Nature. Publishers keep growing, they continue adding new titles (either new to them or newly created), and new features and tell us how much they are doing for us and so we have to pay this much more, hoping to reap more and more market share and force other companies out of business. There is no recognition that libraries have a limited amount of money and it doesn't matter what they throw into the package, I still can't pay more for it. The only thing libraries can do at this stage is to unbundle the publisher bundles and start over. There are instances in the literature of "small deals", where libraries have been able to negotiate for a more selective deal of what they want. Remember the 80-20 statistics example I showed you earlier. How many titles do you think in that package are zero use? When I start talking cancellations, the first thing my faculty ask is why don't we just get rid of all the dentistry titles since we don't have a dentistry program.

And the licenses and publisher demands for secrecy based on proprietary information limit the ability of any library to share information and try and get a good deal. Will the CRKN Bands help? I think they will to the extent of pricing fairness across bands, but only if a library can take the full package. And it doesn't address any of the other issues with licenses and the publisher's view of proprietary information. Currently licensing terms seem to be working against libraries' ability to collaborate and ensure fair treatment.

And as already mentioned, don't look to the current Open Access model to help. It is just as unsustainable. In the two years of operation at Memorial, the spend on our Open Access Author's Fund grew 500%, with medical faculty being amongst the top users. Paying up front with author fees or paying on the back end with subscription fees is no difference.

So where do library collections go from here?

In my opinion, for collections, we will see smaller deals, selective deals, and increased individual selection on the journals side. Strong collaboration with faculty will need to be coupled with the librarians' judgement backed by usage statistics from both electronic platforms and document delivery.

Package and Individual purchases of e-books selected by librarians will continue to be balanced with Patron Driven Acquisition for the next few years, at least until the market and publishers gain more experience and it settles into a mature product. Then whether it remains or falls on the wayside will depend on the publishers, but also on guidelines that libraries should and need to develop. Nonetheless, I think we will see a retreat from the movement to wholly virtual libraries back to stronger print collections – with the exception of mobile apps; I don't think we're getting away from them.

Collections across the country will no longer be as homogenous as they have become under the Big Deals but will develop strengths in certain areas. There is a question as to how we ensure a balanced collection, but at the same time, there is a question as to whether it needs to be balanced. **If the collection is meeting the needs of its primary clientele, does it matter? Medical libraries in particular** tend to collect current material to meet specific educational and research needs. Is there a need to build a "Collection" for posterity that will be kept for the ages?

Already developing, we will have a greater emphasis on unique materials that are local to the institution... Digital Repositories, e-theses, learning objects banks, reading lists, Data sets, digitization of archives & special collections:, and the library as publisher or involved with the university in open access journals - essentially the making of unique collections that distinguish one library from another.

And so we will have increased emphasis on resource sharing.

There will still be a role for Collections Librarians. While the actual selection of titles and liaison with faculty will be spread out, specialised collections librarians be more involved in assessment and libraries will continue to hire scholarly communication librarians to find ways to collect the academic output of the university through repositories and to encourage true open access models of "publishing".

If we look back at our dichotomies from the beginning of the session ...

- Serials vs monographs Has turned into Continuations versus Firm Orders. Almost everything that the library now buys is a continuation, even a large portion of its books and videos
- Ownership vs access was one way of debating whether the library should own the material or rely on resource sharing. It transitioned into a new phrase of Just in time vs just in case. Today we can look at it as Short Term needs versus long term needs or Immediate versus future use. Do we need to collect for the future, for the enduring knowledge bestowed by collections, or do we simply provide what it needed at the time and hope it is available somewhere when next it is needed.
- Print vs electronic is still an argument of today. People want to be able to choose what suits them at a particular point in time. They see the container as simply a choice of how to access and do not understand why the library restricts them to one or the other. Economics and licenses will dictate what a library can provide.
- Bundled vs stand-alone represents a conflict between publisher and librarian, and where the best value can be obtained. For most libraries now, the bundle is an irritation at best and a strait-jacket at worst. Tying products together increases publisher sales models but costs the library more money and it is increasingly difficult to drop one piece of the pie and still save money.
- Individual selection versus package selection is a similar conundrum. The library can obtain better cost value from packages but the overall price has become so unsustainable that the packages need to be broken out simply due to the total cost as a percentage of the library's budget.
- And so a new dichotomy: the Big Deal, which contains virtually all a publisher's offerings including a great many that are never used, versus the Small (or Customized) Deal, where the library negotiates a price for a mix of X number of titles that the library is choosing. But are we then simply

creating our own bundle of sorts and moving the issue ten years down the road?

- Interlibrary loan vs document delivery is a movement that we have already seen and is not likely to go away as publishers grapple with new ways to charge users (or libraries) for access to their content.
- Open access vs pay per view reflects a difference in access models and looks at who pays and when. Unless the faculty, caught in their own publish or perish dichotomy takes a stand, it is unlikely that open access will truly go free. Thus the library is caught between Author fees, Author Funds, Research Funds, and Subscriptions. How can we get a share of the Research Funds that have been allocated for OA publishing to finance OA Authors' Funds?
- And so we have Collection development vs content development... if a library buys access to an article for one patron, how can they manage this content in the assumption that another patron will also be interested in the same content. This is after all, the premise behind Patron-Driven Acquisition of ebooks, and purchases of books requested on interlibrary loan. Many born digital e-journals are publishing articles, identified by article numbers, and not bundling the articles into volumes and issues. The article is the commodity. Will book chapters be far behind? Some books now are simply compilations of articles? **What is the role for the library in these cases?**
- This leads into User selection vs librarian selection, who is selecting the materials and how is a balanced collection maintained, or is it? Leading to ...
- Institutional curriculum versus knowledge of discipline then considers whether or not we need to preserve/whether we need to collect a body of knowledge, or if we just need to collect what the users want at this point in time.
- This brings us to Research versus teaching, where should the bulk of the budget for an academic health library go? Students who are the reason for the medical school to exist, research which brings in the money, students who have to rely on the library, research with its access to grants and

collegial networks, students who have specific and generally homogenous needs and researchers with very specific needs in very concentrated topics.

What is an appropriate balance?

- Collection development vs collection management then is a reflection of the depth and breadth of issues surrounding collections. No longer expert bibliographers selecting and weeding titles, collections has grown to encompass licensing and negotiating, preservation and digitization and open access and scholarly publishing

The Library will still exist in the future and will continue to collect resources for its primary users. But the collection will not be aligned around the format or container. It will be focused on the discrete content, on managing the output of the institution, and in collaborative efforts to widely share the limited resources we are able to purchase or license.

And the library will continue to face issues of Roles, Budgets, Licenses, User Needs, and Evolving Technology.

Thank you.

Bibliography

- Birdsall, W. F. (1998). I am read, therefore I am: Faculty and the psychology of journal cancellations. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 24(3), 240-241. doi:10.1016/S0099-1333(98)90046-5
- Bucknell, T. (2012). Garbage in, gospel out: Twelve reasons why librarians should not accept cost-per-download figures at face value. *Serials Librarian*, 63(2), 192-212. doi:10.1080/0361526X.2012.680687
- Crawford, Gregory A. and Lisa German, *Creating a New Collections Allocation Model for These Changing Times: Challenges, Opportunities, and Data* (2013). Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284315251>
- Education Advisory Board. (2011). *Redefining the academic library: Managing the migration to digital information services*. Washington, DC: Advisory Board.
<http://www.infodayblog.com/tcc-images/Provosts-Report-on-Academic-Libraries2.pdf>
- Eril-l. (2015) *Cyclical Review of E-Resources?* Eril-l listserv communications from March 11-13, 2015 <http://lists.eril-l.org/listinfo.cgi/eril-l-eril-l.org>
- Foudy, Gerri; McManus, Alesia. (2005) *Using a Decision Grid Process to Build Consensus in Electronic Resources Cancellation Decisions*. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31 (6): 533-538. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2005.08.005>
- Gorman, G. E. and Ruth H. Miller. (1997) Collection management for the 21st century : a handbook for librarians. Westport, Conn. : Greenwood Press.
- Harker, Karen; Todd Enoch & Laurel Crawford. (2014) Keeping it Real: A Comprehensive and Transparent Evaluation of Electronic Resources. UNT Digital Library.
<http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc407874/>
- Helgren, Jame E. (2010 November 30) *Booking to the Future*. *American Libraries*.
<http://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2010/11/30/booking-to-the-future/>
- Henry, Charles. (2010 June) The idea of order : transforming research collections for 21st century scholarship. CLIR publication ; no. 147. Washington, DC: Council on Library and Information Resources.
<http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub147/pub147.pdf>
- Hill, Joanne Schneider. (1991) Collection development in college libraries. Chicago : American Library Association.

Jenkins, Clare. (1999) Collection management in academic libraries. Aldershot, Hampshire, England ; Brookfield, Vt. : Gower.

Karel, Thomas A. *Is There a Future for Collection Development Librarians?* (2013). *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284315257>

Michalak, Sarah C. (2012) *This Changes Everything: Transforming the Academic Library*. *Journal of Library Administration*.52:411–423. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2012.700801>