COLLECTION MANAGEMENT: AN OVERVIEW

Woodruff Library – June 2012
The mission of Collection Management at the Woodruff Library is to develop, manage, and evaluate collections to support advanced teaching and research at Emory University.
## Importance of Collections to Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ithaka Report (cross-institutional):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty see/perceive library's role as “Buyer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Over 70% agree with the library’s role as “buyer” of information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research support and archiving functions still high in the Humanities and Social Sciences (60-70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 75% faculty consider <strong>print collections</strong> to be essential/very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 97% consider <strong>ejournal &amp; ebook collections</strong> to be essential/very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 90% consider <strong>database collections</strong> to be essential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Groups and Interviews:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to manage and build our Collections, Print, Electronic, AV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build local and national collection partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create more robust access and catalog tools for collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for interdisciplinary collections support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Statistics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 30-40% of all consultations by faculty are collections-focused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
what we do:

- Build research collections
  - Acquire new and build existing collections to support current teaching and research needs, but also to meet Emory’s future, long-term research interests
  1. 11M spend for journals, databases, books
  2. 1.5M for MARBL
  3. 700K for Common Good
  4. 600K for Business Library
what we do:

- Evaluate and assess the quality of collections and how they support research
  - E-resources value initiative
  - Assessments requested by the campus for new programs
    - Bioethics
    - Islamic Studies
    - Science Collections at Emory
    - MDP – Master’s in Development Studies
    - Biomedical Engineering (with Georgia Tech)
    - Assessment of our print vs. e expenditures
what we do:

- **Partner with other Emory libraries, and with libraries in the region and the nation to build distinctive collections**
  - Collaboration with HSCL on Life Sciences
  - Collaboration with Pitt’s, Law, and Oxford
  - Collaboration with Georgia Tech

- **Market new acquisitions and collection services to our users**
  - Subject Liaisons: contact with programs, LibGuides
  - Critical need: new acquisitions list
products

- Collection
  1. Consistently high satisfaction ratings for the last 5 years
  2. ARL ranking for expenditures

- Library Materials Budget
  1. Allocation budget to library selectors
  2. Monitor the budget
  3. Budget reports for management
Assessments
1. 2007 Overall collection assessment
2. Series of assessments (see above)

Policy
1. Library policy
2. Subject polices
3. Moving beyond Paper
Collection Management Team
1. Chuck Spornick, team leader
2. Kim Collins
3. Chris Palazzolo
4. Susan Bailey

Subject Teams and subject liaisons
1. Sciences
2. Social Sciences
3. Area Studies
4. Humanities
CMTAG
(Collection Management Team Advisory Group) - responsible for managing e-resource funds. Chris Palazzolo, chair voting members are subject team leaders (Kristan Chilcoat, Kim Collins, Chris Palazzolo, Chuck Spornick), David Vidor, Susan Kellett Gue, Susan Pinckard, and Heather Williams

Charge

• review requests for new database and e-collections
• sets priorities (with Content Division staff) for processing
• sets priorities for cataloging large collections
• manages a budget of approximately $500K (for the last 3 years $1M)
**Project Teams**

- Serials Review for cancellation – cross library
- Database Review for cancellation – cross library
- Storage Scenarios for administration decision
- Moving Beyond Paper (on-going) – cross library
- Stacks Tower Review Group (on-going) – cross divisional
- Metrics Bunch – group that conducted the 2007 collection assessment and created subject collection policies
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE OUTCOME STATEMENT:

To improve our users’ access to the content they need in the format they want.

Collections are a critical service to the students and faculty of Emory University. The success of our faculty and students in their research and teaching is directly affected by the quality of our library collections. To improve our users access to the content they need, we have committed to a series of initiatives to improve our collections and how they are discovered.
how: values & FY12 initiatives

① to build deeper electronic collections - by acquiring more serials backfiles, by acquiring new serials, and through launching a DDA pilot for users selection of e-books

② to provide better access to electronic collections - providing our users access to the content of the HathiTrust; providing users with e-readers for using library content in different formats on different platforms

③ to better manage our Emory collections - reviving the ElCoDe group; developing collection polices for Emory storage

④ to better manage our print collections - review of our stacks tower; review of our Storage collection; explore developing a GT/Emory facility

⑤ to better understand our users expectations regarding collections
FY13 Initiatives

**DDA – Demand Driven Acquisitions**

**Purpose:**
To implement and evaluate a pilot program (September 15, 2012) for user selection of current e-books through DiscoverE. $75K allocated for FY13.

**Challenges:**
On Target. Deduplication with purchased ebook packages.
FY13 Initiatives

**E-JOURNALS 2013**

**Purpose:**
To reduce the footprint our current Emory journal collection by at least 50%

**Challenges:**
- Effort in producing accurate lists for journals
- Community review of titles that should be considered for e-only
Purpose:
To analyze the cost and usage of our e-resources (ebooks, databases, and e-journals) to determine the value to Emory and better align our acquisitions with use

Challenge:
More robust data, vendor statistical limitations, single sign-on/Shibboleth
Issues

1. Storage for physical collections
2. Aleph implementation:
   a. Roll-over - need a successful rollover for managing both year end and new budgets
   b. GOBI backlog - impact on year end budget and FY13 budget
3. e-book policies and approaches
   a. business model not in place
   b. content models > DRM
   c. user acceptance
Issues

4. **Sustainable collection development**
   a. Cost of building and maintaining print and electronic collections
   b. Need for a sustained organizational discussion on the trade-offs and the cost
COLLECTIONS DATA FROM THE EMORY LIBRARIES SURVEY 2012 & ARL DATA

Prepared by Susan Bailey
EULS 2012--Importance of Print Resources by Discipline

Importance and Satisfaction taking top two categories on Likert Scale
EULS 2012--Importance of E-resources by Discipline

Importance and Satisfaction taking top two categories on Likert Scale
EULS 2012--Importance of E-resources by Discipline
## Emory’s Rank on Selected ARL Variables - 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volumes Held</td>
<td>62 / 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monographs Purchased</td>
<td>33 / 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Serials</td>
<td>45 / 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Materials Expenditures</td>
<td>18 / 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>25 / 115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gaps Between Emory and the ARL Top 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Investment Index Rank</th>
<th>Total Exp</th>
<th>Total Expenditures Gap</th>
<th>Mat Exp</th>
<th>Materials Expenditures Gap</th>
<th>Tot Prof+ Suppt Staff</th>
<th>Total Professional and Support Staff Gap</th>
<th>Prof Sal &amp; Wages</th>
<th>Salaries &amp; Wages Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34,720,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,977,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,498,891</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARL Statistics 2009