

70% and Climbing: E-Resources, Books, and Library Restructuring

Laura Newton Miller, David Sharp, and Wayne Jones

Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis Group in *Collection*

Management on 27/06/2014, available online:

www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01462679.2014.901200

70% and Climbing: E-Resources, Books, and Library Restructuring

Laura Newton Miller, David Sharp, and Wayne Jones

Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Within the past decade, academic libraries have seen a shift in purchasing from mostly print to mostly electronic. Although Carleton University Library (Ottawa, Canada) has experienced this shift, it had continued until recently to work within the confines of an organizational structure based on a print purchasing model. This paper will describe in detail the restructuring of the Library's collections and technical services departments to better meet growing electronic demands. Changes included dedicating more staff from print resources to e-resources, changing a librarian position to focus specifically on collections assessment, and shifting budgets to manage growing e-resources more efficiently. The authors will explore accomplishments and hurdles that needed to be overcome, cite lessons learned in making organizational shifts, and make some cautious predictions about future changes.

Keywords: *restructuring, reorganization, e-resources, collections assessment*

INTRODUCTION

Carleton University Library (Ottawa, Canada) underwent a major renovation during 2012-2013, with extensions added to the fourth and fifth floors at the back, a façade and new space added to the four above-ground floors at the front, and renovations and refitting of both public and staff spaces throughout the building. There's more individual seating and more group study space, a new Discovery Centre where faculty and undergraduate students can collaborate on projects, and a new home for archives and special collections.

The fact that adding more space and shelving for printed books and journals was not a focus of the renovation illustrates one of the key factors in the environment in which academic libraries operate. Overall, not only is the use of print collections declining, but academic libraries are tending to spend less and less of their collections budget on acquiring them. Print journals are often a last resort, acquired only if the publisher for some reason does not produce an electronic version.

The printed book is not dead, of course, but there are now viable alternatives not only to the books themselves (e-books) but also to the standard means by which they are acquired (patron-driven acquisition). The research has clearly and repeatedly shown that a high proportion of the books that academic libraries acquire never get used even once. Rick Lugg (2011) cites the famous study that focused on 36,982 books acquired by the University of Pittsburgh library in 1969 (Kent 1979). It concluded that “40% of these books did not circulate within the first six years on the shelves, and predicted that the chances of them circulating after that were a mere 1 in 50” (Lugg 2011). And a study by OhioLINK and OCLC in 2011 found that “80% of the circulation is driven by just 6% of the collection” (OhioLINK Collection Building Task Force 2013).

At the same time, the publication and use of electronic resources are rising dramatically. The latest survey by the Publishers Communication Group shows that large academic libraries spent almost 70% of their collections budgets on electronic resources in 2012 (the figure in 2005 was just over 30%) (Publishers Communication Group 2013, 13). E-resources are expensive and most are licensed annually, and so at a time when many academic libraries’ budgets are flat or even declining, there are tough but necessary decisions to make. The choice generally does not

reduce to a categorical “books or e-resources?” but often, fiscal year after fiscal year, libraries shave just a little off the book budget and add just a little more to the electronic resources budget.

Another key factor in the environment for academic libraries is that many are not administratively organized to acquire and manage e-resources properly. Plainly stated, there is just not enough staff devoted to e-resource work. A typical pattern is that the library has seen a dramatic reduction in the number of staff working in collections and technical services overall – often through retirement and attrition – at the same time as e-resources started to gain ascendancy, but for various reasons there has not been the necessary reorganization of staff in order to cope with these two changes. The result is that the staff and attention accorded to all aspects of e-resource work suffer while a larger portion of staff remain dedicated to long-standing practices in the acquisition, cataloging, and maintenance of books. The problem is compounded by the fact that the e-resources to which a typical academic library provides access are not only numerous but are also of course notoriously volatile. They tend to break down or move around from package to package, and there are many more of them that are candidates for such volatility.

At Carleton University Library we made some basic changes in the administrative structure in 2011 and 2012, mostly by combining serials and e-resources units and then converting a gifts librarian position into a collections assessment librarian. In 2013, the library embarked on a more comprehensive review of collections and technical services activity across the organization. The authors each played key roles in both initiatives. Laura Newton Miller is the collections assessment librarian, the first incumbent in that position at Carleton, and a member of the new review group. David Sharp is the head of the collections, e-resources, and serials department, also the first head of that combined department, and a member of the review

group. Wayne Jones is the associate university librarian who initiated the original changes and chairs the current review group. The 2011/2012 changes were accomplished mostly through discussions the AUL had with the department heads, but the 2013 changes are being reviewed more formally and collaboratively with the participation of an ad hoc group with representative membership (librarians, supervisors, and support staff) across the affected departments. This article details what has been accomplished so far, discusses our current activity and plans, and makes some cautious predictions for the future.

LITERATURE REVIEW

“Collection development is not what it once was.” (Nabe 2010, 3). Electronic resource growth is changing how libraries function. Kichuk (2010) described and analyzed electronic resource growth at the University of Saskatchewan library over a twelve-year time period (1996/97-2007/08). The case study revealed that growth in various e-resource types (bibliographic, fulltext, and reference) doubled within the last four years of the time period, with approximately 100 resources being added annually. Although this is a single academic library experience, libraries across (at least) North America share a similar history of sustained rapid growth (Kichuk 2010). Longstanding workflow practices are not sustainable when working with a decrease in print and an increase in digital resources. “Traditional approaches to budget allocation, collection development policies, acquisition workflow and preservation honed over several decades will need to be realigned” (Horava 2010, 143). As more money is spent on electronic resources, libraries are rethinking just how many resources to devote to their print collections. “As academic libraries ... contemplate moving from a ‘just-in-case’ model to a ‘just-in-time’ model for collection management, it is useful to know the level of investment academic libraries are (or are not) continuing to make in print collections” (Stewart 2011, 356).

There is no shortage of articles written on reorganization of technical services. The reasons for reorganization are staffing and budget shortages (Wiles-Young, McNally, and Anemaet 1998; Dunham and Davis 2008; Wells 2004) and e-resource workload coordination to streamline practices, increase efficiency (Clendenning, Duggan, and Smith 2010; King, Metcalf, and Larkin 2007) and remove silos (Goldberg, Horvath, and Neagle 2001). Issues regarding communication, training, staff morale, and learning to do more with less are also common themes in reorganization literature (King, Metcalf, and Larkin 2007; Wells 2004).

There are some examples of reorganization specific to collection management. Fisher (2001) examined the literature regarding the organizational structure of acquisitions and collection development and found that most restructuring exercises resulted from the “arrival of a new director, personnel change (loss or gain) other than the director, introduction of new technology, participation in a network or consortia or trying to reduce the hierarchy within the library” (413). His findings from a survey of mostly academic libraries found that there was “no clear pattern of an optimal organizational structure to enhance acquisitions and collection development activities” (409).

Dollar, Gallagher, and Glover (2007) described the pressures on staff to deal with increasing electronic resources. The Technical Services Department changed names to become the Collection Development and Management Department, and the electronic resources librarian became associate director “to reflect its new emphasis on collections and managing electronic resources” (150). Courtney and Jenkins (1998) aimed to flatten organizational structures by having all librarians participate in collection development and by making collection development subject-based rather than department-based. The Coordinator of Collection Management then supervised a support team comprised of staff members who were previously part of the Book and

Periodical Acquisitions department. Years later Nabe (2010) describes how this collection development model is used by many Association of Research Libraries (ARL) institutions – one that encompasses one collection development librarian managing the overall collections budget and overseeing the collections-related work of liaisons (Johnson 2009).

In an effort to address structure and staffing issues, Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC) Library removed collection roles from liaison librarians in order to free up time for other responsibilities (e.g., instruction and outreach) and formed three collection development librarian positions to oversee the collection development of all areas of the library (sciences, social sciences, and arts and humanities). In other words, three positions were created to “replace the overburdened (and retiring) head of collection development” (Nabe 2010, 7). Although not without some issues, the change has created opportunities to tackle a workload of increasing electronic resources in the face of budget and staffing shortfalls. In contrast, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill Libraries recently merged collections, reference, and collection development, and now Research and Instructional Services librarians have collection development responsibilities. A team of librarians “representing multiple subjects ... manages each fund. As boundaries between funds disappeared, interdisciplinarity became easier to support” (Michalak 2012, 415).

There is relatively little in the literature regarding library reorganization and the role of collections assessment and gift processing. From informing our day-to-day work to demonstrating value both internally and externally, the need for more data-driven decision making within collection management has been well documented. With budgets that remain flat or have limited increases or decreases, usage is becoming a “key driver in decision making”

(Collins 2012, 22); Beals and Leshner state that “collecting usage data has become a necessity rather than an option” for libraries (Beals and Leshner 2010, 220).

Meanwhile, time and space pressures have put library gifts processing under scrutiny. Bishop, Smith, and Sugnet (2010) reveal that after determining the increasing staff time taken to accept a relatively small amount of resources from donors, plus the shortage of space for print material in general, the Colorado State University Library eliminated their general gift program and restricted gifts-in-kind to those materials supporting archives and special collections.

BUDGET AT CARLETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Prior to 2012, Carleton Library’s Collections and Gifts department and Technical Services department were typical in many ways, with an evolved structure that had its origins in an almost exclusively print-based world. Collections and Gifts was responsible for collection development, consortia e-resource management, and gifts, while cataloging, monographic acquisitions, and serials units all reported to the Head of Technical Services. The Electronic Resources Librarian, a position created in the early 2000s, had an improvised home base in both serials and cataloging, pragmatically reflecting the two main skill-sets of the person who occupied the position. The portion of the collections budget at Carleton allocated to e-resources has steadily increased over the years, from 16.5% in 1997/1998, to 54% in 2005/2006, and up to 70% (and climbing) in 2012/2013. At the same time, shelving space for print material continues to be static or arguably is even decreasing. The funding stipulation for the newly renovated part of the building was that any new space was to be for new services and student seating only. The actual amount of space for print materials continues to be defined by building code restrictions in the older parts of the Library, with additional pressures coming from an increasingly fully utilized on-campus storage facility.

Carleton University is a well-managed institution that weathered the financial downturn of 2007/2008 relatively well. The increase in the value of the Canadian dollar in relation to the US currency, coupled with only modest cuts to the collections budget, meant that Carleton's budget was stable for several of the past years. Although the Library collections budget is on the low end compared to similar-sized institutions in Canada, the university's stability meant that planning and spending the budget did not require major cuts. However, starting in 2012, some stronger financial headwinds were starting to be felt. First, there was a one percent base budget cut which was mostly mitigated by a corresponding one-time infusion to the fiscal budget. But, in the 2012/2013 fiscal year, the first real taste of financial distress to the collections budget in many years arrived: another one percent cut to the base budget, along with a more severe cut of \$400,000 to the fiscal budget. All told, the collections budget was reduced by almost \$500,000 in one year. On top of this, the five percent decline in the value of the Canadian dollar relative to the US dollar meant that we lost about five percent of our purchasing power for the many products we buy in US dollars. These events all necessitated large cuts; no part of the collections budget was left untouched, including monographs, serials, e-resources, special collections, and maps and government information.

Though not easy, the straightforward part of implementing the collections budget cut was slicing expenditures from the areas of a one-time nature, such as monographs. Once the new, lowered budget was allocated in these areas, it was a matter of spending within the limits. The larger challenge looming was tackling what needed to be cut from the subscription-based resources, particularly the e-resources.

THE REVISED GIFTS SECTION

The 2012 reorganization of collections and technical services at Carleton was a relatively minor one, as far as reorganizations go, but was significant enough to create an impactful change in four main areas of operations in Technical Services and in Collections and Gifts. Perhaps one of the most significant changes was an overhaul of the gifts policy and the conversion of the Gifts Librarian position into a Collections Assessment Librarian. In addition to the Gifts Librarian, there was one other full-time staff position in the support ranks who provided assistance with gifts. Much time and expense went into the evaluation of the donations and the issuance of tax receipts. The disposal of unwanted gifts was handled by communicating and coordinating with the Circle of Friends library association. Each year, one of the major activities of the Friends was the organization of a very large book sale, for which the major source of stock was the unwanted books received via Carleton University Library's Gifts department. The book sale was very popular with staff and students, and in its last year, 2012, raised \$2,000 for student bursaries and \$17,767 for the Library Endowment Fund. At the same time, however, it was labor intensive, requiring a fair amount of paid staff time and volunteer time, and also requiring space for housing and sorting the books destined for the sale. While \$17,767 in donation revenue is not insignificant, the amount of staff time devoted to the book sale reduced the benefit to the Library. Overall, the gifts process was still derived from a print-based milieu, while e-resources, a much larger part of the actual day-to-day operation, was left wanting in some areas, particularly assessment.

The first major change, then, was a revision and updating of the gifts policy by a small cross-departmental review group. The review group was chaired by the AUL for Collections, and had representation from each department with a stakeholder status in the gifts process. Although the incumbent Gifts Librarian was on long-term leave (and retired shortly thereafter),

the gifts support staff person joined the review group to serve as institutional memory. During this time, the Library also started working much more closely with the Advancement staff on campus, and one member of the Advancement team played a key role in helping to revise the gifts policy and procedures.¹

In the end, the revised policy was designed to do three main things: streamline the amount of print material coming in through gifts, by checking to see if we own it or want it *before* it comes to the Library; reduce the amount of staff time devoted to gifts, so that other priorities, especially e-resources, could benefit from newly allocated staff time; and increase the amount of cash (versus in-kind) gifting by partnering with Advancement and tapping into their professional role as fundraisers.

By partnering with Advancement, the Library has been able to shift its focus to the purchase of more e-resources. In 2012/2013, for instance, Advancement was able to raise \$108,000 through targeted campaigns for new e-resources. The Library supplies a wish list of e-resource products, such as an e-book package, for example, and Advancement builds a campaign around the product, soliciting donations from alumni, parents, the general public, and even corporate donors. The result is a welcome increase in donation revenue for the Library, with reduced staff costs because the fundraising process is integrated into another campus partner's workflow.

One of the effects of the revised gifts policy was to reduce the amount of staff time needed to handle print donations, for which there are two main reasons. First, the new policy asked that potential donors submit a list before the Library would agree to accept the material.

¹ Advancement is the office which works with alumni and other potential donors to encourage and steward financial and in-kind giving to the University. In the case of the Library, new gifts are generally in the form of money for the purchase or licensing of collections, or actual donations of titles and collections both large and small which are assessed and added to the Library's holdings.

Prior to 2012, Carleton accepted almost all donations of print material offered to the Library, with no list to screen offers. The purpose of asking for a list was to check our current holdings against what was offered, so that we might accept only what we truly wished to add to the collection, and did not need to devote staff time to the disposing of unwanted material. What we kept, increasingly, was material that was special or unique in nature, highly used, or that filled a gap in the teaching and research agenda of the university.

A second aspect of the revised policy was that the Library would issue a tax receipt only for gifts of more than \$200 in value. The idea behind the change was not only to reduce the amount of paperwork, and thus professional staff time, needed to handle tax receipts, but also to encourage quality over quantity in gift-giving. The combination of fewer donations and less time spent on paperwork meant that we could change staffing in the gifts area, from one professional librarian and one support staff worker to just one support staff worker who became the gifts coordinator. Prior to 2012, the gifts support staff worker reported directly to the Gifts Librarian. Now, the Gifts Coordinator reports directly to the Head of Collections, E-Resources, and Serials.

CHANGES IN E-COLLECTION ASSESSMENT

The creation of a Collections Assessment Librarian position was the direct result of the changes made to the gifts unit. By reducing a librarian position in gifts, the Library was able to create a much-needed position in collections assessment. As noted, 70% of the acquisitions budget is spent on e-resources, but despite that proportion, there had been relatively little detailed oversight of the spending. Again, this had much to do with the fact that Collections was working within an outdated paradigm, with most of the assessment activities based on a print acquisitions model. At Carleton, as at many other academic libraries, the purchase of print resources, books

in particular, is coordinated by public service subject liaisons. Carleton's Reference Services staff, over time, develops a deep expertise in their subject areas, and each uses traditional collection development practices in deciding how to purchase monographs from an allocated budget for their area. They are experienced in collections assessment and make informed choices in their niche areas. Yet, the budget for print monographs continues to decrease. In the past five years, the print monograph budget has declined by 32%, from \$922,800 in 2009 to \$630,000 today. Similarly, the print serials budget has also declined steeply: 38% over five years. The titles we do retain in print are usually print-only subscriptions or a print-plus-online-only option.

One consequence of Carleton Library's budget provenance is that there is a large oversight assessment structure on the print side of the ledger, with a relatively generous supply of Reference Services staff engaged in decision-making and assessment of print resources (and individual e-book purchases), but comparatively little assessment on the e-resource side even as the budget for e-resources grew. One of the main reasons for this was how the budget was structured. Reference Services staff are responsible for spending within their allocated amounts for their subjects, but for monographs only. It is the purview of the Head of Collections, E-Resources, and Serials to ensure that spending in e-resources, serials, and e-book packages is monitored and kept under control. Of course, Reference Services has a strong voice in what is collected in e-resources, but the overall onus on balancing the budget and ensuring that money is well spent resides with the Head of Collections.

The conversion of the Gifts Librarian position to a Collections Assessment Librarian was one step in rebalancing the equilibrium between print monographs and e-resources. The Collections Assessment Librarian position's day-to-day work is rooted in the thorough

evaluation of e-resources as they come up for renewal. Because of the severity of the collections budget cut in 2012/2013, the incumbent's first year in the position has involved retrieving and analyzing usage statistics, and evaluating any potential overlap between the product up for renewal and other subscribed products. Particular attention is paid to products that have very low usage. We do not use a strict methodology to define low use, but instead use a common-sense approach informed by experience and good judgment. For instance, low usage could be an indicator of a technical problem, or of a resource in need of more attention through marketing, or reflective of a niche area where only a small number of people would be using the resource. Although the Collections Assessment Librarian does not rely exclusively on quantitative measures and will seek advice from Reference Services staff when appropriate to determine why an item might not be well used, items used fewer than 20 times a year are a typical benchmark for cancellation. Products that have a cost per use of greater than \$30 per download are also analyzed closely. In the context where most articles through interlibrary loan are obtained for \$5 per article, we look closely at justifying a high-cost-per-use item. Sometimes, the cost is justified, since a product may be both high use and high cost per use, and cancelling it would increase the workload of ILL significantly. The Collections Assessment Librarian also plays a role in realigning the overall budget and its constituent parts, for example by formulating and revising an algorithm that allocates the amount of money which goes to each subject area for monographs, and amalgamating the amount we spend in the various subject areas, across all types of expenditures (e-resources, serials, monographs).

REBALANCING THE STAFF COMPLEMENT

Two other major changes occurred in the 2012 reorganization. There was a rebalancing of existing Technical Services staff to add further support to the collections work. Prior to 2012,

Collections consisted of three full-time staff: the Head of Collections, the Gifts Librarian, and the gifts support staff worker. The Head of Technical Services oversaw a more robust staff of close to 25 full-time staff members in cataloging, acquisitions, e-resources, and serials. To address workload imbalances on both sides, the 2012 reorganization merged serials and e-resources with Collections to form a new department called Collections, E-Resources, and Serials (CES). The former Technical Services department was a fusion of the three remaining functions of print and e-book acquisitions, cataloging, and end processing. This new department is now called Acquisitions and Cataloguing (ACQCAT). For the former Head of Technical Services, the rebalancing meant a more fair division of management and human resource responsibilities. By bundling serials and e-resources with collections, a critical mass of staff, knowledgeable and competent in e-resources, was formed to create the synergies needed to tackle the greater role of e-resources in the Library. Although informally these staff members have always communicated and worked closely together, the combination formalized the relationship between them. Although the Head of the newly formed CES department now had more management responsibilities with a corresponding increase in staff who directly reported to the position (from two staff to eight), the restructuring also meant that more support was available for the work of collections. No longer did the Head of Collections have to request help formally from another department head for serials or e-resource work. Now those staff members were reporting directly to the person who most needed their expertise.

It is true that while the restructuring did not necessarily modify the nature of collection development at Carleton University, what it did allow was a formalized integration of the existing decision-making processes with the actual line work being carried out in the technical services areas. Prior to the reorganization, the Head of Collections worked in an office that was

outside and independent of the main room for technical services. Although this was not a problem per se, one net positive of the reorganization was that the new Head of Collections is now physically and functionally located within technical services. The advantage is that collection development and decision-making is further grounded in the day-to-day routines of the staff who report to the Head of Collections.

One example of bottom-up change can be seen in how monograph funding is administered, moving away from a model that made perfect sense conceptually but in practice had some drawbacks, to one that resulted in more money being spent more evenly throughout the fiscal year with less staff intervention. The subject liaisons in the Reference Services department are each responsible for purchasing monographs to support the academic departments. Prior to the reorganization, and in reflection of the liaison model, the budget for monographs had been divided into 117 individual fund codes. For most subject areas, there was one fund code for firm orders, and a separate one for monographs that came as part of the approval plan. The model was one that worked, but had a few drawbacks. At the beginning of the fiscal year, it necessitated a lot of time inputting the initial allocations into the acquisitions module. It involved a lot of transferring money between firm order codes and approval codes, as the subject specialists ran dry in firm order money but wanted to tap into extra approval money that was in jeopardy of not being spent. Lastly, the multiple fund divisions had the unintended but deleterious effect of leaving the overall book budget underspent every year. Each fund tended to be slightly underspent as year-end approached, with a bit of “rainy day” money left in case of last-minute requests. Taken as a whole, though, all that individual money left unspent added up to a noticeable under-expenditure in the monograph budget. Attempts were made to spend out

these reserves at times, but as is the danger of year-end spending, not everything ordered arrives in the fiscal year and can leave large encumbrances for the next fiscal year.

Consequently, changes were made to the number of fund codes that were allocated to monographs. Instead of 117 codes, it was decided to allocate money at the faculty level; for Carleton, that means five allocations (Arts and Social Sciences, Business, Engineering and Design, Public Affairs, and Science). A few other codes also remained, for Carleton's table of contents enrichment service, a PDA pilot, and for general expenditures such as reserves and replacements. In all, the number of fund codes with allocations devoted to monographs went from 117 to seven. We still use codes to track expenditures down to the departmental level, for assessment purposes. But the change in allocating money has made for much more efficient collection development processes.

THE FINE LINE BETWEEN SERIALS AND ACQUISITIONS

The last major change that came out of the 2012 reorganization was the fine-tuning of e-resource purchase responsibilities between the serials and acquisitions units. The organizational difference between the two units is again rooted historically in a print-based world. Acquisitions evolved around the purchasing of print monographs, standing orders, and other one-time purchases; serials dealt with subscription-based material. With the introduction of e-versions of serials and books, the model continued to the best of its ability. Individual e-books continued to be purchased by Acquisitions, and e-journals continued to be purchased by Serials. Things started to get more complicated, though, with the introduction of package collections. Over time, Serials gained more experience handling the packaged e-resource collections, and indeed handled the uploading of e-resource entitlements into the integrated library system (Millennium). Acquisitions handled e-book packages because of the historical distinction between monographs

and serials and their separation as sub-units. Since an e-book package was monographic in nature, it was part of the acquisition unit's oeuvre. But the nature of the work does not necessarily fit the historical paradigm. What historically has been a contradistinction between administering the one-time purchase of books and subscription resources is, if not obsolete, at least complicated by the advent of new purchasing models for all resources, whether they be an e-resource or print material. The 2012 reorganization did not resolve the tension between these two dynamics – for instance, amalgamating all e-resource purchasing and processing together into one, whether monographic or continuing. But it was decided to move the role of handling e-book packages over to the e-resources and serials department (CES) to better consolidate the synergies that exist between continuing e-resources and static e-book packages (which, as we know, are hardly static).

Staffing the two departments has been a challenge since 2012 as well. Not only has the collections budget been strained, but so has the staffing budget. Retirements and personal leaves are not automatically re-staffed, and the collections and technical services areas have been fortunate that retirements and extended leaves have occurred mostly in areas that could absorb the workload, thanks to the initial restructuring made in 2012. Nonetheless, future organizational reviews will need to look closely at cross-training and staff flexibility. Though the 2012 reorganization was a step in the right direction, perhaps one of its obstacles was that it was not designed to examine and evaluate the historical underpinnings of how collections, gifts, and technical services evolved. It was a worthwhile process which prioritized e-resources, but it did not engage the departments' *raison d'être*, whose foundation and divisions were poured from a print-based experience. Just as with any improvement, it can be functionally and operationally

successful, but in the end one still has to decide if it is better to start anew and build from the ground up.

NEXT STEPS

In the summer of 2013, the AUL for Collections at Carleton formed another review group of collections and technical services to initiate a broader restructuring. This time, the reorganization process is inductive, starting with a review of all job descriptions for accuracy and completeness, supplemented by an accounting of what is actually being done by staff members on the ground, which in many cases is not captured in official job descriptions. The goal is not to take chunks of existing job duties and move them between statically defined departments, but to assess and evaluate the overlap and uniqueness between departments. The 2013 reorganization is looking closely at how the broadened permeation of e-resources across all departments might be classified and organized so that, from the ground up, a newly reborn collections and technical services area can thrive and adapt to the new realities of emphasizing e-resource acquisition.

The reorganization process is different, too, in that it is extra-departmental in scope. The original reorganization of 2012 was limited to the traditional technical services unit; the 2013 review group is looking at technical services functions throughout the Library, including harmonizing policies with Archives and Research Collections (ARC) as well as in the Maps, Data, and Government Information Centre (MADGIC). With staff changeover, and new metadata standards coming in (such as RDA), the 2013 review will see if greater symmetry and synergies are appropriate. One of the goals of the reorganization will be to prioritize and reflect the strategic goals of the Library as a whole. Moving forward, the physical library as a collection is about accessing e-resources and highly used print material and special collections.

The revision of the gifts policy in 2012, along with the conversion of the gifts librarian into an assessment position, projects and reflects back on the larger space imprint by emphasizing the retention of highly used material – material with a special value and uniqueness. Cross-training, flexibility, and ease of movement of information and expertise should be emphasized over specialization and compartmentalization.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Though some of the detailed lessons from the reorganization of collections and technical services at Carleton might be institution-specific, there are other aspects which are broadly applicable. The main lesson is that the ascendancy of the electronic resources collections in any library (especially an academic library) necessitates a whole range of changes in the collections work, such as staffing, policies, budgets, and strategic planning. The typical disjuncture is that while e-resources now account for more than 70% of the collections budget, the staffing and other factors have not kept pace with the change. Many libraries have an early-21st-century budget but a staffing model in collections and technical services dating from the 1990s. As difficult as it might be for many reasons, change is absolutely essential if the e-resources are going to be acquired and managed properly so that they are available for faculty and students.

Staffing in general should be an area of focus and concern, but in particular some degree of collections assessment is no longer a luxury in these circumstances. For some libraries it will mean dedicating a librarian to the full-time responsibility of measuring e-usage and making those statistics available so that they can inform decision-making around subscriptions and cancellations. For other libraries the facts of a constrained staffing budget may not permit this, but any academic library that acquires e-resources at the typical current rate without the benefit

of evidence-based assessment is likely going to have difficulty rationalizing the budget and may make some poor decisions about cutting or not cutting one resource or another.

A broad review of all collections and technical services activity with an eye to substantial reorganization will be necessary in many libraries. The extent of this will vary from institution to institution, but if there has been virtually no major change for the past 10 to 15 years, or mere tinkering as the institution dealt with budget cuts by attrition of the staff, then it is very likely that a major overhaul is in order.

What are some of the key factors we see in the environment for Carleton and for academic libraries generally, as we review operations? The main and most obvious factor is that the proportion of funds and staff devoted to e-resources is bound to increase even more; the trend is clear and fairly dramatic. Non-electronic resources are still important to the Library and to students and faculty who use those resources in teaching, learning, and research. However, the amount allocated to electronic from the collections budget will likely become so much that the amount for other materials will be relatively insignificant for planning purposes – perhaps even irrelevant in financial terms.

The means of accessing e-books, and the various pricing and publishing models which currently clutter the market, will eventually settle down to a few standards and models. In fact, in the future e-book access issues will *have* to become more standardized so that end-users will have a consistent experience whenever they access an e-book. Variables such as number of simultaneous users, “save-ability” on mobile devices, vendor or publisher platforms, in-book navigation, and embargos need at some point to become less *variable* so that overall e-books can and will become a much more standard product, used and accepted by even more users.

Most standard cataloging (of print monographs) will be done by the vendors by means of shelf-ready arrangements with libraries. In-house catalogers will be those who are specialists, working on rare books, non-English-language materials, or specialty formats such as music scores and CDs.

CONCLUSION

The changes brought about in the 2012 reorganization of collections and technical services at Carleton University Library were beneficial, with four main areas of focus and results. There was a rationalization and overhaul of the policies and practices around the acceptance of gifts, so that materials accepted were wanted and much less staff time was spent in post-acceptance processing. We formalized a new gifts policy and established a closer partnership with our Advancement office so that campaigns for donations could be targeted at materials (generally e-resources) that were highly desired but that we could not afford to purchase otherwise.

Part of the revamping of gifts also included an emphasis on collections assessment. The Gifts Librarian position was converted to a Collections Assessment Librarian, and we now pay much more attention to all aspects of e-resources – low-use and high-cost-per-use materials especially. This new position has evolved over the year so that the incumbent also plays a key role in budget decisions generally.

The other two major changes coming out of the 2012 reorganization were a rebalancing of the staff in the two departments – partly to start to even out the numbers in Collections and in Technical Services, but also to put the responsibility for e-resources and serials into the one department – and a fine-tuning of responsibilities between the serials and acquisitions units, at least for e-resource purchases.

All these changes are in place and a review group is now examining operations more extensively and comprehensively, with a view to making administrative, policy, and procedural changes that will position us even better for dealing with e-resources and other materials, especially as both collections and staffing budgets are flat at best. It is difficult to specify details, as we are right in the midst of discussion and consultation.

And, finally, collections and technical services staffs will not disappear. The trend is to consolidate staff resources to make more efficient use of expertise across all areas of collection development. With its new review group looking at collections and technical services across the Library, and engaging the expertise and experience of staff at all levels, Carleton plans to establish a renewed infrastructure to manage e-resources even better, and to position itself for the inevitable changes to come in all aspects of our work.

As discussed above, there are some important lessons in Carleton's experience that may benefit other academic libraries, regarding both what has been accomplished already and considerations for the future. The main lesson is to recognize the primacy of electronic resources, which consume the bulk of the collections budget and are in the highest demand among users, and then to initiate and embrace the changes necessary in order to properly support them. Changes in staffing will likely be essential, both in the specifics of which duties require more staff, such as assessment and e-resource management, and broadly concerning the need to administratively reorganize collections and technical services activities overall.

REFERENCES

- Beals, Nancy and Marcella Leshner. 2010. "Managing Electronic Resource Statistics." *Serials Librarian* 58 (1-4): 219-223.
- Bishop, Janet, Patricia A. Smith, and Chris Sugnet. 2010. "Refocusing a Gift Program in an Academic Library." *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* 34 (4): 115-122.
- Clendenning, Lynda Fuller, Lori Duggan, and Kelly Smith. 2010. "Navigating a Course for Serials Staffing into the New Millennium." *Serials Librarian* 58 (1-4): 224-231.
- Collins, Tim. 2012. "The Current Budget Environment and Its Impact on Libraries, Publishers and Vendors." *Journal of Library Administration* 52 (1): 18-35.
- Courtney, Nancy and Fred W. Jenkins. 1998. "Reorganizing Collection Development and Acquisitions in a Medium-Sized Academic Library." *Library Acquisitions* 22 (3): 287-293.
- Dollar, Daniel M., John Gallagher, and Janis Glover. 2007. "Realizing What's Essential: A Case Study on Integrating Electronic Journal Management into a Print-Centric Technical Services Department." *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 95 (2): 147-155.
- Dunham, Barbara S. and Trisha L. Davis. 2008. "Literature of Acquisitions in Review, 1996-2003." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 52 (4): 238-253.
- Fisher, William, 2001. "Impact of organizational structure on acquisitions and collection development." *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* 25: 409-419.
- Goldberg, Tyler Miller, David Horvath, and Eric Neagle. 2001. "Serials Management: Integration and Enhancement through Reorganization." *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services* 25 (4): 401-407.

Horava, Tony. 2010. "Challenges and Possibilities for Collection Management in a Digital Age."

Library Resources & Technical Services 54 (3): 142-152.

Johnson, Peggy. 2009. *Fundamentals of Collection Development and Management*. 2nd ed.

Chicago: American Library Association.

Kent, Allen. 1979. *Use of Library Materials: The University of Pittsburgh Study*. New York: M.

Dekker.

Kichuk, Diana. 2010. "Electronic Collection Growth: An Academic Library Case Study."

Collection Building 29 (2): 55-64.

King, Serenity, Mona Metcalf, and Molly Larkin. 2007. "Tackling the Reorganization Chart."

Serials Librarian 52 (3): 311-316.

Lugg, Rick. "Beyond the Kent Study." *Sample & Hold: Rick Lugg's Blog*, accessed 10/13, 2013,

<http://sampleandhold-r2.blogspot.ca/2011/09/beyond-kent-study.html>.

Michalak, Sarah C. 2012. "This Changes Everything: Transforming the Academic Library."

Journal of Library Administration 52 (5): 411-423.

Nabe, Jonathan. 2010. "What's Next for Collection Management and Managers?" *Collection*

Management 36 (1): 3-16.

OhioLINK Collection Building Task Force. "OhioLINK-OCLC Collection and Circulation

Analysis Project 2011." OhioLINK-OCLC Collection and Circulation Analysis Project

2011. OCLC Research, accessed 09/10, 2013,

<http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2011/2011-06r.html?urlm=161044>.

Publishers Communication Group. 2013. *Library Budget Predictions for 2013*. Boston, MA:

Publishers Communication Group.

- Stewart, Christopher. 2011. "METRICS: The Next Chapter: Measuring the Pace of Change for Print Monograph Collections." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 37 (4): 355-357.
- Wells, Kathleen L. 2004. "Hard Times in Technical Services: How Do Academic Libraries Manage? A Survey." *Technical Services Quarterly* 21 (4): 17-30.
- Wiles-Young, Sharon, McNally, Judy and Anemaet, Jos. 1998. "Merger, Reorganization and Technology Meet Technical Services." *Serials Librarian* 34 (3-4): 379-384.