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I want to begin in the days of yesteryear when we actually thought that our mission in life was to build collections for all time. Do you remember the time when directors of libraries actually boasted about volume counts? As in, “We are the seventh biggest library in the ARL.” Or, “We now have 3,245,971 volumes in our libraries.” Do you hear much of that anymore? Maybe when the library passes a threshold, like its three millionth volume, or its five millionth volume. More often you hear the sentiment: “I just wish that we could outlaw volume counts.” I have heard directors of small libraries say this, and I have heard collection development librarians at major libraries say the same thing. Why? Because we no longer see ourselves as building lasting collections. Instead we want credit for our new document delivery initiatives, and we certainly want credit for our fulltext electronic journals online.

I have named the good old days after the movie, Field of Dreams. In the movie, the hero, relying on the mantra, “Build it, and they will come,” builds a baseball field in the middle of Iowa. When I saw the movie, the audience was moved to tears of rapture, followed by loud sniffing, when this baseball field in the middle of nowhere magically fills with people at the end of the movie. I was not so moved, but, then, I had not yet thought about the analogy with library collections. If I had, I would have been sobbing for joy along with my fellow moviegoers.

“Build it, and they will come.” In a world like that, what did collection development librarians think about? They thought about collection evaluation, and they developed a tool called the ARL/RLG Conspectus so that every library could evaluate any of thousands of subject areas on their scale from one to five, minimal to comprehensive. They thought about balance; they tried to collect materials from the political left and the political right so that their readers could see all sides. They thought a lot about approval plans; how to obtain easily the books that they wanted both from the United States and from around the world.

My personal favorite from the old days was the topic of fund allocation; it engaged the best minds in collection development, and in its heyday we saw thousands of crazy allocation formulas flying around. It no longer seems to be a very popular topic. Finding the best allocation formula is what we do now.
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The deals that we are getting with the new technology are indeed too good to refuse.

If you are marooned somewhere without a consortium, find one.

Muse is an electronic database of Johns Hopkins University Press journals. One might question the value of having all of the Johns Hopkins journals together in one place, but it is hard to fault their electronic interface. It is a pleasure to work with.

Project Muse offers a discount on the paper journals for libraries purchasing electronic access. For us, the consortial discount was so good that we would pay less for the paper and electronic together than we were paying for the paper alone. Pay less; get more. This was a true no-brainer; it was the deal we couldn’t refuse. Unfortunately, Johns Hopkins University Press now makes libraries choose either the paper discount OR the consortial discount.

We got together with another group of libraries to purchase Academic Press’s product called IDEAL. IDEAL is perhaps typical of many consortial offers today. It is an extremely good deal for the smaller library involved in it, and more like a normal purchase for the larger library. Basically, every library in the consortium ends up with the same electronic product, but they pay according to how many journals they were subscribing to at the start. In our consortium, we ended up with 124 journals. Some libraries had only been subscribing to two or three of them, and they were paying something like $500 for journals that are worth more like $100,000. This is an offer that they cannot refuse.

IDEAL has a very complicated system of discounts and add-on costs, but basically for us we doubled our list of Academic Press titles for a very small additional cost. And if we canceled enough of our print titles we actually could save money over our old total cost. Even though we are one of the larger libraries in our consortium, I thought that we had a tremendous deal, and I anxiously awaited the arrival of the product. Our access arrived, but we had not thought of everything. Even the small libraries with the fantastic deals complained about how slow the response on the Internet is. I am sure that Academic will fix the response rate soon.

I am supposed to tell you what you need to know today, and you are probably afraid that I am going to advise you to watch Field of Dreams. Return to the past. Well, not exactly.

The deals that we are getting with the new technology are indeed too good to refuse. I am not being ironic. If you are marooned somewhere without a consortium, find one. If you are already in a consortium, push it to find the best products and negotiate the best prices. The electronic world has perils indeed, and I could tell you about many more of them. But its rewards are greater than its perils, and we must take advantage of them.

My second piece of advice is: take advantage of the past. Despite predictions, paper seems to be in no hurry to leave us. Walt Crawford and Michael Gorman have demonstrated convincingly that regardless of improvements in computer displays, you will never be able to read on a computer the way you can read a book. And, they note, if you printed out everything that circulated from the UCLA Library in a year, the cost of the paper alone would exceed the annual cost of all the salaries and all of the resources at the UCLA library.

So do not throw away those old studies of collection evaluation and fund allocation. And do not forget the old commitment to build balanced collections and fight censorship. The electronic world is not supplanting the paper world; it is making it better.
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