



**Art Libraries Society of North America, 34th Annual Conference
Fairmont Banff Springs, Banff, Alberta, Canada, May 5-9, 2006**

**Collection Development Discussion Group
Sunday, May 7, 2006, 4:40 – 6:00 p.m.**

Moderator: Timothy Shipe

Recorder: Amanda Bowen

After introductions, the first suggested topic was encouraging the use of digital image resources. A collection development decision to purchase a resource such as ArtSTOR is only the beginning. There is the need to educate users about the resource, encourage its use and then substantial technical support can fall to the library staff if these efforts are effective. At the University of Georgia, the arrival of a new VR staff person with energy for digital teaching helped convert hesitant faculty. Georgia's Student Learning Center provides technical support for such resources. At Cornell, a task force was formed across four campus schools to promote public services for digital resources.

Collection assessment was the next topic. How does one determine the universe of what has been published? In some cases, vendors are willing to supply numbers for their universe of materials. The North American Title Count, which used to be produced by a division of ALA, is now being produced by a commercial firm called Library Dynamics.

Support for new academic programs was discussed. The library at the University of New Mexico is frank about its ability to support new programs and emphasizes that they can only truly claim to support most fields at the undergraduate level. The library staff at Virginia Commonwealth are also asked to comment on their ability to support new initiatives. All agreed that it is rare to receive start-up funds with new professors or programs; Queens College has had some success equating the arrival of new humanities faculty to support for new science initiatives; they also have claimed a portion of the overhead on large grant funds. All try to meet with prospective faculty members to gauge expectations and needs.

A question was asked about e-books and their utility for art libraries. Some librarians have had experience with NetLibrary but find few relevant titles included in their offerings. There are still limitations with downloading available titles. Furthermore, many students, particularly those in studio programs, still depend on shelf browsing of physical books. The consensus was that e-books, other than reference titles, have little utility for art programs so far.

Cataloging free web resources was the next topic. Practice varies widely; University of Wisconsin digital titles were mentioned as useful candidates. The conference session on online exhibition histories highlighted the increasing availability of museum publications online.

Cornell's new reference model, CRIO, was discussed. Collections, Reference, Instruction, and Outreach staff were merged. Others including the University of New Mexico and Emory

follow this model as well. It was generally agreed that reference helps inform the selection process and that this model seemed to work well.

The continued utility of collection development policies with scarce resources was the next topic. Policies need to be updated regularly. The University of New Mexico can no longer purchase materials "in case of future need" but is committed to support for coursework. Georgia is still committed to buying for potential future research. On the related matter of access vs. ownership, Wesleyan is dealing with the perception that increased Interlibrary Loan access allows resources to be redirected from collection budgets. On the contrary, demand remains high for key titles that ILL is ill-suited to supply. At Emory, Interlibrary Loan staff have access to funds to simply purchase new titles for the collection requested through ILL.

Finally there was little time remaining to discuss the notion that traditional funding structures in most academic institutions do not easily support interdisciplinary programs and research.