The ACRL LES Collections Discussion Group met at ALA Annual 2017 for an hour-long discussion, which drew 8 attendees. The discussion was moderated by Robin Kear and Chris Ruotolo, co-chairs of the Collections Discussion Group. Mark Dahlquist took comprehensive notes, which are condensed below.

The following topics were discussed:

* How are you dealing with demand-drive acquisition (DDA) models?

* Do you follow/update a collection development policy?

**Summary of discussion:** DDA acquisitions are working well; however there may be a long-term danger that some materials may go uncollected, and we should consider the long term implications of DDA. It can be difficult to anticipate future interest in materials. Faculty appreciate the convenience of DDA, but many retain a strong desire for comprehensive acquisition. There is emotional labor in reassuring faculty that the collection is being carefully developed, and helping them to feel confident in their own work. Faculty may not always have detailed information about how materials are selected.

Library consortia are important resource for collection development, and many libraries are trying to coordinate more with other schools. However, it can be difficult to make the case to faculty to that we don’t need to acquire books held at consortium institutions. Lending in consortia is not evenly distributed.

Administrators often see ebooks as a space solution, but many faculty and some students strongly prefer print. Some students do appreciate having ebooks, because they can access them late at night and search them. Ebooks can be a good option for materials that tend to be stolen. Preservations issues may be important in acquisitions; ebooks may become inaccessible (although print doesn’t last forever either, especially when frequently used). The inability to lend ebooks to consortia members continues to present a challenge. Patrons expectations for library collections are conditioned by their experiences in public libraries, and they are surprised that academic libraries can’t lend ebooks like public libraries do.

The difficulty of providing access streaming and other digital media (such as Netflix) remains a concern. Some patrons have even considered “hacking” Netflix to download materials. Some video materials cannot readily be accessed through library channels. In some cases it might make sense to ask students to subscribe to resources individually, but it is troubling to see libraries excluded from these relationships.
Shelf browsing remains important in the humanities, although patrons are doing less of it. Virtual browsing can be useful, despite some resistance.

* How does your library approach the purchase of “big ticket” items, such as resources from Elsevier, or Nineteenth century newspaper databases? Is there an alternative to a system in which the needs of the “squeaky wheel” are funded?

Summary of discussion: The acquisition of “big ticket” items can be mysterious -- it involves end-of-the-year funds that are difficult to predict, and pricing is complicated by the practice of vendors negotiating prices for bundles of products at the same time. This model produces difficulties in communicating with faculty. Other difficulties can result when vendors communicate with faculty directly; fortunately, this is uncommon. It is sometimes possible to find funding for expensive resources by finding areas in which there is money to be saved.

Faculty supporters are important advocates for new resources. Getting faculty to explain their instructional needs for the requested materials can be a key factor in winning approval for expensive items.