

---

---

# Creating a collection development policy with Collection Evaluation

— Elisabetta Morani - AMICAL 2016 —

---

---

# In the past - the problem

---

Several attempts to define a collection development policy at JCU had failed.

- ★ FACULTY-DRIVEN ACQUISITIONS
- ★ SMALL BUDGET (about 1000 acquisitions per year)
- ★ BROAD CURRICULUM (13 majors and over 700 courses per year)

**To develop a useful policy, we needed macro-analysis and top-level priorities, but the tools available to analyze the collection (subjects/classification numbers) were too specific**

# In the past - the workaround solution

---

**«We buy all what's needed for the University curriculum»**

The “collection development policy” was based on non-formal, experience-based knowledge of both collections and curriculum.

**BUT...**

# In the past: the limits

---

## Informal knowledge is hard to share

- Does not help you in saying “NO” when necessary
- Makes hard to involve faculty and even librarians
- Requires strictly centralized selection

**The more the University grew, the stronger the limits became**

# A consortial perspective?

---

In 2014, in light of improved participation in URBS, a local consortium, we received a request for a coordinated description of participants' collections with the [Conspectus](#) model.

The proposal, based on the IFLA [Guidelines](#) , included

- A [simplified template](#) (based on major divisions)
- Identification of common [collecting level indicators](#)

# A consortial perspective? Opportunities

---

- ★ Creating the policy in response to a consortial request (and not independently) would eliminate possible frictions with Faculty
- ★ Followed a professional, standard library practice
- ★ The task looked simple

# The basic policy

---

The Library decided to use [OCLC Collection Evaluation](#)

- Quantitative approach
- Limited to print books
- Looked at the major Conspectus divisions adding notes on current acquisitions practices related to geographic areas, historical periods, languages

<http://johncabot.libguides.com/coldevpolicy/subjects>

# Next developments

---

We described WHAT WE HAVE in our collections. We want now to

- Further detail the policy
- Match it to the curriculum to establish WHAT WE SHOULD HAVE (desired collecting levels)

Map the curriculum to Conspectus subjects (sample):

- Assign Conspectus subjects to the active courses and cluster them by importance
- Assign consistent collection codes to subjects

**Then, revise the original policy and check the gaps between collecting level codes (actual and desired)**



# Is there a “RESPOND collection”?

---

## MAYBE NOT

RESPOND LIBRARY COLLECTIONS can be analyzed as a comparison group

A report on RESPOND holdings for print books in English published from 2000 to 2016 and held by more than 3 RESPOND libraries shows only 1,252 titles.

# Documentation

---

## CONSPECTUS

- [IFLA GUIDELINES](#)
- [BRIEF HISTORY \(Bushing, 2001\)](#)
- [OCLC CONSPECTUS MAP \(by DIVISION\)](#)
- [OCLC CONSPECTUS MAP \(by CLASS NUMBERS\)](#)
- [COLLECTION CODES \(IFLA\)](#)
- [COLLECTION CODES \(WLN\)](#)

## OCLC COLLECTION EVALUATION

- [HELP GUIDE](#)
- [COLLECTION EVALUATION SUPPORT AND TRAINING HOME PAGE](#)
- [TUTORIALS](#)