COLLECTION EVALUATION FOR THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIES: PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Trevor Zweck

In the past decade, there has been a growing emphasis on the theoretical aspects of collection development in Australian and New Zealand theological libraries, with nearly all of the major libraries and a significant number of smaller libraries having produced written collection development policies. However, little of this activity appears to have been based on serious collection evaluation. While the reasons for this lack are not difficult to understand, the objects of this article are to take away some of the mystique surrounding collection evaluation and to encourage librarians to undertake an evaluation project that will provide them with a scientific basis for collection management and for co-operative collection development. It does so by demonstrating how such a project might be carried out in a library which is sufficiently typical of theological libraries in Australia and New Zealand as to serve as an illustration and for the hypothetical project to provide some kind of model for possible emulation. While specific methods are recommended, the discussion embraces all the generally accepted methods, with sufficient bibliographic references to provide access to basic information on them.

In making the following proposals, some of the harsher realities of life in theological libraries in Australia and New Zealand have been taken into consideration. Chief among them is the fact that such libraries do not have high staffing levels and, therefore, do not have much time to spend on any but the most pressing everyday demands of providing an adequate library service. Another is that the librarians who serve such libraries, even if they have had a professional library education, are not likely to have had much training in collection evaluation. For such reasons, the methods proposed need to be reasonably straightforward and quick and easy to implement.

Lohe Memorial Library

The Lohe Memorial Library serves the three schools of Luther Campus, North Adelaide, S.A.: Luther Seminary (for the training of clergy), Lutheran Teachers College (for the theological training of church teachers), and Lutheran School of Theology (for the theological education of lay people). The three schools currently have 160 internal and 260 external students, pursuing the following programs: Bachelor of Theology, Bachelor of Arts in Theology, Graduate Diploma of Theology in Education, Graduate Diploma in Ministry, Master of Education and Master of Theology. The masters programs are a matter of major concern to the library, because, although it has been possible to satisfy accrediting committees that there are adequate resources for postgraduate study, there has always been a lingering doubt about the assumptions involved.

It has been noted elsewhere (Zweck, 1988, p. 90) that the general lack of involvement by universities in theological education challenges all theological libraries to take on something of the role of a research library. This is a policy which the Lohe Memorial Library has been pursuing, with limited resources, for the past fifteen years. During this time, the monograph collection has grown from 23,000 volumes to 79,000, supplemented by 10,000 volumes of periodicals and 450 current serials subscriptions. Permanent staff numbering 3.4 (EFT), currently supplemented by 2.0 (EFT) for retrospective conversion purposes, serve a clientele represented by nearly 1000 registered borrowers (including a large number of students of other Adelaide colleges of theology). While the vast majority of users are undergraduate students, there are significant, and increasing, numbers of postgraduate students and researchers, whose needs must be anticipated and met. G. Edward Evans has suggested that acquisitions must be based on clear and foreseeable patron need, the context of his remark indicating that he is talking about needs that will surface within a year (Evans, 1970, p. 298), but the research collection must endeavour to provide for potential needs which may not show up for many years. While the Lohe Memorial Library currently has a collection development policy, it is not based on rigorous collection evaluation. The proposed evaluation is intended to serve as a basis for filling this need, while also giving a clearer picture of the capacity of the library to serve the growing needs with which it is confronted, especially in the area of postgraduate research.

Objectives

The design of the project follows the seven steps suggested by Gorman and Kennedy (1992, p. 132-137, 162) and Lockett (1989, p. 3), the first of which is to set objectives. The first main objective is suggested by McLachlan and Trahn's assertion that '... a sound collection development policy statement requires a detailed assessment of the present state of the collection (McLachlan and Trahn, 1982, p. 60)'; the second, by the need (expressed above) to determine the adequacy of the collection to support the developing postgraduate programs and research role of the institution. It is hypothesized that the library will be shown to be adequate for such a role, at least in specific, identifiable areas of the collection. Hence, the following are the aims of the project, adapted to the specific situation from Gorman and Kennedy's more extensive list (Gorman and Kennedy, 1992, p. 128):

(1) to gain a better understanding of the scope, depth, and utility of the collection;
(2) to serve as a basis for the preparation of a detailed collection development policy;
(3) to serve as a guide and basis for future collection development;
(4) to determine the adequacy and quality of the collection, especially for the support of postgraduate education and research;
(5) to identify strengths and weaknesses in specific subject areas, so that strengths may be built on and weaknesses rectified.

Literature Review

There are a number of good reasons for beginning a project such as this with a review of the literature. It helps you to build on and benefit from previous research in the area and to grasp a better overall understanding of what you are doing; it introduces you to the research methodologies and techniques which have been used; and it may also reinforce your belief in the value or necessity of what you are doing. (Cf. Mauch and Birch, 1993, p. 105-111).

Charles van Heck III (1993, p. 106) has noted a 'lack of use/user research data on theological libraries', which would seem to be substantially correct. Since it is definitely true of the Australasian situation, the review of previous research will have to include the projects of non-theological libraries, such as Swinburne (Arthur, 1986), the State Library of New South Wales (Schmidt, 1989), the University of New South Wales (McLachlan and Trahn, 1982), and the State Library of Victoria (Whitehead, 1989). While all of these were clearly dependent on use/user studies, both Arthur (p. 32) and Whitehead (p. 42) also acknowledge dependence on what are obviously qualitative evaluations; the latter, in particular, speaking of assessments which were 'largely a matter of judgement (p. 44)'. The need for both qualitative and quantitative studies for this project is developed below.

Van Heck (1993, p. 106) has also suggested that theological libraries should model their evaluation efforts on those of public libraries, on the basis of their supposed similarity in size, budgets, and personnel. Leaving aside questions of the factualness of his suppositions, the really important consideration for comparison is not the size of the library, but the nature of its activity and, this, in the case of theological libraries, is specifically academic; hence the choice of mainly academic and research libraries on which to model a theological library's evaluation, rather than public libraries (as suggested by Van Heck).

Within the narrower field of theological librarianship, one would have to begin a review of the literature with Coralie Jenkin's pioneering Australian effort at the Joint Theological Library, Melbourne (Jenkin, 1987) and the project of the Sydney College of Divinity (SCD), the first co-operative theological library evaluation in Australia (Sydney College of Divinity, 1993; Smith and Goodall, 1993).

Looking overseas, the reports on collection evaluation projects are restricted almost exclusively to North American libraries. The first of these appears to be the acquisitions overlap study of the eight libraries of the Boston Theological Institute in 1970 (.Lewkowicz, Oliver and Diener, 1975). The conference of the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) held a collection development conference in 1978; it included several papers on collection evaluation projects, the most interesting of which is John Kossey's report on his research at Ambassador College, Pasadena CA, in which books were classified according to curricular use levels (Kossey, 1978).

Several studies involving theological and religious collections have been carried out at universities and colleges in the United States. They include the list-checking assessments of the Religion collection at the University of Mississippi in 1979 (Ferguson, 1979) and the major study of the History of Christianity collections at Ohio State University in 1984 and 1985 (Shiels and Alt, 1985; Alt and Shiels, 1987).

Other studies in theological collections are useful for illustrating specific assessment techniques. They include the circulation studies at Cornell College, IA (Stiffler, 1983) and the citation analysis studies in Biblical Studies at Notre Dame University (Gleason and Deffenbaugh, 1984), and in four topics in Christianity and Religion at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Stelk and Lancaster, 1990). A citation study of the expected mutual interdependence of Biblical Studies and Ancient Near Eastern Studies was carried out by Yitzhaki (1986) and one on the nature of scholarly communication within the discipline of theology (on the basis of ninety-nine periodicals indexed in *Religion Index One*) by Julie Hurd (1984). Also of relevance to theological libraries is the study of Lauer (1989) of the time delay of publication and the overlap of book reviews in theological journals.

Data Collection Methodology

Since no single method of collection assessment has proved sufficient, on its own, for adequate and reliable evaluation, it is proposed to use three methods, one of each of the three groups of assessment techniques: user-oriented, collection-centred and non-quantifiable. The specific methods are: a Document Delivery Test, a verification studies and a visual appraisal. It is expected that any problems associated with any one of these methods will be counter-balanced by the other methods.

User-Oriented Studies

User-oriented studies are based on the assumption that 'use' is a reliable indicator of 'value'; but, as Gorman and Kennedy point out (1992, p. 161), this is not necessarily so - especially if, as is generally the case, use is measured in terms of the number of items circulating or the number of times a particular item circulates. Yerbury (1984), replicating work done by Bookstein, has demonstrated that the very concepts 'use' and 'read' are tricky ones to pin down precisely, that respondents to surveys interpret these terms differently (p. 19), and that they therefore tend to underestimate their use of the library (p. 21). Notwithstanding all these problems, it is probably still true, as Fussler and Simon maintain (McGrath, 1971, p. 284; cf. Gorman and Kennedy, 1992, p. 163), that past use is the best predictor of future use; and this is one justification for this kind of study. While use studies may not indicate the full extent of user demand, significantly omitting non-use and failure to supply (Osburn, 1982, p. 45), they will provide comparative data on the use of various parts of the collection, thus providing some guidance for the determination of desired collecting levels.

According to Osburn (1982, p. 45), the justification for use studies is that 'the proportion of the community that depends seriously upon the library is growing smaller'; but this can hardly be said of theological libraries, where ever spiralling circulation statistics (Greenwood, 1995, Table 2) are putting tremendous pressure on over-worked and under-paid staff. The professional librarian will be concerned to provide, not only for the 'demands' of users, but also for their 'needs' - a term which is just as slippery as 'use'. Though Evans works with the assumption that 'use' equals 'need' (Evans, 1970, p. 298), Gorman and Kennedy point out that there are such things as 'subconscious need' and 'yet un-expressed need' (Gorman and Kennedy, 1992, p. 92-93); to which it may be added that there may be differences of opinion on what constitutes a need. For example, a student may choose a different book from that recommended by a lecturer, because it is easier to understand or because it happens to suit his preconceived ideas, and may find the resulting essay severely penalized because (in the opinion of the lecturer) the book which was really 'needed' was left sitting on the shelf! The librarian will want to be alert to such dimensions of need and to observe, as Gorman and Kennedy (1992, p. 161, 163) suggest, that what has happened in the past may not reflect what should have happened in the past, nor what ought to happen in the future.

Document Delivery Test. The caveats above and the purpose of the whole evaluation suggest that the most useful use/user study for this project is the Document Delivery Test. Developed by Orr and others in a medical library context (Orr *et al.*, 1968), it aims to asses the library's ability to provide items needed when they are needed, combining availability and accessibility into one index number, the 'capability index' (CI), by measuring the adequacy of the collection and the speed of delivery of items required (Hall, 1985, p. 39). Following the method suggested by Gorman and Kennedy (1992, p. 164), the procedure will be to design an instrument that lists a number of documents considered most likely to be needed by students, and then to determine how many are available at the time, and how long it takes to make them available; and thus, through the capability index, to provide objective information on the ability of the library to supply such needs.

The Document Delivery Test is recommended for use in theological libraries because it is a reliable measure of the ability of the library to fulfil the needs of users, is easy to design and can be carried out with minimal disruption to library services. Using a sample of 300 items, it takes about four hours to administer and is considered 95% reliable. Its validity depends on the sample representing actual needs of library users (Hall, 1985, p. 39).

Shelf Availability Test. The shelf availability test is a relatively straightforward method of determining whether items required by users are owned by the library and, if so, whether they can be located by those users. Originally developed by Saracevic, Shaw, and Kantor (1978), it uses a clever 'branching line analysis' to indicate the reasons for user failure to locate wanted items. It has been further refined by Kantor (Hall, 1985, p. 44) to include five categories of user failure: (1) failure of the library to acquire the item; (2) failure of the user to copy the call number correctly; (3) failure to find the book because it is in circulation; (4) failure of library procedures (e.g., re-shelving); and (5) failure of the user to find the book when it is actually on the shelf. All this data is tabulated on a complex Availability Analysis Form (Hall, 1985, p. 48) to yield a quantifiable Measure of Availability (MAV). This technique measures real failures of real users, which, one would venture to hope, would be considerably less in a modern, automated library than the fifty-fifty rate Trueswell found in 1964 (Trueswell, 1965, p. 22); but, while it yields useful information, this would seem to have as much relevance to user education and library administration as it does to collection development. Moreover, with respect to availability studies in general, Goehlert's analysis of the reasons for user failure to find required items (Goehlert, 1978, p. 370) leads to the pertinent observation that most initial failures can be turned into eventual successes (through better searching, interlibrary loans, etc.) and that (within reason) library users are happy to receive the item eventually, no matter how long they have to wait for it.

Circulation Studies. For a library with an automated circulation system, the collection of circulation statistics is relatively simple, and as the Lohe Memorial Library has been operating such a system for more than the three years Trueswell (1966) considers necessary for such studies, it would be possible to compile such statistics. However, circulation studies are undertaken for four main reasons: (1) to identify items for weeding; (2) to identify a core collection and items for relegation to storage; (3) to identify use of items in various subject categories; and (4) to identify the user population (Gorman and Kennedy, 1992, p. 165); only one of which is relevant to the present project.

Using the last circulation date as a basis, Trueswell (1966) has developed a system for determining how many items in the collection are needed to supply any desired percentage of loans (even 99%); it is possible to work back to the date since which the desired percentage of loans have been checked out. The items circulating within that time frame constitute the core collection, and any items which have not circulated since the cut-off date become candidates for relegation or storage - neither of which are aims of the present project. Nor is there any need for this library to identify its population base, for the users and uses of a theological library are bound to be very homogeneous.

A technique for identifying use patterns in various subject areas, however, warrants some consideration. Wenger, Sweet and Stiles (1979) have gone beyond simple usage totals to develop the concept of the C/I (circulation/inventory) ratio, according to which usage of a subject area is related to the number of items held in each respective area. This data could be helpful in determining strengths and weaknesses, but there are so many factors affecting the circulation of different parts of the collection (e.g. relation to courses, requirements of lecturers, enthusiasm of students, and nature of the subject) that a great deal of subjective evaluation is still required - and that will be provided by other methods.

In-House Use Studies. In-house use studies have been designed primarily for use in conjunction with circulation studies to provide a clearer picture of total use of the library. The basic method is to count items left on tables and re-shelving shelves, working on the assumption that their location in these places implies 'use'. McGrath (1971) found that in-house use was roughly equivalent to borrowing of materials, but subsequent studies have revealed substantial variation between the two types of use and, indeed, between the in-house use of items from different subject areas.

In-house use studies are particularly relevant, however, to non-circulating collections, such as (in most libraries) periodicals. In this case, the cooperation of library users is required, for marking used items in some specified manner, and the validity of the data collected will depend on the extent of such cooperation. While declining budgets may force libraries into such studies in the interests of cancelling subscriptions for little used items, the more important agenda for theological libraries in Australia and New Zealand is to rationalize subscriptions in cooperation with other libraries, to maximize the coverage of theological periodical literature within regional areas and across Australasia as a whole.

Collection-Oriented Studies.

Collection-oriented studies operate on a 'stimulus-response' pattern, based on the needs of users (Gorman and Kennedy, 1992, p. 166). They can be used to assess the size of areas of the collection related to the subject areas of the curriculum. Since the data collected are statistical, these methods of assessment are quantitative, rather than qualitative; and, for this reason, it is proposed that the method chosen be supplemented by a non-quantifiable visual appraisal.

Verification Studies. Verification studies involve the checking of library holdings against standard checklists or bibliographies, to assess the adequacy of the library to supply the items most likely to be in demand (Gorman and Kennedy, 1992, p. 166). The biggest problem for theological libraries is to find suitable checklists; and, since any checklist is (inevitably) immediately out of date, it will probably be necessary to supplement any previously used list, if not, in fact, to construct a custom-made one. However, the effort involved in the selection or compilation of a checklist provides an excellent opportunity to introduce a qualitative factor into a quantitative method, if the checklist itself contains quality items. It is chiefly for this reason that verification studies have been chosen for the present project.

As one of the primary goals of the proposed evaluation is to assess the adequacy of the collection to support postgraduate and research programs, it is considered that the checklists to be used should focus specifically on materials appropriate to this level of study; in terms of the Australian Conspectus codes (Henty, 1992, p. 9-12), levels 3b and 4. Some of the distinctive features of these levels are the inclusion of all significant reference works, retrospective materials, periodicals and foreign language materials of all kinds; and the list to be used must include such features.

While the Conspectus will be used to define levels of adequacy, however, it is a different question altogether whether to use its very detailed breakdown of the subject matter (with more than 100 categories within the Dewey 200 class alone). Studies by Saunders, Nelson and Geahigan (1981) at Purdue University cast considerable doubt on the value of both the Dewey and Library of Congress class numbers in defining the literature of a subject. While this is not so likely to be the case with the Pettee Classification (which is used at the Lohe Memorial Library), as it is based on the same traditional theological quadrivium as the courses offered at the institution, it is proposed, rather, to develop subject categories on broader divisions of the theological quadrivium, each of which will have to be aligned to the appropriate sections of the Pettee Classification. (If the data is subsequently to be mounted on the national Conspectus database, it will also have to be recast in terms of the Dewey categories).

The procedure is to divide the collection into appropriate subject areas, to choose suitable bibliographies for each, and to select (by random sampling) a sufficient number of items from the bibliographies to constitute a checklist. It would be good to be able to find checklists already compiled, but, in the case of theological libraries, there are few to be found. The SCD checklists (Sydney College of Divinity, 1993, p. 169-302) have been criticized for their choice of source bibliographies (Sydney College of Divinity, 1993, p. 317) and for not focusing sufficiently on distinctively research materials (specifically, foreign language and reference materials) (Sydney College of Divinity, 1993, p. 329); and the researchers themselves admit to poor choices in two areas (Sydney College of Divinity, 1993, p. 126).

The SCD researchers decided on twenty-eight subject areas, based on the traditional theological quadrivium and adapted from the categories used in *Religious and Theological Abstracts* (Sydney College of Divinity, 1993, p. 129). You can choose as few or as many categories as you wish, according to the aims and purposes of the development of the collection, guided (where applicable) by the institution's curriculum, but not limited to it. For the present project, it is proposed to use the following twenty-seven categories:

Reference

1. General and Theological Reference

Biblical

2. Biblical Languages
3. Old Testament
4. Intertestamental Literature
5. New Testament

Theological

6. Philosophy
7. Prolegomena
8. God, Trinity
9. Creation and Providence
10. Redemption/Christology
11. Sanctification/Soteriology
12. Church, Sacraments
13. Christian Ethics
14. Sociology of Religion
15. World Religions

Historical

16. Patristics
17. Medieval Church
18. Reformation
19. Modern Church

Practical

20. Practical Theology
21. Pastoral Care and Counselling
22. Worship and Liturgics
23. Homiletics
24. Christian Education
25. Missiology
26. Art and Architecture
27. Spirituality

Citation Analysis. Citation analysis is based on citations in bibliographies, lists of references, and footnotes, usually taken from journal articles (e.g. all the articles in one or more annual volumes of key journals in a subject area), which are analysed in various ways to yield empirical data for qualitative judgements (Nisonger, 1983, p. 164; cf. Gleason and Deffenbaugh, 1984, p. 111). Fitzgibbons summarizes its uses as follows: 'The results of these studies have been used to guide the selection of journals for library collections, to determine the adequacy of coverage of secondary services, and to trace the structure of knowledge and the flow of communication within a discipline (Fitzgibbons, 1980, p. 294)'. While the latter use would be valuable for pinpointing key journals within a discipline, it really has more to do with understanding the structure of the discipline than with collection development. With regard to the current situation, pinpointing key journals can be done very simply, by consulting expert opinion and by checking items covered by indexes and abstracts. It would seem that there is, as yet, no unanimity on the validity and value of citation analysis studies, and Fitzgibbons warns that they should not be used in isolation from other methods (Fitzgibbons, 1980, p. 297, 321).

Standards. Standards may be either quantitative or qualitative. While the former were much in evidence in the early years (beginning with the 1930s and 1940s), more recent standards tend to be mainly qualitative (Nisonger, 1992, p. 83; cf. Hall, 1985, p. 20). The standards applicable to theological libraries in Australia and New Zealand are the *ANZTLA Standards for Theological Libraries* (ANZTLA, 1991, p. 4-10). These standards are qualitative, rather than quantitative, stating, *inter alia:* 'A library's collections shall be of sufficient size and quality to support the institution's instructional needs and, as applicable, to facilitate approved research programmes (p. 8)'. While this advice will be taken into consideration, it suggests no particular methodology, nor does it call for any quantifiable measures. The same is true also of the standards of the Association of Theological Schools of the United States and Canada and the *Guidelines for Theological College Libraries* of the Association of British Theological and Philosophical Libraries (ABTAPL, 1990, p. 2-31).

Qualitative Methods.

Qualitative, or non-quantifiable, methods rely on expert opinion, rather than counting, and aim to assess how well the collection is meeting the needs of its present and potential users (Gorman and Kennedy, 1992, p. 169). It is the opinion of George S. Bonn (1974, p. 279-280) that: 'Of all the ways in which to evaluate a library's collection, finding out what its users think of it comes closest to an evaluation in terms of the library's objectives and mission'. It has been noted above that the effective use of many of the user-oriented and collection-centred methods is dependent on qualitative judgements, and this is, in itself, sufficient warrant for the use of qualitative methods. However, they also provide reliable data for the professional librarian to look beyond immediately expressed needs, to consider also potential needs of future researchers, as well as providing the resources by which all users may be challenged to expand their outlook (Gorman and Kennedy, 1992, p. 163).

One of the problems involved in the use of qualitative methods by Australasian theological librarians is that they do not have the specialized training required for making the judgements required (Gorman, 1992, p. 9-10); however, the problem can be overcome, in an academic setting, by getting lecturers involved in the appraisal process. While they will need some training in understanding the Conspectus levels, they are already experts in their respective fields, have worked with research collections, and are, in most instances, very well aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the local collections with which they have to operate day by day. In the case of Luther Campus, all lecturers have at least a masters degree, and seventy-five per cent also doctorates, in most cases gained at overseas institutions with outstanding library collections. These observations are supported by Anthony Arthur's use of academic staff (together with library staff) in producing qualitative assessments, based on collection-centred measures, in the Swinburne project (Arthur, 1986, p. 30, 33).

What is being advocated is, in short, a visual appraisal of the relevant subject areas of the collection by people who have a sound understanding of the literature of the subject, as also of the educational objectives of the institution (Hall, 1985, p. 18). They will be capable of giving a quick assessment of the size, scope, and quality of the collection and of the recency and general condition of the material.

It is considered that the combination of the visual appraisal with the verification studies and the Document Delivery Test will be sufficient to provide an adequate evaluation of the collection, with as many checks and balances as can reasonably be expected. Such a combination provides the best situation for achieving subjective judgements of quality which are based on objective measures of quantity. Such a procedure was planned for the Sydney College of Divinity collection development project, but faltered on the grounds of the reluctance of lecturers to pass judgements on the collections of other members of the consortium (Smith and Goodall, 1993, p. 15). Due note will have to be taken, however, of the fact that the very lecturers who do much of the selection of resources will be assessing the parts of the collection for which they have done the selection.

Population Samples

The fourth step in the evaluation is to select the samples of the populations to be assessed, in this case, for the Document Delivery Test, the verification studies, and the visual appraisal. The best source of titles for the Document Delivery Test will be the reading lists of the three schools of Luther Campus and the three schools of the Adelaide College of Divinity (1996), the most prolific users of the collection. A ready-made alternative would be Beacon Hill Books' *Recommended Theological Texts*, which is revised annually on the basis of textbook orders placed with the bookshops by theological colleges all over Australia and New Zealand (Open Book, 1996). The size of the sample to be taken from this work will be guided by the Sample Size Table (Hall, 1985, p. 120). The selected titles will be entered onto Document Delivery Test Data Sheets (Hall, 1985, p. 35) and handed to student volunteers, who will be selected, at random, from those who enter the library. The completed sheets will be followed up by library staff, who will enter the results on the Document Delivery Test Analysis Form (Hall, 1985, p. 40) and calculate the Capability Index.

The verification studies will be carried out on the basis of checklists compiled from select bibliographies, identified for each subject area from works such as Gorman and Gorman's *Theological and Religious Reference Materials* (1984) and Kepple and Muether's *Reference Works for Theological Research* (1992), updated by Lawrence D McIntosh's regular survey, 'Major theological reference materials', in the *ANZTLA Newsletter* since 1990 (McIntosh, 1990). Since it is desirable to maintain as much objectivity as possible in such choices, due note will be taken of the incomplete list of titles indicated in Gorman and Howes' proposals for the SCD project (Sydney College of Divinity, 1993, p. 142-143).

The visual appraisal will be carried out on the basis of appropriate modifications of the CAP Faculty Survey Form (Hall, 1985, p. 139) and the BYU Faculty Periodicals Survey (Hall, 1985, p. 150), as suggested also for the SCD project (Sydney College of Divinity, 1993, p. 149-151). Lecturers will also be provided with the definitions of the various Conspectus levels.

Data Analysis

The data collected on the forms for the three collection methods will then be analysed. The Document Delivery Analysis Form provides for the calculation of the Capability Index (CI). These data will then be tabulated on a simple chart, showing the raw scores of the number of items located by each process, the percentage of the total items this number represents, and the percentage of the items acquired which the number represents (see Hall, 1985, p. 107-108). A CI of 50 is desirable, as it would indicate that 50% of items likely to be requested can be made available within one day.

In the verification studies, the number of items on the checklist found in the collection will be totalled for each subject category. The percentage of items held to the number of items in the checklist for each category will then be calculated. All these figures will be listed on a simple chart, showing, by subject category, the number of items in each sample, the hit rate of items found in the collection, and the percentage of the latter to the former (see Hall, 1985, p. 17). Considering that it is largely research material that is being sought, a hit rate of 60% would be very pleasing, but the quality of each section will have to be interpreted in terms of the objectives of the library and the desired collecting intensity, which, in this case, will tentatively be 3b or 4 in Conspectus terms, since such levels have not previously been determined.

The overall analysis, however, may well determine that such levels are not realistic for all the categories listed, the actual levels being determined, finally, by the visual appraisal. These results will be tabulated on a simple chart showing, by category, the Existing Collection Strength, the Current Collecting Intensity, and the

Desired Collecting Intensity. It will then be necessary to determine what is required to bring sub-standard categories to the desired level or whether it is necessary to modify expectations.

Facilitating Replication

At every step, every reasonable effort will be taken to facilitate replication of the exercise by others, not only for their benefit, but also so that further studies, undertaken under similar circumstances, can be used to verify the findings of the present project. In particular, to facilitate co-operative collection development among Australian and New Zealand theological libraries, it is necessary to arrive at understandings of the Conspectus levels which will be the same for all libraries; e.g. that a coding of 3b or 4 will indicate the same quality of collection wherever it is located. The best chance of achieving such understandings would seem to be by ascribing commonly accepted values to the scores of verification studies based on sound checklists, especially if those values are consistent with the Conspectus level codings determined by a visual appraisal.

There is a desperate need for cooperation in collection development among theological libraries, not only for the mutual benefit of the libraries involved, but for the benefit of the whole community. This evaluation should prove helpful to other theological libraries, because it is based on standard tests, adapted, as required, to local conditions. While other libraries may want to define subject categories differently, the Document Delivery Test, the verification studies, and visual appraisal can be utilized in much the same manner in any library.

Utilization of Results

At the conclusion of the evaluation, a report will be presented to the Faculty of Luther Campus. It will include the following elements (adapted from Hall, 1985, p. 95-98):

1. Introduction: outlining the purpose and objectives; methodology (user-oriented, collection-centred, and qualitative methods); problems encountered.

2. Document Delivery Test
   A. Analysis of results
   B. Conclusions

3. Verification studies
   A. Analysis of results
   B. Conclusions

4. Visual appraisal
   A. Analysis of results
   B. Conclusions

5. Conclusion
   A. Summary of conclusions
   B. Recommendations

Following the completion of the evaluation, it will then be necessary to implement the recommendations. This will include the preparation of a detailed collection development policy and the implementation of the policy in the selection of materials for acquisition, with specific attention to the strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation. By then, we will have a clearer idea of how the library is performing and whether, or to what extent, it is capable of serving the postgraduate and research needs of our users.

References

Adelaide College of Divinity (1996). *Adelaide College of Divinity Handbook. Adelaide*: Adelaide College of Divinity.

Alt, Martha S. and Shiels, Richard D. (1987). Assessment of library materials on the history of Christianity at the Ohio State University: An update. *Collection Management* 9: 67-77.

Arthur, Anthony J. (1986). Collection management - an Australian project. *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 17,1: 29-38.

Association of British Theological and Philosophical Libraries (1990). Guidelines for theological college libraries. *Bulletin of the Association of British Theological and Philosophical Libraries* 2,8: 2-31.

Australian and New Zealand Theological Library Association (1991). ANZTLA standards for theological libraries. *ANZTLA Newsletter* 15: 4-10.

Bonn, George S. (1974). Evaluation of the collection. *Library Trends* 22: 265-304.

Evans, G. Edward (1970). Book selection and book collection usage in academic libraries. *Library Quarterly* 40: 297-308.

Ferguson, Chris (1979). Evaluation of the Religion collection, John Davis Williams Library, The University of Mississippi. ERIC report ED 184 536.

Fitzgibbons, Shirley A. (1980). Citation Analysis in the Social Sciences. In *Collection Development in Libraries: a Treatise, Part B,* edited by Robert D. Stueart and George B. Miller, p. 291-344. Foundations in Library and Information Science, Vol. 10. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Gleason, Maureen L. and Deffenbaugh, James T. (1984). Searching the Scriptures: A citation study in the literature of Biblical Studies. Report and commentary'. *Collection Management* 6: 107-117.

Goehlert, Robert (1978). Book availability and delivery service. *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 4: 368-371

Gorman, G.E. (1992). Collection evaluation for Australian theological libraries. *ANZTLA Newsletter* 18: 3-17; 19: 20-29.

Gorman, G.E. and Gorman, Lyn (1984). *Theological and Religious Reference Materials.* 3 vols. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984-1986.

Gorman, G.E. and Kennedy, J. (1992). *Collection development for Australian libraries.* 2nd edn. Topics in Australasian Library and Information Studies, no. 5. Wagga Wagga, NSW: Centre for Information Studies.

Greenwood, Helen (1995). ANZTLA Statistics 1993. *ANZTLA Newsletter* 25: insert.

Hall, Blaine H. (1985). *Collection assessment manual for college and university libraries.* Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Henty, Margaret (1991). Conspectus in theological libraries. *ANZTLA Newsletter* 17: 9-19.

Henty, Margaret (1992). *Australian Conspectus manual: A collection assessment manual.* Canberra, ACT: National Library of Australia.

Jenkin, Coralie E.J. (1987). The collection for the saints: Collection development at the Joint Theological Library. MLib thesis, Monash University, Clayton, Vic.

Kepple, Robert J. and Muether, John R. (1992). *Reference works for theological research: An annotated, selective, bibliographical guide.* 3rd edn. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Kossey, John A. (1978). Collection analysis measures and techniques for academic libraries. In *Summary of Proceedings, Thirty-second Annual Conference, American Theological Library Association, Saint Vincent College, Latrobe, Pennsylvania, June 19-23, 1978,*pp. 113-115, 121-123. Philadelphia, PA: American Theological Library Association.

Lancaster, F. Wilfrid, with Joncich, M.J. (1977). Evaluation of the collection. In their *The measurement and evaluation of library services,* pp. 165-206. Washington, DC: Information Resources Press.

Lauer, Jonathan D. (1989). Urgency and overlap in the dissemination of information: Five religion journals and the book reviews they published in 1986. *Collection Management* 11: 113-126.

Lewkowicz, Linda B., Oliver, Peter L., and Diener, Ronald E. (1975). Acquisitions analysis employing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. In *Information revolution: Proceedings of the 38th ASIS Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts, October 26- 30, 1975*, edited by Charles W. Husbands and Ruth L. Tighe, pp. 53-54. [s.l.]: American Society for Information Science.

Lockett, Barbara (ed.) (1989). *Guide to the evaluation of library collections.* Collection Management and Development Guides, 2. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Mauch, James E. and Birch, Jack W. (1993). *Guide to the successful thesis and dissertation: A handbook for students and faculty.* 3rd ed. Books in Library and Information Science, 49. New York: Marcel Dekker.

McGrath, William E. (1971). Correlating the subjects of books taken out of and used within an open-stack Library. *College and Research Libraries* 32: 280-285.

McGrath, William E. (1985). Collection evaluation: Theory and the search for structure. *Library Trends* 33,3: 241-265.

McIntosh, Lawrence D. (1990). Major theological reference materials. *ANZTLA Newsletter* 1990-

McLachlan, Jo and Trahn, Isabella (1982). A method of collection evaluation for Australian research libraries. *Universityof New South Wales Library Annual Report* 51-61.

Nisonger, Thomas E. (1983). A test of two citation checking techniques for evaluating political science collections in university libraries. *Library Resources and Technical Services* 27: 163-176.

Open Book (1996). *Recommended theological texts.* Adelaide, SA: OpenBook Publishers.

Orr, Richard H., *et al.* (1968). Development of methodologic tools for planning and managing library services, II: Measuring a library's capability for providing documents. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 56,3: 241-267.

Osburn, Charles B. (1982). Non-user and loser studies in collection development. *Collection Management* 4: 45-53.

Saunders, Stewart, Nelson, Harriet, and Geahigan, Priscilla. (1981). Alternatives to the shelflist measure for determining the size of a subject collection.*Library Research* 3: 383-391.

Schmidt, Janine and Ventress, Alan (1990). *State Library of New South Wales Collection Development Policy.* Sydney, NSW: State Library of New South Wales.

Smith, Gai, and Goodall, Mara (1993). The genesis of a joint collection development policy: The Sydney College of Divinity experience. *ANZTLA Newsletter* 19: 4-19.

Stelk, Roger Edward and Lancaster, F. Wilfrid (1990). The use of textbooks in evaluating the collection of an undergraduate library. *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 14: 191-193.

Stiffler, Stuart A. (1983). Core analysis in collection management. *Collection Management* 5: 135-148.

Sydney College of Divinity (1993). *Joint collection development policy for the libraries of the Sydney College of Divinity, May 1992, with the individual collection development policies of the Libraries of Member Institutions of the S.C.D., and the S.C.D. Library Evaluation Project report, August 1990.* Sydney, NSW: Sydney College of Divinity.

Trueswell, Richard W. (1965). A quantitative measure of user circulation requirements and its possible effect on stack-thinning and multiple-copy determination. *AmericanDocumentation* 16: 20-25.

Trueswell, Richard W. (1966). Determining the optimal number of volumes for a library's core collection. *Libri* 16: 49-60.

Trueswell, Richard W. (1969). Some behavioral patterns of library users: The 80/20 rule. *Wilson Library Bulletin* 43: 458-461.

Van Heck, Charles (1993). Use and user studies: An application to theological libraries. *Journal of Religious and Theological Information* 1,1: 97-111.

Wenger, Charles B., Sweet, Christine B., and Stiles, Helen J. (1979). Monograph evaluation for acquisitions in a large research library. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 30: 88-92.

Whitehead, Derek (1989). Catching up on collection evaluation. *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* 20: 38-46.

Yerbury, Hilary (1984). Is library use using a library? *Australian Library Journal* 33: 19- 23.

Yitzhaki, Moshe (1986). Determining the mutual dependence between two related disciplines by means of citation analysis: The case of Biblical Studies and Ancient Near-East Studies. *Libri* 36: 211-223.

Zweck, Trevor J. (1988). The future of theological libraries in Australia and New Zealand. In *Australian and New Zealand religious history 1788-1988: A collection of paper and addresses delivered at the 11th Joint Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Association of Theological Schools and Society for Theological Studies, held at Burgmann College,Australian National University, 5-8 September, 1988,* edited by Robert S.M. Withycombe. Canberra, ACT: ANZSTS/ATS.

(Revd) Trevor J. Zweck,
Lohe Memorial Library, Luther Campus