AUSTRALIAN AND NEW

ZEALAND

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

ASSOCIATION

NEWSLETTER No. 19

MAY 1993

CONTENTS

ANZTLA AFFAIRS

Planning is well in hand for the Angles on Acquisitions conference of ANZTLA, to be held at Mount St Mary's Seminary, Greenmeadows (near Napier) New Zealand, 8-11 July, 1993, hosted by local librarian Glenys Dalziel. It promises to be a practical and helpful conference at an exciting location. Late enrolments must be directed to the New Zealand treasurer of the conference.

Australian delegates are reminded that, unless 'common border' conditions are arranged by July, it will be necessary to have a current passport to obtain entry back into Australia. A recent report in the local press indicates that Air New Zealand will soon have in place a common border for entry to New Zealand (allowing Australians to bypass customs and immigration), but similar arrangements for entry to Australia look like taking longer to set in place.

Statistical forms for the 1992 statistical year have been sent out by the Statistician, Helen Greenwood (St John's/Trinity, Auckland, NZ). Please make her job a little easier by returning your questionnaire promptly.

Our team of voluntary indexers has by now completed data sheets for volume 5, number 1 of the *Australasian Religion Index*. You can look forward to having this issue in your hands within a month or two; however, you are reminded that number two for this year will be a full five-year cumulation. This is an issue which should be widely promoted among those libraries which are not yet committed to a continuing subscription.

The American Theological Library Association has expressed interest in producing a CD-ROM version of *ARI*. This is an issue which the Board of *ARI* will have to tackle at its meeting in Greenmeadows in July. Members will be concerned to maintain control and copyright of the data and will have to look closely at the financial viability of any such project. If it is decided to produce a CD version, we will need to consider also whether there are better alternatives for having it produced locally.

Two recent periodicals from North America, aimed at theological librarians are worth noting in this column. The older is *Theology Cataloguing Bulletin*, a quarterly newsletter, now into its third issue. It is produced xerographically by the American Theological Library Association and most of the news and articles it contains are very much of the ATLA interest only; however, the section which is of general interest for Australasian librarians is its listing of new subject headings and subject heading changes devised by the Library of Congress. Anyone who wants to keep up to date with subject headings and who cannot afford the *LC Weekly Lists* will want to receive *TCB* for this valuable cataloguing information. The serial must be ordered direct (not through a subscription agent) from Ferne Weimer, Billy Graham Center Library, Wheaton College,

---

Wheaton, IL 60187-3593, USA. The annual subscription is US$20.00. (Cheques payable to American Theological Library Association).

A much more ambitious journal is the *Journal of Religious and Theological Information*, edited by Dr William Miller and an 18-member Editorial Board of mainly United States theological librarians and published by Haworth Press (10 Alice Street, Binghamton, NY 130904-9981). The cost to non-North American libraries is US$48 plus 40%. If you can afford that kind of money, you will find it a rich source of varied and interesting articles, ranging from very practical to very theoretical, all very well written. Look for reviews in *ANZTLA Newsletter*, *Australian Library Review*, and *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*.

Most readers will be aware that The American Theological Library Association is currently producing its own CD-ROM versions of the Religion Indexes database. Recent correspondence received by Ken Elder (Tahlee Bible College) indicates that ATLA is not averse to the sharing of such CDs by networks, the additional terminals costing only US$25 to licence. The host library, of course, would have to pay about A$3000 for the CD if not entitled to discounts. To become involved in such a network you would need a suitable computer and modem. For more information, call Ken.

A new acronym to add to your list is WOCATI (World Conference of Associations of Theological Institutions) which had its constituting meeting in Pittsburgh, Penn. last year, with two Australians (Dr Ian Williams and Dr MaryAnne Confoy) in attendance. The importance of WOCATI to theological librarians is that it is establishing a committee on library services. While specific terms of reference are yet to be drawn up for this committee, the obvious intention is to promote theological libraries and librarianship on an international scale. We will watch developments with interest.

As I write this column, news has come to hand of a proposal of the Network Committee of the Australian Bibliographic Network which could have dire consequences for theological libraries currently participating (i.e. as full service users) in ABN or considering such participation. The proposal is to limit the payment of bibliographic credits to 125% of inquiry debits. In the case of Luther Campus Library, this proposal would have the effect of reducing credits by $500 a month - a cost which we would simply be unable to bear. I have been assured that it was not the intention of ABN to disadvantage any current participant. It appears a survey was undertaken last year, before Luther had reached its present levels of productivity and that no libraries were found whose bibliographic credits exceeded inquiry debits by more than about 25% - hence the figure of 125% of inquiry debits. If your library would be adversely affected by this proposal, you should convey your concerns to Ted Vellacott of the ABN as soon as possible, as the proposal is intended to come into effect on 1 July 1993.
(Rev) Trevor Zweck, President.

THE GENESIS OF A JOINT COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICY: THE SYDNEY COLLEGE OF DIVINITY EXPERIENCE

Gai Smith and Mara Goodall

Historical Background

In 1910 the Melbourne College of Divinity was constituted by an Act of the Victorian Parliament, empowering it to confer Bachelors and Masters degrees and Doctorates, and to grant diplomas and certificates, in the areas of theology and ministry. The College then represented the Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, and by co-optation, the Churches of Christ. In 1972 the Catholic Church and the Churches of Christ joined the College.(1) Among the minimum requirements for the approval of an institution or group of institutions as an associated teaching institution of the Melbourne College of Divinity is one that: "The institution or group of institutions shall have a Library which in the opinion of the College is adequate to support studies in the subjects prescribed for the degree of Bachelor of Theology and research in these and associated theological fields" and, in the case of higher degrees, "adequate to support the necessary studies for the degrees of Master of Theology and Doctor of Theology".(2)

Part of the impetus for the founding of the Melbourne College of Divinity came from the fact that the study of theology had been explicitly excluded from the charter of the University of Melbourne in 1853.

Nothing was said about theology, for or against, in the charter of the University of Sydney (3) (1852) but it was not until 1935 that the university set up a Board of Studies in Divinity, to organise a programme of studies leading to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, "offered, in the tradition of the medieval universities, to holders of a primary degree, usually in Arts".(4)

Thus, there was still no civil recognition in New South Wales, of church based, ministerially oriented theological education.

In 1969 the Higher Education Act was passed in New South Wales. At the time the two-tier system of tertiary education throughout Australia was being set up, that is: self-accrediting universities on one level, and, on the other, colleges of advanced education accredited by state authorities. The NSW Act also gave the Advanced Education Board the power "to make reports and recommendations to the Minister on the approval of courses as advanced education courses outside universities and colleges of advanced

education. (5) Theological colleges could therefore approach the Advanced Education Board for approval of their courses, and civil recognition of their awards.

The University of Sydney, anxious to protect its B.D. degree, was involved in negotiations with some of the bigger theological colleges, and at one point the theological colleges made individual submissions to the Higher Education Board (which would allow them to grant diplomas but not degrees,(6) so it was May 1977 before the first meeting of what was to become the Sydney College of Divinity took place, and they set out on what John Hill, in his articles on the foundation of the Sydney College of Divinity, calls "the frustration of long years of discussion, negotiation, applications made, applications denied, and, in general, finding the way through the trackless wastes of bureaucracy".(7) The participants in the negotiations were Catholic Institute of Sydney, Moore Theological College (Anglican), the United Theological College (Uniting Church), Union Theological Institute (Catholic), St Paul's National Seminary (Catholic), the Baptist Theological College of NSW (Morling College) and the Churches of Christ (NSW) Theological College

It was a long hard road, as Hill indicates. Sadly, Moore College withdrew from the negotiations in June 1983. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the educational, theological and ecumenical issues that had to be resolved to the satisfaction of the individual member institutions and their constituent bodies, on the one hand, and the Higher Education Board on the other, but I recommend John Hill's articles in *Journal of Christian Education,* April and July 1987, to anyone who is interested.

At last in September 1983 the Sydney College of Divinity was incorporated, and in February 1984 conditional approval was given for the Bachelor of Theology programme, retrospective to when those courses had been introduced at the beginning of 1982. In 1986 St Andrew's Greek Orthodox Theological College joined the Sydney College of Divinity; at the end of 1989 Morling College withdrew; and in September 1989 St Mark's College of Ministry (Canberra, Anglican) joined.

The Sydney College of Divinity has seven member institutions but, as Union Theological Institute has two campuses, at Turramurra and at Hunters Hill, it includes eight libraries. The report of the Higher Education Board accreditation committee in 1984 emphasised that library services should be developed as a whole, rather than on an individual basis. "The emphasis should be not so much on developing individual libraries in isolation but on creating a network of interdependent libraries to serve Sydney College of Divinity needs."(8) At that point it was recommended that an outside expert carry out an assessment of the libraries with a view to establishing a common purpose and effective and affordable means of co-operation.

Development of Library Services of SCD institutions.

In the following year, August 1985, the Australian and New Zealand Association of Theological Schools (ANZATS) meeting in Adelaide included the ANZATS Library Consultation which gave rise to the Australian and New Zealand Theological Library Association (ANZTLA). That consultation began with a paper by Gary Gorman on Principles and Procedures for Collection Development in Theological Libraries. He quotes Gardner, that a written collection development policy is intended "to clarify objectives and to facilitate coordination and cooperation, both within a library or library system and among cooperating libraries".(9)

Gary himself defines collection development as "the process of assessing the strengths and weaknesses of a collection and then creating a plan both to correct those weaknesses and to build on those strengths".(10) A written collection development policy must describe the short-term and long-term goals of a library, "taking these goals into account and then correlating them with the environment. The environment includes audience demand, needs and expectations; the wider information world; fiscal possibilities; and the history of a given collection".(11)

The SCD Libraries Committee minutes file includes a letter dated October 1985 to Hans Arns, the Librarian at the Catholic Institute of Sydney, from Gary Gorman who was then lecturing in the Department of Librarianship at Ballarat College of Advanced Education. Gary was then "conducting a research project on Australian theological libraries, focussing primarily on the development and use of their collections in relation to perceived educational goals of the parent institutions",(12) and asking Hans to take part in that project. Hans' reply said, in part: "One of our major concerns at present is the question of identifying subject strengths (and weaknesses) in the combined Sydney College of Divinity libraries. This is obviously necessary as a preparatory step to subject specialisation and rationalisation of purchases. As the SCD will soon be preparing higher degree submissions there is a certain urgency in finding out how capable the system is to support higher degree studies. Our difficulty is to find a methodology to do this and accordingly prepare a brief for someone engaged by the SCD to do the job. It was suggested [at the meeting of Sydney ANZTLA Chapter the previous week] that we take up contact with you for advice on the matter".(13) Gary's reply announced his transfer to the School of Information Studies at the Riverina-Murray Institute of Higher Education, Wagga, the following February. He asked for statistics for each library: size of collection, rate of acquisitions, budget, classification scheme used, availability of shelf list. "This would help me decide what might be done".(14)

Unfortunately there is a gap in the file there, the only documents for 1986 being the 25th March report of the M.Th. committee to the SCD Academic

Board, and Hans Arns' reply to a request from Edmund Perrin concerning "subject strengths in the library of the Catholic Institute of Sydney capable of supporting a proposed M.Th. programme within the Sydney College of Divinity."(15)

In March 1987 a letter to Hans from Gary Gorman begins "Once again my attempts to get to Sydney have been thwarted due to events beyond my control. I can see this continuing forever, so I think we need to plan a new approach. I've spoken to a colleague here in the School of Information Studies, J.J. Mills, who is also interested in collection development. Between us we believe that something can be done for you fairly quickly on a (low-cost) consultancy basis ... What we would need to have from you in writing is some background on what is needed and why, a list of the libraries involved and a time frame within which the job needs to be finished. When we have that we can provide a detailed proposal of what we would do and how, as well as cost (transport, accommodation)".(16)

Hans replied "Wagga Wagga is a considerable distance from Sydney and I suspect that delays due to your other commitments, and costs of accommodation, repeated travel to and from Sydney, and a consultancy fee, would make it difficult to keep the project within a certain time span and budget. Could I therefore make an alternative suggestion?

"The kind of exercise we are trying to engage in must certainly have been done in some other other consortium, and guidelines must have been produced for such a project, and be available, i.e. the criteria for evaluation (both quantitative and qualitative), for determining present and future needs in member institutions, and for deciding how subject specialisations can be implemented. If you could provide such a set of guidelines for us from your own store, or provide us with a contact from where they may be obtained, I would like to suggest the following:

"Let me find a local person to do the evaluation according to a set of established criteria. By this I mean to do the tedious and time consuming tasks which neither you nor I would have the time to do. This evaluation would then be supervised by myself on a day to day basis in consultation with yourself and the SCD librarians.

"I would also like to suggest that there should be three separate sessions (no more than one day each) with yourself,, SCD librarians and the project person, to discuss the project in all its ramifications, i.e. at the beginning to plan strategy and methodology, after some week s to review progress and to correct mistakes in methodology, and a session at the end of the project to discuss a draft report and recommendation which I am quite willing to finalise".(17) Hans at that time had in mind a Bathurst Mercy Sister with library training who could have been the "project person".

Gary replied that it might take the project person "3 months full-time to do the data collection and interviewing necessary. I(and a colleague) would be happy to provide the initial impetus in the form of a project outline which would be discussed in full at our first meeting. Two additional meetings would be needed during the data collecting stage (1) to iron out initial wrinkles and (2) to monitor progress towards the end. And there would be a final meeting to discuss a draft report ... Selecting the appropriate documentation from which to work will be a major task at my end well before Stage 1, as will the development of an initial strategy.

'The normal rate for work of this type is now $280 per day, which would be impossibly high for the SCD. I suggest a total honorarium of $1,000 plus travel and accommodation."(18)

In August 1987 Hans wrote to the Academic Board of the SCD concerning the SCD libraries as a combined resource, for the purposes of post-graduate study, as the college moved towards seeking accreditation of higher degrees. He pointed out the need for identifying subject strengths within the collections to allow for planning and rationalisation, and recommended, in the light of fiscal possibilities, specialisation in narrowly defined areas.

He also raised at this point an issue which was to become a focal one later in the project. He wrote "The matter of library resources is only one of several interrelated questions which need to be addressed in the planning of postgraduate programmes, and many may see it only as the final question which can only be resolved when the other questions have been answered. They are:
1. In what specialised area of postgraduate study is supervision at present available, and does forward planning ensure that these areas of specialisation will be continued?
2. Are the available areas of specialisation intentional or accidental? In the latter case is the member institution willing to commit itself to this (or these) area(s) of specialisation or does it want to opt for alternative specialisations more in line with its aims and ideology? Does it also intend to train or obtain academic staff in those chosen areas to ensure continued excellence in those areas?:
3. Can library specialisation schemes really be undertaken unless these preceding issues have been resolved?"(19)

On behalf of the SCD Libraries Committee, Hans recommended that the Academic Board provide that funding of $8,000, one thousand from each of the member institution (MI) library constituent bodies, be guaranteed for a project to evaluate existing collections and produce library development policies for member institutions and for the SCD libraries as a whole.(20) That amount was approved at the December 1987 meeting of the Academic Board and the meeting between the SCD librarians and Gary Gorman and Brian Howes of Riverina-Murray Institute of Higher Education to get the

project started at last was held on Friday, 12th February at the Catholic Institute of Sydney.

Gary and Brian came armed with documentation on the National Library's moves towards implementing the Conspectus methodology and collection assessment techniques, the collection development policy produced by the Andover-Harvard Theological Library of Harvard Divinity School and other bibliographical references. Fr Gerard Kelly, who was then convenor of the Librarians Committee, reported to the Academic Board as follows:

"There was quite lengthy discussion as to the purpose of the assessment and the criteria to be used. The major catalyst, according to the librarians, has been the decision by the SCD to move into the M.Th. and the need to indicate to the HEB [Higher Education Board] that our libraries are adequate for M.Th. work. Fr Gorman and Mr Howes then suggested that the Collection Assessment be made against this background. It was pointed out, though, that the survey should not be conceived too narrowly: the SCD may well move to accept doctoral candidates in the future.

"The librarians are also aware that this Collection Assessment is only a beginning. It will need to be followed up by a Collection Development Policy. The librarians envisage a situation where this Development Policy will be undertaken at the level of each MI, but with some clear agreement among the various libraries of the SCD.

"The Collection Assessment project will be undertaken in the following stages:
1. Design of the project; acceptance of that design.
2. The implementation of the process.
3. Analysis of the data; presentation of the report.
Stage 1 will be completed by Fr Gorman and Mr Howes, and considered at the meeting of librarians to be held at UTI (Hunters Hill) on 4th March, 1988.
Stage 2 will be in the hands of the librarians who will employ a suitable person to supervise the process. The aim is to complete this stage by the end of May.
Stage 3 will be co-ordinated by Fr Gorman and Mr Howes. The aim is to complete the analysis of the data by July and have the final report ready by August." (21)

Gary and Brian's 36 page draft project proposal was dated 19th February 1988 - one week after the meeting at CIS - and was sent to Hans on 25th February. It is a very interesting document and will be included in the library documentation to be published by the SCD later in the year and made available for purchase.

The methodology devised by Gary and Brian for the evaluation of the collections involved user-oriented measures and collection-oriented measures, the latter based primarily on checking our holdings against "standard lists and bibliographies." There was also to be a survey of faculty to indicate their use of the library of their own member institution *in their own area of expertise*, and their perception of its strengths and weaknesses in comparison with other academic libraries they had used. Faculty members were also to be asked to carry out a visual appraisal of their subject area in the libraries of two other member institutions.

By its meeting on 18th March 1988, the Libraries Committee had already carried out a pilot project on a sample checklist prepared by Edmund Perrin, drawing on some of the bibliographic resources recommended by Gary and Brian.(22) The results were considered "statistically useful" in that, as expected, the larger libraries had a higher hit rate than the smaller libraries, but because some of the bibliographies from which the checklist was drawn were large and rather old, the randomly selected list threw up a lot of items we didn't have and wouldn't particularly want to have. It was felt that it was important to collect quality, up-to-date, published bibliographies in the subject areas in which SCD libraries aim to provide coverage, so that the resulting checklist would be testing what we held against what we would want to hold. It was agreed that a checklist of approximately 1,000 items would be valid and manageable, and that number was divided among the subject areas in proportion to their importance in the collections and the quantity of literature available, as follows -

Philosophy	40
New Testament	90
Old Testament	90
Inter-testamental literature	30
Biblical languages	20
Church history	90
Australian church history	30
Patristics	50
Christology	50
Church	40
Sacraments	30
Soteriology	30
Trinity	30
Apologetics and revelation	30
Ecumenics	30
Ethics	60
Missiology	70
Pastoral care and counselling	40
Theology and practice of ministry	40
Homiletics	30
Catechetics and Christian education	30
Liturgy	40

Spirituality	40
Canon law and church polity	20
World religions	40 (23)

That in fact totals 1,090 in 25 categories. (In the end, the 28 checklists included 1,300 items).

At the May 1988 meeting the Faculty Survey (of their subject area in the library of their own MI) was set in train. At this point a progress payment of $1,000 was made to Gary and Brian, and, with travel (24) and printing costs, ($6,683.25 of the budget remained. By 17th June 1988 results were coming in from the faculty survey: "A full collation is yet to be done - awaiting more returns and the appointment of a project officer"(25) and "it was decided to go ahead with the next part of the survey which was a visual appraisal. A sample questionnaire was tabled by Edmund Perrin [based on the one proposed by Gary and Brian in their draft project proposal] and suggestions were made for various changes. Faculty members are to be approached by librarians to survey the libraries of other SCD institutions to gauge the adequacy of library resources for mounting a Masters programme. Faculty members who agree to this task will be asked to survey at least two other libraries within the SCD in their area of study. Not all libraries will be surveyed in all areas since they are not in the running to mount Masters courses in those areas. Each librarian has taken a list of those libraries and areas which are to be surveyed. If there are insufficient volunteers individual faculty members will be approached to fill in any areas left uncovered."(26)

This June meeting was the first for which Neil Ormerod was convenor, Gerard Kelly having gone on study leave. At that time, the convenor of the Libraries Committee had to be a person who was a member of the Academic Board of the SCD by virtue of being nominated as one of the two representatives from each MI. One of the librarians was entitled to go, as a non-voting representative of the librarians, to Academic Board meetings. It was at this point that Edmund Perrin left that position and I took it.

At this stage, the Committee was experiencing some difficulty finding a suitable person as the Project Officer. By the July meeting some 25 persons had been contacted, there was still no Project Officer therefore no progress towards a checklist, and faculty members were showing reluctance to participate in assessing subject strengths in the libraries of MIs other than their own. There is no record on file of the August meeting.

On 21st October, at the meeting of the Libraries Committee, a sort of revolution took place. The draft project proposal had given as one of the key requirements of the project that:
"It must result in several discrete analyses and policies, and in one college-wide policy aimed at postgraduate requirements and possible subject specialisation".(28)

It was clear to Hans, and through him to Neil Ormerod, the Convenor, that a joint collection development policy, for SCD libraries as a whole, could be valid only if it was supported by the individual collection development policies of the member institution libraries. "During the discussion it became clear that at the MIs it is not librarians who are in control of accessions [sic] but academic staff. Library budget are divided among the various faculty departments. Thus while the committee has been contemplating an SCD Collection Development Policy, it became clear that individual MIs do not have a CDP operating in their own libraries ... Librarians...[are] dependent on the academic staff to order books. Thus any CDP at an MI level would need to take into account the interest of staff at the MI. This would make long-term CDPs difficult to maintain as staff move on".(29)

This was the same issue as Hans had raised with the Academic Board in August, 1987, but that was "before my time", and I, for one, was hoping the checklist would make possible an objective assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of our collection that I did not feel competent to make unaided after only 8 months in theological librarianship.

Because the date of the meeting had been changed at short notice, only half of the MI libraries were represented at that October meeting. Neil proposed, in the light of responses to the minutes he circulated, to recommend to the December meeting of the Academic Board that the evaluation project be abandoned. As it happened his intention became clear at the November meeting of the Academic Board, and the Libraries Committee was instructed to advertise for the position of project officer, and, if necessary, to involve Gary Gorman in getting the project on course again.

There had been rumblings of discontent among librarians, that the affairs of the committee were in the hands of a non-librarian who did not always fully understand the issues in question, and when, at its meeting on 18th November 1988, Neil Ormerod announced he would not be representing his MI on the Academic Board of the SCD in future, and hence could no longer convene the Libraries Committee, it was recommended that one of the Librarians become its convenor. Hans wrote a report for the December 1988 meeting of the Academic Board, which recommended that each MI work on a collection development policy for its library, and also that one of the librarians become Convenor of the Libraries Committee. Of more ultimate consequence than all the "politicking", Hans circulated copies of his draft CDP for the Catholic Institute of Sydney, and, example being the best teacher, other librarians began work on formulating, with faculty help, CDPs for their MIs.

At the 7th December meeting of the Academic Board it was decided that the Libraries Representative on the Board should be Convenor of the Libraries Committee and a member of the Board. The rest of the libraries' business

was held over to the next meeting because the following two days saw the meetings with the panel appointed by the Office of Higher Education (OHE) for the re-accreditation of the SCD B.Th. and the initial accreditation of the M.Th.

The position of Project Officer was advertised in the 9th December 1988 issue of *Incite*.

By the February 1989 meeting of the Academic Board, the summary report of the OHE Assessment committee had been received. One of its comments was:
"The Committee draws the attention of the SCD to the need for constant upgrading and expansion of library and other resources to meet the need of Masters students in the programme proposed."(30)

So when the Libraries Committee met on 24th February 1989 it was to respond to the summary report, to get us moving on formulating individual MI collection development policies, and, at last!, to recommend to the Academic Board the appointment of candidate no. 26 as Project Officer for the SCD Libraries Evaluation Project. Mara Goodall had been in our midst all along, as Librarian (part-time) of the Churches of Christ (NSW) Theological College, and the termination of another part-time job left her free to take on this task. At this meeting the process of collecting reputable published bibliographies on the 25 subject areas designated at our March 1988 meeting was begun, so that by the time Mara began work on 8th May, bibliographies had been provided, or the sources for them indicated, in the fields of Philosophy, Biblical Studies, Church History, Ecumenics, Missiology, Pastoral Care and Counselling, Theology and Practice of Ministry, Homiletics, World Religions, and Spirituality, and by 16th May, Mara was ready to send our the first three checklists.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION PROJECT

Now we came to the long and sometimes tedious task of assembling all the bibliographies and compiling the checklists. In the published report you will find discussion on which bibliographies we chose, and why, in each subject area.

We were very fortunate to have the Audio-visual room in the Colin Library at CTU Hunters Hill offered for my use whenever needed, and this became my work station. This was very helpful in many ways, because not only did I have facilities such as an electric typewriter to compile the checklists, a photocopier, discarded catalogue cards for notation of sample titles, and floorspace to sort out all the returned checklists into their categories, but also a great many of the bibliographies recommended at our SCD library meetings were available in the Colin Library, and did not have to be sent over or consulted in situ. In quite a few cases the bibliographies used were whole books that had to be examined and edited,

the pages to be used noted, numbers of titles either counted or estimated, (depending on the length of the bibliography), and then the sample ratio determined according to the number of titles required on the checklist. In the case of the Trinity checklist, a visit to the Veech library at St. Patrick's, Manly, was required in order to go through the Bibliografia trinitaria and take a sample of the English titles. This took a whole day to do, since complete bibliographical details needed to be written out and taken back to my workstate at CTU.

As Gai has mentioned, at our SCD librarians' meetings we assigned the number of titles we required for each checklist, relative to the proportion of literature available in that particular subject area. Bibliographies were brought to SCD librarians' meetings for discussion, and approval was based on their coverage, quality and as far as possible, up-to-dateness. There were some areas where it was very difficult to find good standard bibliographies, and it was necessary to use bibliographies in the works of acclaimed authors in that particular field. In most cases, not more than three or four bibliographies were used to give comprehensive subject and denominational coverage, but in some it was necessary to use more (e.g. Sociological Setting of the Australian Church, which gave special emphasis to subsets such as aboriginal culture, multiculturalism and the aging).

In some cases we used special bibliographies that were compiled by MI faculty members who were experts in their field, e.g. Select bibliography for phenomenology of religion and a bibliography for Ecotheology prepared by the faculty of St. Columbans College, Turramurra, and also two bibliographies for philosophy from Louvain University. For our checklist samples, the first then every 'nth' title was taken, continuing on from one bibliography to the next, "n" being the result of dividing the (estimated) number of titles in the bibliographies by the number of titles required for the checklist. Foreign language works and journal articles were disregarded, because foreign language works are not extensively collected in most of our libraries, and because rationalisation of serials was to be done at a later date. Once the sample titles were determined and noted on cards, the checklists had to be typed and sent to the SCD libraries, and great were the groans over the time required to check through thirteen hundred titles spread over 28 separate lists! However, this most necessary task was finally completed, and results were compiled and tabulated.

We were very pleased to have our overall impressions confirmed on the whole as to the strengths and weaknesses of individual collections, especially considering the fact that not too many of the standard works that all libraries would be expected to, and did, hold were included on the checklists. Many were the complaints that "We hold all the other works by this author, but not this one!", the one in question usually being more esoteric. It was encouraging to see, too, that even the smaller libraries contributed by sometimes being the only library to hold a particular title on

the checklist, so that we could all feel that we had an important part to play in our combined collection strength.

At this stage I should mention two other measures that we attempted to use, as recommended by the Gorman and Howes report. The first was the Collection Appraisal by Faculty of Own MI Library, which sought to collect quantifiable data in terms of purpose and frequency of use of the collection, adequacy for study and research purposes, comparison with other MI libraries, and ease of ordering and obtaining new acquisitions, etc. The results were collected, and a sample tabulation prepared for one of the subject areas, Christian Ethics. We were relatively successful in persuading faculty members to complete the collection appraisal of their own MI library, but when we came to collate the information into a useful form, it became apparent that it would be very difficult to reduce it to meaningful statistics. This overhead will show you the kind of complicated results that were obtained. It was decided that time and money were too limited to do this for each subject area, and that the completed appraisals would be kept and used in estimating the strengths of individual collections at the time of establishing subject specialisation areas for individual MIs.

The Visual Appraisal by Faculty of other MI Libraries was a different story. Faculty members were asked to visit other MI libraries, conduct a visual appraisal of the collection in their area of expertise, and fill in a questionnaire. Only one library succeeded in getting its faculty members to carry out this difficult and time consuming task, as you will see from this overhead, due partly to the reluctance of some of the faculty to make subjective evaluations of other MI collections. It was finally decided to abandon the attempt, particularly in view of the difficulty of collating the information in a tabled form.

As with the earlier parts of the evaluation project, the writing of the final report was a joint effort. I would bring a draft to the meeting for approval, and there it was pored over, added to, altered, discussed, and beaten into shape. The whole project was very much a combined effort, with many hours and much hard work being put in by all of the SCD librarians, followed by an even greater effort in completing individual CDP's, and finally the joint CDP's, and finally the joint CDP, We can now say from our own experience: "If libraries can do it, they can do it together."

Meanwhile, correspondence between Hans and Gary in March, April and May, 1989, had focussed on the need for individual MI CDPs to form the basis of a joint SCD CDP. Gary wrote "I have not commented on the draft joint CDP, or first part thereof [prepared by Hans in November 1988], as I think this should be set aside until each library has made at least a draft of its own policy; this seems now to be a more efficient way to proceed."(31) He did re-assert, however, that "individual libraries still need to agree on a common assessment methodology" and the establishment of objective

standards of measurement, as the checklist results accumulated, gave all of us, I am sure, more confidence to proceed to CdPs for our own libraries.(32)

In March 1989 a recommendation had come from the Academic Board "That MIs be made aware of the need for faculty involvement in library collection development policy ... Each MI is asked to submit a written report to the Secretary of the Academic Board before the May meeting, indicating their response to the issue of library development as raised by the Assessment Committee of the Office of Higher Education."(33) This had given the drafting of individual MI CDPs higher priority within the MIs than librarians could have achieved unaided and highlighted the fact that faculty members responsible for book selecting had to take responsibility for setting clear guidelines and consistently following them. UTI Turramurra in fact produced its draft collection development policy for the May 1989 deadline.

The final report to the Office of Higher Education, NSW, on assessment of Sydney College of Divinity's Bachelor of Theology degree, Conversion course, Graduate Diplomas and Master of Theology degree, June 1989, urged that the Libraries Committee "be encouraged to step up its efforts towards formulating a collective library policy, with details of the steps to be taken to achieve this, as a matter of urgency"(34) and reiterated its "recommendation on the necessity of the expansion of library stocks and services to enable satisfactory work to be produced at Master's level - particularly the development by MIs of their chosen areas of specialisation".(35) The response drafted by the Libraries Committee meeting on 14th July, 1989, drawing on the high level of co-operation that had been built up over our years of working together, could be convincingly confident. In December 1989 the Academic Board voted a contingency fund of a further $1,000 to be used for the completion of the evaluation project.

The Academic Board conducted another annual survey of MI libraries (designed by the Libraries Committee) in April 1990, and this again pressed MIs to reach final formulation of collection development policies, and areas of responsibility for research level collecting. The tabling of Mara's report on 5th September, 1990, added further impetus as the Academic Board decided that its first recommendation should be implemented, namely
"Individual MI Library Collection Development Policies should be completed with the help of faculty, indicating
a)   areas of desired specialisation for M.Th research level; and
b)   budget allocation for these areas"(36)
MI's library collection development policies were to be lodged with the SCD Registrar by 31st January, 1991 - and most of us made the deadline.

At our October 1990 and February and July 1991 meetings, a survey was made of SCD libraries' serial holdings, using the new AULOTS and our emerging CDPs, and resulted in some rationalisation of current

subscriptions, and a significant amount of consolidation of partial holdings and terminated subscriptions.

In October 1991 the ACLIS guidelines for the preparation of a collection development policy were obtained (37) and at our meeting on 8th November were used to set targets for preamble statement drafts which were reviewed at our meeting on 3rd February 1992. The resulting draft was discussed and added to at our meeting on 20th March, along with the sections of the SCD Central Document which needed to be updated as we prepare for re-accreditation (through what has now become the Higher Education Unit of the NSW Department of Education) towards the end of 1992. At that meeting it was decided to leave the final editing to a sub-committee consisting of Mara Goodall, Hans Arns and myself. We spent a lovely sunny Saturday at Hans' home at Manly on 11th April and I then wrote up the results of our deliberations and tabulated the subject specialisations listed in the individual MI CDPs. The Libraries Committee met on 24th April for proofreading and final editing, and the resultant document, of which we are inordinately proud, was tabled at the SCD Academic Board meeting on 6th May 1992.

Whether we date its beginning from February 1984, when the original accreditation committee suggested that joint library development was essential, or from November 1985 when Hans first approached Gary Gorman to design a collection evaluation and development project, or December 1987 when the $8,000 to finance the project was approved, or February 1988 when the Gorman and Howes project got, slowly, under way, the genesis of the SCD joint CDP has been a long and laborious process. But the outcome of that process has been not just the policies it has produced. All the work we have done together has fostered among us levels of co-operation and bonds of friendship that contribute to a deeper awareness that the SCD is definitely not just "an umbrella organisation for a number of colleges that ... continue to operate as if the SCD did not exist"(38) but indeed "member institutions working together, open to each other, and interacting with each other in common community".(39) I know ecumenism is not everyone's 'cup of tea', and I respectfully acknowledge that there are denominational differences in this area, but for me it has been both professionally and spiritually satisfying to be involved in this task which I believe does contribute to the praise of God and the empowerment of the People of God.

NOTES

(1) *Melbourne College of Divinity Handbook*, 1992-1993, p.5
(2) Ibid., p.29-30
(3) Hill, John: The foundation of the Sydney College of Divinity: Part 1: from the origins to 1980: *Journal of Christian Education*, Papers 88, April 1987, p.40
(4) Ibid., p.41

(5)   NSW Higher Education Act, 1969, 6.a.i,ii. Quoted in Hill, op.cit., p.42

(6)   Hill, op.cit., p.42.

(7)   Ibid, p.46

(8)   Report quoted in "SCD library co-operation: a discussion paper" [E. Perrin] in SCD Libraries Committee minutes file.

(9)   Gardner, Richard K. *Library collections: their origin, selection and development*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981, quoted by Gary Gorman in "Principles and procedures for collection development in theological libraries", 1985. SCD Libraries Committee minutes file.

(10)   Gorman, Gary E. Principles and procedures for collection development in theological libraries: amended version of opening remarks at ANZATS Library Consultation, Adelaide, 1985, p.1

(11)   Ibid., p.1

(12)   G. Gorman to H. Arns, 7.10.1985

(13)   H. Arns to G. Gorman, 19.11.1985

(14)   G. Gorman to H. Arns, 21.11.1985

(15)   H. Arns to E. Perrin, 23.6.1986

(16)   G. Gorman to H. Arns, 3.3.1987

(17)   H. Arns to G. Gorman, 13.3.1987

(18)   G. Gorman to H. Arns, 17.3.1987

(19)   H. Arns to Secretary, SCD Academic Board, 3.9.1987

(20)   Already the first person proposed to work on the project had proved unavailable, and a second person was nominated

(21)   G. Kelly to SCD Academic Board, 18.2.1988

(22)   McIntosh, Lawrence D. *Library guide sheet No. 12: resources for the Study of systematic theology*. Parkville, Vic.: Joint Theological Library, 1986. Gorman, G.E. and L. Gorman *Theological and religious reference materials: systematic theology and church history*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood ress, 1985. (pages 60-63 and 134-137) *Religious books, 1876-1982*. New York: Bowker, 1983 (randomly selected items from pages 785, 791 and 3641-3649).

(23)   Minutes of meeting of SCD Libraries Committee, 18.3.1988 (G. Kelly)

(24)   Including those for Frank Carleton who compiled the Patristics checklist at CIS in August 1988

(25)   Minutes, 17.6.1988 (N. Ormerod)

(26)   Ibid.

(27)   No files had been officially maintained for the Libraries Committee. Documentation prior to December 1988 was gathered from files maintained by the Librarians at CIS and UTI Hunters Hill.

(28)   Collection development policies for libraries of the Sydney College of Divinity: phase 1: determination of parameters and draft project proposal. Consultants: Fr G.E. Gorman and Mr B.R. Howes (School of Information Studies, Riverina-Murray Institute of Higher Education) 19 February 1988.

(29)   Minutes 22.10.1988 (N. Ormerod)

(30)   Summary report, p.4

(31)   G. Gorman to H. Arns, 16.5.1989

(32)   Ibid.

(33) W.K.s Hoekstra, Secretary, Academic Board, to MI Registrars, 4.3.1989
(34) Final report, p.9
(35) Ibid., p.14
(36) A. Dean, SCD Registrar, to all MI Registrars, 18.9.1990
(37) Australian Council of Libraries and Information Services, *ACLIS News*, v.3., no. 4, December 1990, Appendix F
(38) Hill, op.cit., p.50
(39) After G. Ferguson, quoted by Hill, op.cit. p.49

Gai Smith is Librarian of the Catholic Theological Union, Hunter's Hill, NSW.
Mara Goodall is Librarian part-time at Churches of Christ (NSW) Theological College, and also at Morling College, Eastwood, NSW.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Still a few copies available: The Joint Collection Development Policy for the Libraries of the Sydney College of Divinity, May 1992. Cost $30.50 plus $8.40 p & p within Australia, $15.40 to NZ. Orders with cheques payable to Sydney College of Divinity, to Gai Smith, Union Theological Institute, 1 Mary Street, Hunters Hill, NSW, 2110.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

COLLECTION EVALUATION IN
AUSTRALIAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIES
PART II

Gary E Gorman

School of Information Studies
Charles Sturt University - Riverina

User-Centred Measures

This kind of evaluation must measure actual use by users and assumes that heavy use of a collection necessarily means it is a 'good' collection. An implicit assumption in this approach is that a measure of the use of a book is a measure of its value to the library. This assumption is the basis of the Slote method of collection weeding, which argues that in weeding one is aiming to reduce the stock to a core collection that will satisfy 95-99 per cent of present use as measured by loan statistics.[16] While it is not difficult to collate figures that indicate classes of books that have not been used in the past, and thus are likely not to be used in the future (for example, fiction collections in a theological library), it may not be possible to do the same for individual items in the collection (works by Flannery O'Connor). Nevertheless, there is little doubt that the best method of establishing likely future use of any individual work is its 'shelf-time period', that is, the time the work has remained on the shelf since it last issued, or (in the case of very recent acquisitions) since its accession. Most writers have now accepted that past use is the most reliable indicator of likely future use in *large research libraries*. Despite this general acceptance one must be aware that there are great variations in different subject areas and that the method needs to be applied with caution. There is minimal precedent in the form of studies of theological collections, and one must wonder whether many Australian theological libraries can be classed as 'large' research collections?

There are at least seven problems inherent in the use and user studies approach. First, it is necessary that some statistics have already been gathered for a reasonable period. Should these statistics not be available, then some sampling must be employed. This could be sampling of the total collection, or a form of sampling of current use such as current loans. Second, statistics gathered on the use of certain parts of any collection do not necessarily reflect the use of other parts, or of different uses of the same parts. For instance, measuring the use of a theological collection by B.Th. students does not indicate the research value and use of that collection. Third, there are problems in measuring 'in-house' use, as most of the

methods rely on user cooperation or on staff who are involved in other work at the time, or are used in uncontrolled areas of the library; given the limited number of staff and long opening hours of most theological libraries, these last two problems are particularly telling. Fourth, the method measures demands rather than needs, and thereby raises the important question of whether measures of what has actually been required in the past should be taken as reliable indicators of what ought to be needed in the future. It is necessary at all times to consider the question of whether theological libraries should be expanding the outlook of their students rather than necessarily limiting collections to cater only for the current outlook. Fifth, any surveys of actual users must of necessity ignore potential users, unless it is to be assumed that the potential users will have the same needs and make the same demands as do existing users. Extrapolation and the forecasting of future use can be effective only if the likely requirements of potential users can be estimated; the more closely the forecast is based on current use, the more likely it is to reinforce the current patterns of use. Sixth, what is the real meaning of 'use' as it is understood by the users being surveyed? There may be considerable variation in what users understand by the words 'use' and 'read', and the term 'use' is often viewed as akin to 'usefulness', rather than as the simple act of 'making some use of'. Seventh, familiarity with the bookstock will influence the advice and recommendations given by staff to patrons. It is almost inevitable that where professional advice is offered, there will be a tendency to recommend material that is familiar or has recently come to notice, thus influencing the results of any 'use' study, no matter how internally valid that study may be; surveys must be designed to take this phenomenon into account and to minimize it.

Use-Centred Measure 1: Circulation Studies. These studies are used to identify the less used parts of a collection for weeding, to identify a core collection, perhaps for duplication or special treatment, or to identify use patterns of selected subject areas for adjustment of funding and collection development practices, and also to identify user populations. The methods used certainly reflect current circulation patterns, but the basic problem remains that although circulation may be a measure of what was done in the past, it is not necessarily a measure of what ought to have been done, or of what is likely to be done in the future. The statistics kept must show loans by different classes of borrowers and of different classes of materials and must also measure different loan periods. Some method of comparison of the figures with those of acquisitions in the relevant subject areas should also be included.

Advantages of circulation studies include the following: with computerization of circulation procedures the data are easily collected and easily arranged for analysis; the duration of a study is flexible; sample sizes can easily be adjusted to suit changing circumstances; the units are easily counted; and the information is objective. Among the disadvantages one may mention that they exclude in-house consultation and thus are

almost certain to underrepresent actual use. They may indeed misrepresent it, for although some research shows a high correlation between volumes used in the library and volumes taken out on loan, other work throws some doubt on this.[17] Circulation studies reflect only successes, and do not record user failures; they may be biased through the inaccessibility of heavily used material; they could fail to identify low use through obsolescence or low quality material.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Circulation Studies

Advantages

1   data are easily categorized for analysis

2   duration of study and size of sample are highly flexible

3   units of information are easily counted

4   information is objective

5   automated circulation systems can generate data as part of normal routines

6   types of users can be correlated with types of material

Disadvantages

1   actual use is under-represented because in-house use is excluded

2   user or collection failures are not counted, only successes

3   bias may exist because heavily used materials are inaccessible

Use-Centred Measure 2: In-House Use Studies. This approach can be used to record the use of material consulted in the library. In-house user studies give more complete pictures of in-house use than do other methods, and they can be used in conjunction with circulation studies for more accurate information on specific parts of the collection. On the other hand, they rely on user cooperation, so they are difficult to use in 'uncontrolled' areas; certain aspects of timing and of the non-recording of materials in circulation may bias results; and they also reflect only successes and do not report failures. It is necessary to define precisely what is meant by 'in-house' and for that purpose some kind of marking of material is used so that it can be seen if it has been disturbed, and use may be more narrowly defined by taking into account only material taken from the shelves and left on tables for re-shelving. Because there is also a considerable amount of variation in use of different parts of a collection, it would be unwise to

make any decision on the basis of 'in-house' studies that could not be verified and supported by other kinds of measures.

Advantages and Disadvantages of In-House Use Studies

Advantages

1   they can correlate type of user with type of material, giving a more complete idea of use

2   they can be used in conjunction with a circulation study of the same part of the collection to give a more complete picture

3   they are appropriate for non-circulating collections

Disadvantages

1   they are difficult to apply in open stacks without full user cooperation, so may need supplementation with another method (observation, etc)

2   the timing of studies may bias results (e.g., during peaks and troughs)

3   materials in circulation are not available for in-house use

4   they do not indicate user failure to find information

Use-Centred Measure 3: Inter-library Loan Requests. Inter-library loan (ILL) requests represent use of the collection because they show what is not in the collection but is still required by the user. In general ILL requests should be viewed as indicators of unmet research demand on the part of users. Accordingly, analysis of inter-library loan statistics can identify areas where the collection is not meeting user needs. ILL requests can also help identify journals to be considered for subscription and serve as a means of monitoring resource-sharing agreements. To be successful an an evaluation tool ILL requests must be recorded by subject and date, not just by specific item. According to the annual ANZTLA statistics, ILL requests are minimal for many member libraries; if this is a genuine reflection of such activity, then inter-library loans are unlikely to contribute much to collection evaluation in this instance. Nevertheless, the larger, more active libraries may want to consider ILL requests as an additional source of information.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Inter-library Loan Requests

Advantages

1   statistical data tend to be readily available

2   analysis is baed on items of known demand

3   requests may serve to identify changing demands or collection
       deficiencies

Disadvantages

1   statistics may be difficult to interpret

2   ILL requests miss users who go elsewhere for materials

Use-Centred Measure 4: Document Delivery Tests. These are used to
assess the capability of the library to provide its users with the items at the
time they need them. They must measure (1) the extent to which the
collection is adequate to provide the material needed in specific subject
areas, (2) the speed with which the material is provided, (3) the effort the
user is required to expend in order to get results, and (4) the level of
precision of the system expressed by its ability to provide what is needed
and to filter out what is not needed. While it is certainly important to
design the study so that it does not interfere with normal work routines,
this introduces the problem that a time and a method that best suit staff
requirements and best fit into work patterns may not be the best in terms of
objective measurement. One might almost assume the reverse to be true: for
instance, a time that suits work patterns could well be a 'slack period' and
would measure a 'non-typical' delivery pattern. An effective approach
would be to design an instrument that lists a number of documents (or
references to them) thought to be those most likely to be needed by the users,
and then to determine how many of the items are owned by the library, how
many are available at the time, and how long it takes to make them
available. Although the technique is said to simulate the processes
employed by a user who walks into the library and searches for a
document, it may be difficult not to introduce unconscious variations. The
best way, of course, would be to make use of 'real-time' situations, but this
would almost certainly result in some unnecessary complications; it could
not only lower the quality of the service being offered at the time but also
introduce an unmeasurable bias. Among the advantages of document
delivery tests are these: they provide objective information on the ability of
the system to satisfy specified user needs; the data can be comparable and
therefore compared among different libraries; they are not difficult to
design, to understand, or to install. However, these advantages are
counterbalanced by several disadvantages: it is difficult to compile a list of
representative citations for use in checking the actual delivery procedures;
they require repeated comparable tests; since the staff who perform the tests
will be familiar with the library's routines, the results can underestimate

the problems faced by users, who are not so well versed in the techniques of using libraries.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Document Delivery Tests

Advantages

1   tests provide objective measurement of a collection's ability to satisfy user needs

2   data can be compared across libraries if identical lists are used

Disadvantages

1   a list of representative citations is not easily compiled

2   user error in locating materials is under-represented because staff perform the searches

3   results require comparison with studies in other libraries in order to be meaningful

Use-Centred Measure 5: Shelf Availability Tests. These form a subset of document delivery tests and are used to determine whether items presumed to be in the collection are actually available to users. The importance of shelf availability per se is open to question, however. Danton reported on work done on the collections of some German research libraries that had been badly damaged in the Second World War and showed that in some libraries up to 40 per cent of the collection was considered not worth replacing.[18] This would indicate that a considerable part of the collections of those libraries was 'redundant'. If that were so of these carefully selected research collections, it is reasonable to assume that it might be even more so in some of the rather haphazardly collected public and academic libraries elsewhere, and that simple measures of what is, or is not, available when asked for may have little to do with any measures of value. These figures correspond quite well with those of Trueswell, who calculated that 99 per cent of the circulation requirements could have been met by 25 and 40 per cent respectively of the two collections.[19]

A shelf availability test has several advantages: it reports failures of real users, and is thus more likely to reflect what is actually happening, rather than what is thought to be happening; it can be used to identify reasons for user failure outside the scope of collection development policies, and thus can be useful for other purposes (such as improving reshelving procedures); it can be repeated readily. Among its disadvantages is the fact that it depends on the cooperation of users; the design and operation of each study is difficult and time consuming; it do not identify the needs of non-users.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Shelf Availability Tests

Advantages

1 tests report user failure to find materials

2 they can be readily repeated at regular intervals to measure changes in library performance

Disadvantages

1 tests depend on the cooperation of users to an unacceptabe degree in some situations

2 they can be difficult and time consuming to design and implement

3 they do not identify the needs of non-users

4 users may not recall all items they failed to find

Use-Centred Measure 6: User Surveys. The purpose of user (opinion) surveys is to determine how well a library's collections meet user information needs. They do this by gathering responses, both written and verbal, to specific questions about user perceptions and use of the collections. Information from a properly structured and carefully administered user survey can be extremely useful in evaluating collection effectiveness in meeting user needs. Surveys can also help to define a user community more accurately and identify groups that could be better served. This is perhaps their most valuable contribution to collection development. For example, a survey of Adelaide theological college library users found that a comparatively small number of academic staff possessed research degrees, that a large number were working on higher degrees, and that they found little of research value in their college libraries – all of which information, when quantified, can contribute to more effective collection development. However, there are so many pitfalls in the development, administration and analysis of surveys that they should be tackled only by the very brave, the very foolish or the very fortunate (that is, a librarian with experience in survey work, or with access to those with such experience).

Advantages and Disadvantages of Surveys

Advantages

1 surveys are not limited to existing data but create new data

2 they permit direct input from users

3   surveys can be either simple or complex, depending on a library's requirements

Disadvantages

1   survey design is difficult

2   analyzing and interpreting survey data can be difficult

3   users tend to be passive about collections so need to be surveyed individually, at some cost both financially and temporally

4   users may not cooperate, which skews the results

5   many users do not know what a library can be expected to do for them and therefore cannot judge what is adequate

6   surveys may record perceptions which do not reflect actual experiences

Conclusion

In any evaluation of a library collection a combination of procedures must be employed. This is because each technique, whether collection- or use-centred, measures a specific aspect of the quality of a collection. No technique is complete in itself, and each has been developed to obtain specific kinds of data. The selection of evaluation techniques must be based on the precise questions to which a librarian is seeking answers. In terms of collection development these questions relate to density and intensity:

What is our collection density?

What is its size?

How does it compare with standard lists?

How adequate is it to meet user demands?

What is our collection intensity?

Is it appropriate to the curriculum?

Does it reflect changing staff profiles?

Are sufficient materials available in heavily used subjects?

The selection of methods must be based on the questions appropriate to the specific situation. When selecting a technique, make sure it is valid for producing the kind of information required. And always employ both collection-centred and user-centred techniques in tandem so that a more complete understanding of the collection will be achieved.

16   Stanley J. Slote, *Weeding Library Collections: Library Weeding Methods*. 3rd ed. (Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1989).

17   William E. McGrath, 'Correlating the Subjects of Books Taken out of and Books Used within an Open-Stack Library.' *College and Research Libraries* 32, 4 (1971): 280-285; Geoffrey Ford, 'Stock Relegation in Some British University Libraries.' *Journal of Librarianship* 12, 1 (1980): 42-55.

3   For examples of practical applications of the methods to be discussed in the balance of this chapter see Anthony J. Arthur, *Collection Development: A Report to the Swinburne Librarian*. 2 vols. (Hawthorn: Swinburne Ltd, 1985); Bruce C. Bennion, 'The Use of Standard Selection Sources in Undergraduate Library Collection Development.' *Collection Management* 2, 2 (1978): 141-152; Gary D. Byrd, D.A. Thomas and Katherine E. Hughes, 'Collection Development Using Inter-Library Loan Borrowing and Acquisitions Statistics.' *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 70, 1 (1982): 1-9; Pauline A. Scales, 'Citation Analyses as Indicators of the Use of Serials: A Comparison of Ranked Title Lists Produced by Citation, Counting and from Use Data.' *Journal of Documentation* 32, 1 (1976): 17-25; Eric J. Wainwright and John E. Dean, *Measures of Adequacy for Library Collections in Australian Colleges of Advanced Education*. 2 vols. (Perth: Western Australian Institute of Technology, 1976).

18   J. Periam Danton, 'The Subject Specialist in National and University Libraries with Special Reference to Book Selection.' *Libri* 17, 1 (1967): 42-58.

19   Richard A. Trueswell, 'A Quantitative Measure of User Circulation
      Requirements and Its Possible Effect on Stack Thinning and
      Multiple-copy Determination.' *American Documentation* 16 (1965):
      20-25.

<center>* * * * * * * * * * * *</center>

ONE (OR TWO) FRENCH PRIESTS AND THE "CATHOLICS OF NEW SOUTH WALES" IN 1788

<center>*Frank R.L. Carleton*</center>

When published at the end of 1988 J.H. Donohoe's *The Catholics of New South Wales 1788-1820 and their families* (Sydney: Archives Authority of New South Wales, 1988. viii, 432 p. ISBN 0 7240 7974 2)[1] was advertised in the *Catholic Weekly*[2] and available at $19.95 through the Government Information Service in Hunter Street, Sydney. According to the preface, which bears the names of the Principal Archivist and the Chairperson of the Archives Authority of New South Wales:

> The Archives Authority believes that the present work - involving 10,000 names - is an important contribution to the documentation of the individuals who made history. It should be of value to family historians, Catholic historians and scholarly researchers alike. (p.iii).

---

[1] "Compiled and edited by James Hugh Donohoe in association with the NSW State Archives and Government Records Repository ("Kingswood"), O'Connell St., St Marys, 2760, and the Archives of St. Mary's Cathedral (sic), St. Mary's Cathedral Road, Sydney 2000" (titlepage verso)

[2] *Catholic Weekly* 7 Dec. 1988 p.21. Curiously, and despite its imprint, this publication did not appear in the June, 1989 list of its publications issued by the Archives Authority, but was advertised again in a letter by the Coordinator of the New South Wales Bicentennial Archives Program which was published in the November, 1989 issue of *Footprints*, the quarterly journal of the Melbourne Diocesan Historical Commission (*Footprints* 6 (12) Nov. 1989 p.36).

The volume consists chiefly of a long unreferenced list of convicts' names, plus, in the cases of numerous women, their husbands (pp.53-420), followed by two appendices - Appendix A : 'List of convict ships arriving in New South Wales 1788-1820' (pp.421-431) and Appendix B: 'The Editor' (a 6-paragraph autobiographical summary p.432) at the end. Appendix A is "reproduced from Guide to the State Archives of N.S.W. No. 14 - *Guide to Convict Records* ..." (p.422). My attention was drawn to several sentences in an initial 6-page section preceding the list, which is entitled, 'Editor's Historical Observations' (pp. 5-10). These sentences, which are quoted below, contain an oblique reference to a priest on the Laperouse Expedition which sojourned in Botany Bay, where a fortified encampment was established, from 26th January to 10th March, 1788 - that is, during the initial weeks of the First Settlement.

> There were a number of priests in the colony before Father Therry.[2A] Their involvement is well documented [but no evidence is cited]. Unfortunately the whole picture may not be known as fully as it may have been [meaning as it once was?]. The first priest actually recorded was a member of La Perouse's expedition [no record is referenced]. (p.8).

The priest assigned to the Astrolabe, the second ship of the expedition was designated in the 'Etat général et nominatif des officiers, savans, artistes et marins ...', or lists of personnel embarked under the orders of Laperouse, as follows:

> Le Père Receveur, Religieux Cordelier, naturaliste, et faisant les fonctions d'aumonier.[3] (Father Receveur, Conventual Franciscan friar, naturalist and doing the duties of chaplain).

The Boussole and the Astrolabe entered Botany Bay on the morning of 26th January, 1788 as the first fleet was departing for Port Jackson and reached the anchorage it had vacated about 9 o'clock.[4] The exchange of courtesies then initiated by Captain John Hunter of H.M.S. Sirius was succeeded by a round of cordial visits by British parties to the French at Botany Bay and

---

[2A] John Joseph Therry (1790-1864) and his senior clerical colleague, the Revd Philip Conolly (1786-1839) were the two first official Catholic chaplains appointed to New South Wales. They arrived in Sydney in May, 1820.

[3] Reproduced in facsimile in *La généreuse et tragique Expedition Laperouse*. Ed. by François Bellec. Rennes : Ouest France, 1985, pp.47-50.

[4] Laperouse, quoted in Henry Selkirk 'La Perouse and the French monuments at Bontany Bay' *Royal Australian Historical Society Journal and proceedings* 4(7) 1981, p.338.

by French parties to Sydney Cove while the French ships remained.[5] As Surgeon Worgan wrote in terms similar to the writers of other First Fleet journals :

> ... there was a constant succession of mutual good offices passing between us. We visited each other frequently, sometimes the parties going by water, sometimes by land (for it is only 8 to 10 miles over) and the little difficulties and fatigues which ye voyagers or the travellers underwent were thought amply compensated if they could obtain a social intercourse with one another.[6]

As recorded by Phillip, King, Collins, White, Tench, Clark and Worgan absconding convicts who tried for admission to the French ships were firmly rebuffed.[7]

According to Lieutenant King:
> Monsieur De La Perouse informed me that a number of ye convicts had been to him and offered to enter, but he had dismissed them with threats, and gave them a day's provision to carry them back to ye settlement.[8]

Père Receveur features in King's gratified account of an early February visit to Botany Bay, although the French friar is inaccurately designated as an abbé, the title for a secular, not a religious, priest:
> An abbe, who is also on the expedition as a collector of natural history appears a man of letters and geniality.[9]

Some three weeks after the Laperouse Expedition's arrival, on February 17th, Père Receveur died - not, it seems, as the delayed result of wounds

---

[5] These visits are tabulated in *The road to Botany Bay: the story of Frenchmans Road, Randwick through the journals of Laperouse and First Fleet writers.* Comp. and introduced by Alec Protos. Randwick & District Historical Society, 1988, p.8.

[6] George B. Worgan *Journal of a First Fleet Surgeon.* Sydney: Library Council of New South Wales, 1978, p.31

[7] For the relevant extracts from the journals of these writers see *The road to Botany Bay ...* op.cit. pp.15-16.

[8] Quoted ibid. p.15.

[9] Philip Gidley King *The journal of Philip Gidley King : Lieutenant, R.N. 1787-1790.* Ed. by Paul G. Fidlon and R.J. Ryan. Sydney: Australian Documents Library, 1980 p.39.

sustained in Samoa as has sometimes been supposed.[10] Mystery surrounds the nature and circumstances of his death. In two letters written only a few days before the friar's death Laperouse reported on the good health of all his men. In the second he observed:

> Our crews arrived at Botany Bay in a better state of health than they enjoyed even at their departure from Brest.[11]

Neither his brother priest, the Abbé Jean André Mongez, nor the officers of the Boussole, who visited Sydney Cove together between 20th and 22nd February, just three to five days after Père Receveur died, and then again on 4th March, seem to have spoken of his death. Nor did Captain John Hunter, who came over to Botany Bay between 26th and 28th February, nor Captain Shea of the Marines, who followed on 7th and 8th March, report the death of the Conventual Franciscan naturalist.[12]

In the words of François Bellec:

> Whether sick or mortally wounded by a native the first priest to die on Australian soil carried away one of the lowly and terrible secrets of the Laperouse Expedition.[13]

This was forever lost when the expedition foundered in the Solomon Islands within weeks of leaving Botany Bay.

What is well reported by several of the First Fleet writers, but with varying degrees of accuracy, and only after the departure of the French ships on March 10th, is the Latin inscription fixed above a humble grave. According to Surgeon White, who visited the site on 1st June, 1788, it was "distinguished only by a common headstone stuck lightly into the loose earth which covered it."[14] The inscription was painted on a board nailed to a tree above the grave. Either its obvious impermanence as White noted,[15] or its removal by the aborigines as Tench asserted,[16] inspired

---

[10] National Parks & Wildlife Service *Bare Island Historic Site* (brochure). Sydney 1975.

[11] Quoted Selkirk op.cit., p.346.

[12] For this succinct summary of salient facts from several sources the writer is indebted to François Bellec 'Rendez-vous a Botany Bay' *Neptunia* 170, juin 1988, p.5.

[13] Loc.cit.

[14] John White *Journal of a voyage to New South Wales*. With a biographical introduction by Rex Rienets. Ed. by Alec H. Chisholm. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1962, p.136.

[15] Loc.cit.

Phillip to have the inscription engraved on a sheet of copper and nailed to the same tree near to, or on the site of, the French observatory.[17]

White, Tench, Phillip and Collins each recorded the text of the inscription in their published journals.[18] The transcription by Collins is probably the most accurate. It recorded the name 'L. Receveur', the 'L' standing for 'Laurent', Père Receveur's name in religion, instead of 'Le Receveur', a corruption of his surname by the other three writers. This transcription reads:

> Hic jacet
> L. Receveur
> Ex F.F. Minoribus
> Galliae Sacerdos
> Physicus in Circumnavigatione Mundi,
> Duce D. de la Perouse
> Obiit Die 17th Febr., Anno
> 1788 [19]

What then did either priest of the visiting French expedition have to do with the "Catholics of New South Wales" in 1788? One did not visit Sydney Cove. There is no record in the First Fleet journals of any religious ministrations by the other priest, the Abbé Mongez, when he did. And any religious ministrations, however casual or incidental, would have been remarkable as Catholicism was a proscribed religion within the British jurisdiction. On February 13th Phillip, in the presence of the Judge Advocate, took the Oath of Abjuration against the Catholic Eucharistic doctrine of Transubstantiation.[20]

---

[16] Watkin Tench *Sydney's first four years* ... With an introduction and annotations by L.F. Fitzhardinge. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1961, p.55.

[17] Loc.cit.

[18] Selkirk quotes in full and examines the text of the inscription as rendered by each of these writers, noting their errors. Selkirk op.cit. pp.347-348.

[19] This translates: Here lies L. Receveur, from the Friars Minor, priest of France, scientist in the circumnavigation of the world; under the leadership of Laperouse. Died the 17th day of February in the year 1788.

[20] Quoted in C.M.H. Clark *A history of Australia*. I. From the earliest times to the age of Macquarie. Melbourne UP, 1963 p.89. Ironically the visit of the Laperouse Expedition, because of the presence of its two priests, is traditionally associated with the inception of the Mass in Australia, whether said aboard ship, or ashore, in Botany Bay.

J.H. Donohoe does not state the relationship between one (or two) priests of the Laperouse Expedition and the "Catholics of New South Wales" in 1788. The allusion may be a gratuitous irrelevance in his prolix preliminary matter which is characterised by the following features:
- obscurity of expression (see the foregoing quotation from p.8)
- infelicities of style e.g. the first sentence: "Ever since I began to research my roots ..." (p.1)
- unreferenced assertions: note again the quotation from p.8 and inter alia, "It has been acknowledged by historians, based on reasonable statistics collected during the Colony's first half century, that Catholics represented about 30% of the population ... (p.1). (Neither the historians nor the statistics are cited).
- no apparatus of footnotes or other precise citations
- absence of reference to standard works of Australian and Australian Catholic history and to the whole periodical literature of Australian history (see the meagre bibliography of inchoate citations on pp.41-42 for obvious gaps)[21]
- no apparent acquaintance with the literature of eighteenth century English Catholic Recusancy, notwithstanding the writer's speculations about the number of Catholics in the First Fleet (pp.1-2)
- extraordinary, if not hilarious, anachronisms like "family reunions" (p.3) and "marriage celebrant" (p.4)

---

[21] An example of glaring omissions is provided by the four paragraphs entitled, 'The miracle of Father Jeremiah O'Flynn' on p.13 with facing fanciful illustration.
The Revd Jeremiah Francis O'Flynn (1788-1831), an Irish priest and ex-Trappist monk arrived in Sydney, without official permission, in November, 1817. Following a legendary semi-clandestine ministry to local Catholics he was expelled from the colony by Governor Macquarie in May,.1818.
The bibliography does not include Eric O'Brien's well known study of Father O'Flynn's career, *The dawn of Catholicism in Australia* (Sydney 1928) nor any of the following relevant periodical articles:
- W.H. Grattan Flood 'Rev. Jeremiah Francis O'Flynn, second Prefect-Apostolic of Australia (1816-1819)' *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 5th series 6 (576) Dec. 1915 pp. 603-609.
- C. Duffy 'The leaving of the consecrated Host by Father O'Flynn' *Journal of the Australian Catholic Historical Society* 2 (2) 1967 pp. 1-20.
- Cathaldus Giblin 'James Dixon and Jeremiah O'Flynn, two prefects-apostolic in Australia' *Collectanea Hibernica* 25, 1983 pp.63-85.

Even more surprisingly perhaps, the text makes no reference to an original autograph letter, signed by Father O'Flynn, written in London and dated 27 March 1817 which survives in the Sydney Archdiocesan Archives at St. Mary's Cathedral. This writer has a photocopy.

It would require an article of considerable length, or a page by page list, to detail all the stylistic, bibliographical and historical solecisms with which the preliminary matter teems and to examine its obscurely explained methodology and the utility of the unreferenced lists which follow.

The correctives adduced above could prove salutary for users of a publication, produced at public expense, which has enjoyed some currency. According to a letter of 19th December, 1988 to this writer from the Principal Archivist, Archives Authority of New South Wales:

> The total expenditure from the Bicentennial grant upon *The Catholics of New South Wales* was about $25,000, the great bulk of which was direct printing costs. It is confidently expected that this expenditure will be more than recouped from sales. And indeed, you will be gratified to know that hundreds of copies have already been sold. (file reference AO 87/109A).

Gratified users of this publication may care to advise the publishing body of their satisfaction.

Frank R.L. Carleton

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

PERSONNEL UPDATES AND NEWS

LIBRARIAN SEEKING POSITION:

Lyn Elsholz, recently returned from Christian Leaders Training College in PNG seeks position anywhere in Australia. Contact Lyn on (02) 899 2612 or (02) 651 1270; Address: 59 Jaffa Road, Dural, NSW, 2158.

STAFF MOVEMENTS:

Corpus Christi College in Melbourne has seen the following changes. In June 1992 Kay Cole retired and has been replaced by Virginia de Crespigny, formerly at Deakin University Library. At the end of the year Jean Leggett resigned. Lorraine Chapman and Judith Harker have joined the CCC team. Farewell and welcome respectively!

Ruth Millard, Ridley College, Melbourne, begins maternity leave at the end of May. Best wishes to Ruth and husband Ian. Welcome to Kerrie Hunter who fills Ruth's position for several months.

LIBRARY STATISTICS

Almost every year at the ANZTLA Conference, there are mumblings about why we need to collect statistics.

Recently I used the ANZTLA statistics for St Barnabas' College Library to perform a very interesting exercise. The 'gut feeling' I had about the cost of books and the performance of the budget were substantiated.

I presented these statistics to my library committee and then to the St Barnabas' College Council. The statistics made a big impact on all to whom they were presented, unfortunately, this has not yet had practical ramifications on the library budget, however ... (one can but hope).

How the Budget has been Spent:

	Mono $	Serial $	Total $	Budget $
1988	6,678	1,675	8,353	7,000
1989	6,169	1,682	7,851	8,000
1990	6,760	2,108	8,868	9,000
1991	6,917	2,410	9,427	9,000
1992				10,000

	Mono %	Serial %	Books Purchased	Average Book Cost
1988	79.9	20	395	16.90
1989	78.5	21.4	246	25.07
1990	76.2	23.7	294	22.99
1991	71.4	28.6	240	25.07

Explanation of Statistics

Since 1988 Serials/Periodicals have increased as a percentage of actual expenditure by nearly 9% causing a similar decrease in the amount spent on books.

At the same time the cost of books has increased by 45%. This has meant a decrease in the number of books purchased from 395 to 240. It is too early to know anything for sure about 1992 statistics but it is my feeling that this trend is continuing. I estimate that the average price of books is now about $30 and periodical prices have increased considerably.

Conclusions

Based on 1991 statistics in order to return to the balance of 1988 (20% periodicals, 80% books) the 1993 budget should be increased to $15,100.

Wendy Davis,
Librarian, St Barnabas' College, Adelaide.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

REVIEW

Journal of Religious and Theological Information. Vol. 1, no. 1 (1993). Binghamton, NY : Haworth Press, 1993- . ISSN 1047-7845. Semi-annual.

Recognizing an obvious lacuna in the literature, the redoubtable Bill Cohen has joined forces with an army of mostly North American theological librarians to produce a journal focussed on theological bibliography in general and theological librarianship in particular. Since the pre-publication publicity touted this as an international journal - and one earnestly hopes it will be! - the aim of this review is to assess (as much as one can on the basis of just one issue) whether it is a truly international journal and whether it is relevant to librarians in this part of the world.

The journal is published in the familiar Haworth Press format of a sturdy issue of about 120 pages, with clear, comfortably spaced type on acid-free paper. The text is accompanied by a plethora of Haworth Press advertising, inviting all and sundry to call a 1-800 number or to mail the tear-off sheets to Binghamton, NY. There is a notable absence of non-American addresses for agents of the journal or the press.

The content of the journal has been masterminded by a massive editorial board, which reads with a *Who's Who* of North American theological librarianship. The nineteen members include sixteen from the United States, and one each from Canada, Central America and Australia. Considering that this is meant to be an international journal, it is amazing that not one person fit to grace the editorial board could be found in either Britain or the Continent, let alone Asia or Africa. One wonders how international the journal can become when it is so overwhelmingly dominated by Americans.

The articles in this inaugural issue are generally of a very high standard and well worthy of inclusion in an international journal. The pity is that the contributors are all, without exception, Americans. Considering that the journal was more than three years in gestation, it is also amazing that not one non-American contribution could be found fit to grace its pages. To be completely fair, it must be added that the list of articles for the second

issue reveals some broadening of the base of contributors, but one might have expected at least a token gesture to the wider world of theological librarianship or bibliography in the inaugural issue.

If one detects a little bias in the editorial policy and the composition of the editorial board, this is nothing compared with the prejudicial pricing policy! To the hefty US$48 for United States subscribers must be added a massive 40% penalty for those unfortunate enough to live outside the United States thus bringing the Australian price to a handsome A$96.00. Many a theological library in this part of the world will have to consider whether it is worth cancelling two or three other journals to subscribe to this one, or whether it is more important than two or three journals which faculty are putting forward for consideration.

The seven articles are contributed by five theological librarians and two seminary professors. They cover theological publishing, pre-Reformation biography and bibliography, John Day's Reformation imprints, special collections, computer tools for biblical exegesis, information technology in general, and use and user studies. There is also a book review section, covering five items of theological bibliography.

Barbara Wheeler's article on the state of American theological publishing is informative and interesting. Paul Stuehrenberg's article on pre-Reformation publishing provides a useful list of sources. Norma Sutton's lengthy article on John Day is a very perceptive and entertaining account. Michael Krieger's article on the Marian Library of the University of Dayton is full of valuable insight and advice for librarians with special collections. Robert Bergen's article on the uses of computers in biblical exegesis extends the usual discussion of this topic into the speculative world of expert systems and hypertext. Mark Stover's article on information technology is a useful summary, but it adds little that local librarians will be unaware of. Charles van Heck's article on use and user studies provides a summary of the theory and techniques of such studies (including a useful bibliography) and would be valuable for anyone contemplating the implementation of any such study. There would seem to be something for everyone in this selection.

Notwithstanding a little looseness in editing (e.g. 'tenants' for 'tenets' on p.50 and 'criteria' for 'criterion' on p.51), this is a superb example of what a scholarly journal ought to be. Whether it ultimately fits the bill of an international journal remains to be seen; but if it is to become anything more than an elite journal for a small band of high-flying North American theological librarians, it will require a more broadly-based editorial board, a more realistic marketing policy (and a clearer understanding of the realities of theological librarianship outside the United States) and a more aggressive attempt to involve non-Americans as contributors. One ventures to hope that the editors will be willing to take such necessary initiatives.

The Australian agents for the journal are Scott Book Agencies, 248 The Parade, Norwood, SA, 5067. Telephone: 08 364 1411.

(Rev) Trevor Zweck
Lohe Memorial Library, North Adelaide, SA.

[This review will also appear in the next issue of The Australian Library Review].

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

CHAPTER PERSONNEL 1993

NSW	Chairperson:	Hans Arns Catholic Institute of Sydney 151 Darley Road MANLY NSW 2095
	Secretary:	Glenys Biddle Centre for Ministry 16 Mason's Drive NORTH PARRAMATTA NSW 2151
SA	Chairperson:	Trevor Zweck Luther Campus 104 Jeffcott Street NORTH ADELAIDE SA 5006
	Secretary:	Val Canty Parkin-Wesley College 20 King William Street WAYVILLE SA 5034
WA	Chairperson:	Alan Meers Perth Bible College Private Bag 3, KARRINYUP WA 6018
	Secretary:	Denise Hallion Catholic Library of WA PO Box 198 LEEDERVILLE WA 6007

WA	Treasurer:	Lyn White Baptist Theological College Hayman Road BENTLEY WA 6102
QLD	Chairperson:	Elizabeth Jordan Trinity Theological College 47 Cadell Street AUCHENFLOWER Q 4066
VIC	Chairperson:	Virginia de Crespigny Corpus Christi College Bayview Road CLAYTON VIC 3168
	Secretary:	Lorraine Chapman Corpus Christi College Bayview Road CLAYTON VIC 3168
NZ	Secretary:	Helen Greenwood College of St John the Evangelist 202 St Johns Road AUCKLAND 5 NZ