

# 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 Turrumurra 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 weeks 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.<sup>(22)</sup> 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 out 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 floor space 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, Turrumurra, 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 CDP's 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 press, 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 C. 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.

\*\*\*\*\*