
PANEL DISCUSSIONS

Defining Balances in Collection Development Policies

Katie Benjamin, Duke Divinity School

Andrew Keck, Southern Methodist University

Myka Kennedy Stephens, Lancaster Theological Seminary

Michelle Spomer, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary

ABSTRACT In addition to defining scope, collection development policies are increasingly defining new balances of digital/print, subscriptions/selections, faculty/student/community/regional needs, curricular/research needs, providing access/building a collection, etc. Learn from three librarians who will dig deeply into the issues around defining a particular balance in collection development as well as describe the process for defining these balances on their respective campuses.

CONSORTIAL AGREEMENTS AND PARTNERSHIPS

Myka Kennedy Stephens, Lancaster Theological Seminary

As seminary librarian at Lancaster Theological Seminary, I have found it worthwhile to consider the balance between collection development decisions for the library and the community it serves and collection development decisions based on the consortial agreements and other partnership commitments our library has made. Our collection development policy had been the result of an assessment of our collection's strengths and an evaluation of the evolving needs of our community. During a recent biennial review, we made

revisions based on conversations with other libraries that we are in relationship with. These include the member libraries of the South-eastern Pennsylvania Theological Library Association (SEPTLA) as well as Franklin & Marshall College (F&M)—a four-year liberal arts college located across the street from our campus. When I arrived at Lancaster as a new faculty member and library director, I relied on the accounts of others to discern the nature of the library's relationships and commitments. There were not any concrete statements recorded in the library's collection development policy, nor were there any formal written agreements that outlined these relationships to be found in our archives.

Based on conversations with librarians at the other SEPTLA libraries, it became clear to me that SEPTLA functions loosely as a consortium. Consortia have recently become synonymous with leveraging group purchasing power. This is not what SEPTLA does, or, at least, not at the present. Its identity as a consortium is rooted in its long and proud history of collaboration and cooperation among the member libraries. It is part of the oral history that SEPTLA library directors collaborated on collection development, with each library making specific commitments to devote portions of their budget toward filling gaps in periodicals and monograph series not held by any of the other libraries (Heisey 2014, 2). While it is well known that the SEPTLA library directors made these commitments, it is not known how these commitments changed over time and across leadership transitions.

Lancaster Theological Seminary's relationship with F&M, at least from the libraries' perspective, is primarily defined by a reciprocal borrowing arrangement. In conversations with F&M's college librarian, we were both aware of collection development decisions being made in consideration of one another's holdings. For example, F&M does not actively seek to develop subject areas like practical theology, which they know to be core to our curriculum and our patrons' research interests. Likewise, Lancaster Seminary does not actively seek to develop subject areas like philosophy or world religions beyond our immediate curricular needs because this is not an emphasis of our degree programs. While this understanding exists, neither of us could locate any formal coordinated collection development commitments by our predecessors.

While these conversations were illuminating and helped me better place the Lancaster Theological Seminary Library within

SEPTLA and in relation to F&M, it did not resolve my unanswered questions about previous commitments to coordinated collection development. What, if anything, had our library agreed to collect, maintain, and preserve? Might it be possible to revise our collection development policy, making much needed changes while upholding and honoring our present institutional commitments and relationships? To begin to answer these questions, I decided to research how SEPTLA libraries approach collection development in relation to other libraries.

Collaboration and cooperation on collection development among the SEPTLA library directors is among the generally accepted facts about SEPTLA, what it is, and what it does. SEPTLA libraries participate in a reciprocal borrowing program and direct interlibrary loan lending. These activities may be the driving force behind these criteria for SEPTLA membership found in the bylaws:

- 1.1.2. Such libraries shall have their own library facilities within the SEPTLA region with adequate collection and accessibility to support their academic programs and the interests of SEPTLA. There must be a demonstrated ongoing commitment to maintain the same. (SEPTLA 2019).

Note that this statement includes “the interests of SEPTLA” as something a member library’s collection needs to support. Logically, consideration of SEPTLA’s interests and a member library’s commitments to SEPTLA have a place in establishing collection development policy.

In spring 2019, I conducted a review of collection development policies from SEPTLA member libraries. Fifteen libraries participated in the study, including Cairn University, Clarks Summit University, Lancaster Bible College, Lancaster Theological Seminary, Missio Seminary, Moravian College and Theological Seminary, New Brunswick Theological Seminary, Palmer Theological Seminary at Eastern University, Princeton Theological Seminary, Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary, Saint Tikhon’s Orthodox Theological Seminary, United Lutheran Seminary, and the University of Valley Forge. The first thing I examined was whether the collection development policy mentioned SEPTLA. At one extreme of the spectrum, five libraries did not mention SEPTLA at all in their collection development policies. Seven libraries mentioned SEPTLA membership in their collection development policy but did not specify what bearing that membership had on collection development. Three librar-

ies mentioned SEPTLA and specified how their SEPTLA membership influenced collection development.

Though grouped at the other extreme of the spectrum, the libraries that mentioned SEPTLA and specified how SEPTLA influenced collection development provided three different understandings of coordinated collection development as part of SEPTLA membership. Reformed Episcopal Seminary stated explicitly that they do not collect “denominational or institution-specific historical materials that are or should be available at another local library or that represent the unique programs of other institutions” (Kuehner Memorial Library, Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Collection Development Policy, revised March 2019). My interpretation of this statement is that it not only includes material specific to an institution’s religious tradition, but also material specific to an institution’s curricular commitments and degree programs. Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary, a Roman Catholic seminary, has a collection development policy that clearly states a reliance on Jewish and Protestant SEPTLA member libraries to develop and presumably maintain deep collections of materials from their religious traditions (Ryan Memorial Library, Saint Charles Borromeo Seminary, Collection Development Policy and Procedures, n.d.). The policy from the former Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, now United Lutheran Seminary, was the most intriguing. It cited dialog with SEPTLA as an influence in purchasing subscriptions to periodicals, serials, databases, and major reference works (A. R. Wentz Library, United Lutheran Seminary Gettysburg Campus, Collection Development Policy, updated and revised October 2012). While the reliance upon or expectation that SEPTLA member libraries would maintain collections of materials from their own religious traditions did not seem unreasonable or out of the ordinary, this statement hinted at the deeper conversation around coordinated collection development that once existed among SEPTLA library directors.

Among those libraries that mentioned SEPTLA membership in their collection development policies but did not specify its influence on collection development, one stood out. New Brunswick Theological Seminary articulated in its collection development policy how its relationships to SEPTLA, the New York Area Theological Library Association, and Rutgers University did not “preclude the necessity of building, on the Seminary campus, a strong core collection in support of the curriculum” (Gardner A. Sage Library, New Bruns-

wick Theological Seminary, Collection Development Policy, October 2018). This statement acknowledged resource sharing made possible by institutional relationships as something that adds to the Sage Library's collection yet does not factor into key collection development decisions.

In my research of SEPTLA library collection development policies, I also wanted to see if there were ways in which our policies might lend themselves to cooperation and coordination regardless of any formal statement in the policy itself regarding other SEPTLA libraries. I focused on whether the collection development policy mentioned any specific collecting commitments. The majority of SEPTLA libraries, nine out of fifteen, did mention specific commitments in their policies. The way in which they articulated these commitments differed dramatically. Some libraries adopt a version of the Research Libraries Group (RLG) Conspectus model, while others simply list subject areas they are committed to collecting.

Research-level collecting commitments are the best point of connection if SEPTLA member libraries were to consider a coordinated approach to collection development. A research-level commitment, according to the RLG Conspectus, “includes major published source materials required for dissertations and independent research” (Library of Congress n.d.). All SEPTLA member libraries that named specific collecting commitments included their identifying denomination or religious tradition as among their research-level commitments. SEPTLA member libraries are diverse in religious traditions, so there is very little overlap of these commitments. The only significant amount of overlap is found when examining the collection development policy from Princeton Theological Seminary Library. It names several subject areas for research-level collecting, some of which overlap with the commitments named by other SEPTLA member libraries.

After sharing this with the SEPTLA membership at our spring 2019 meeting, I incorporated the findings and our discussion into a revision of Lancaster Theological Seminary Library's collection development policy (Lancaster Theological Seminary Library 2020). Regarding SEPTLA, I named our research-level commitments to subject areas related to our German Reformed heritage and our United Church of Christ affiliation as what we bring to our commitment as a SEPTLA member library. I also named that our participation in that association provides for the research needs of our

students and faculty when they extend beyond the library's narrowly focused research commitments. Regarding our relationship with F&M, I borrowed language from New Brunswick Theological Seminary's collection development policy. While the use of the F&M library is a benefit to our students and faculty, the nature of the relationship does not make it practical to rely on their collections in any way.

Since revising and adding these statements to our collection development policy, I have also considered how to publicly indicate what we intend to keep and conserve in our collection. Like many other theological libraries, we have been deaccessioning a lot of material from our collection. I have reduced the size of our circulating collection by approximately forty percent and am currently assessing and making decisions about our rare book collection. Within SEPTLA, we have looked at and talked about OCLC's GreenGlass as a tool that might help us take a more detailed look at our collections and decide as a group which materials each would commit to retain. The possibilities of such a cooperative project are attractive, yet our deaccessioning projects cannot wait for the shared adoption of a tool at a price point we can afford. For the time being, we are indicating our commitment to retain in other ways.

The first way is by adding a 583 Action Note to the MARC records of items we intend to keep and preserve. I am primarily using this for rare books I have determined we need to keep and are committing to be a home library for as long as we are able. We are an OCLC cataloging library, so we add this 583 Action Note to the OCLC record to indicate our commitment to other libraries. The following example uses syntax as recommended by the Library of Congress (2005):

583 ## \$a will conserve \$c YYYYMMDD \$2 pda \$5 LCT

We are starting by using the action "will conserve" and will update this with the specific preservation action we take on the item when that action is completed in the future.

The second way we are indicating a commitment to retain is by adding a locally defined 593 note field. MARC 59x fields are made available for libraries to define them as they need, so I decided that an appropriate companion to the 583 Action Note would be a 593 Local Retention Note. This is used primarily for items in our circulating collection, and sometimes special collections, that faculty members recommended the library retain. The syntax I have adopted is simi-

lar to the 583, and these notes are visible in our OPAC from the title notes tab in record view:

593 0# \$a retain \$c YYYY-MM \$f Name of Faculty \$x Non-public note (optional) \$z Public note (optional)

It is possible to search our OPAC specifically for these notes using search queries based on MARC fields. We are able to provide SEPTLA member libraries, and anyone else who wishes to coordinate on collection development, with encoded links that return lists of all items in our collection that we plan to retain or conserve.

In conclusion, I posit that a library rarely develops its collection in isolation. As responsible stewards of our collections, we must continue to find ways to work together in the collection and preservation of these materials. Balancing the needs of our local communities with our commitments and relationships among fellow libraries is an important piece of that work. Communicating about and sharing what your library is collecting and how you intend to care for it is a key action that you can take toward advancing that work.

Works Cited

- Heisey, Terry. 2014. "SEPTLA – A Golden Anniversary." *Teamwork: Newsletter of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Theological Library Association* (Fall 2014). septla.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Teamwork-2014_2-Fall.pdf.
- Lancaster Theological Seminary Library. 2020. "Collection Development Policy." *Library Policies*. Latest revision May 30, 2020. guides.lancasterseminary.edu/subjects/guide.php?subject=library_policies#tab-6.
- Library of Congress. 2005. "Preservation & Digitization Actions: Terminology for MARC 21 Field 583." Accessed June 18, 2020. loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/pda.html.
- . n.d. "Collecting Levels." Accessed June 18, 2020. www.loc.gov/acq/devpol/cpc.html.
- SEPTLA. 2019. "Southeastern Pennsylvania Theological Library Association Amended Bylaws as Adopted May 9, 2019." septla.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/SEPTLA-Bylaws-May-2019.pdf.

BALANCES IN SUBJECT AREA COLLECTING

Michelle Spomer, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary

I finished writing a 34-page collection development policy recently, so today, I'll be talking about the various considerations that went into the policy section on subject area collecting.

Context

In 2016, I started my job as the director of Barbour Library at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary (PTS). I brought with me 20 years of experience in theological libraries, as well as an MDiv and MLIS, but I'd never written a collection development policy, nor had I ever done collection development on a large scale before. After a major library renovation was completed in 2018, I decided that the existing policy needed to be updated, and then I quickly realized that I would really be writing a brand-new policy.

Selection Criteria

I will be focusing on subject as part of the selection criteria for library materials, but I'd like to briefly cover the other criteria that I included in the policy.

- Language — Is there a primary language that is preferred? What other languages are appropriate and why?
- Currency — Are current resources being selected? Under what circumstances is it okay to select non-current items?
- Geographic Coverage — Are global perspectives represented? Why or why not?
- Quality of Scholarship — Did it come from an expert and/or a reputable publisher?
- Format — Is there a preference for print vs. non-print? For what types of items? What formats are to be avoided and why?
- Projected Use — What's the likelihood that the item will be used? I have to say that I'll be asking this question a lot when I evaluate the standing orders in the fall.
- Cost — Are there limits in what will be spent per item? How are these limits determined?
- Subject — Which subject areas will be included in the collection? What are the factors that influence subject coverage?

Considerations for Subject Areas

Subject area collecting may seem like a no-brainer in a theological library—we all know that there should be a lot of books with “B” call numbers on the spine (or “200,” as the case may be). But knowing how to provide subject coverage that’s specific to your particular community can be tricky. These are the major considerations that helped me shape subject area coverage for the Barbour Library:

- **Seminary Mission Statement** — Collections should support the institutional mission. While mission statements generally don’t offer a lot of subject detail, they can often point in a general direction. Take a look at these two mission statements:
 - Pittsburgh Theological Seminary — “Pittsburgh Theological Seminary is a community of Christ joining in the Spirit’s work of forming and equipping people for ministries familiar and yet to unfold and communities present and yet to be gathered.”
 - Harvard Divinity School — “Harvard Divinity School educates students of religion for intellectual leadership, professional service, and ministry.”
 - “Forming and equipping people for ministry” points to the importance of practical formation, while the Harvard statement perhaps emphasizes a more academic approach. Vision statements and strategic plans should also be considered.
- **Seminary Degree Programs** — In addition to considering the Doctor of Ministry and various master’s degree programs offered at the seminary, I also wanted to be sure to include certificate and continuing education programs in developing the collection.
- **Course Descriptions** — The curriculum and corresponding course descriptions are pure gold in determining subject areas of collection. Combing through syllabi for bibliographies is also very useful.
- **Faculty Research Interests** — Often, there is much being collected for the curriculum that also supports faculty research interests. You want to keep an eye out for more specialized areas. For example, one of our faculty specializes in Asian

American history and theology, and another in theologies of disability and suffering.

- Denominational Affiliation(s) — PTS is a Presbyterian institution, specifically PC(USA). However, there are also ongoing and developing partnerships with United Methodists, Episcopalians, and Baptists. How will the collection serve them?
- Other Library Users — Who are your library users outside of faculty, staff, and students? Local clergy comprise one of our bigger groups of users, so I try to provide a certain level of practical theology and professional resources for this group.
- Special Collections — If you have special collections, are there resources you can add to enhance them?
- Local & Regional Interests — Since many PTS students go on to ministry positions locally or in the region, are there resources that could help them understand the people and history in these areas better? We had a book on reserve in the spring with the title *A History of Christianity in Pittsburgh*.
- Previous Policy Decisions — If you have a previous collection policy, which subject areas were included? Are they still relevant? Also, simply walking through the physical collection and taking note of what's been collected can be immensely helpful, especially if you're new to the institution. Of course, this can also give you ideas for deselection!
- Policies from Other Institutions — And lastly, see what you can find from other institutions. I learned a lot by finding and reading other policies. You'll find the policies I used in the reference list for this session. I was even able to add a link to Karl Stutzman's policy from AMBS, which was highlighted in yesterday's session on collection development.

Organizing Subject Criteria

Now that I had an idea of the subjects that should be collected, how was I going to prioritize and organize them? I settled on the conspectus method collection depth levels as a way to prioritize collection in subject areas. Probably, many of you have heard of or used some sort of subject conspectus in your policies. As I looked at other policies, I found many different versions of this, and decided to try to find the original conspectus.

So it turns out, in the late 1970s, a library consortium called the Research Library Group (RLG) developed the conspectus method as a national approach to collection assessment. It was described as “a multi-faceted, multi-purpose collection-centered assessment process that provides a survey of a library collection” (Wood and Strauch 1992). The conspectus process used worksheets for recording collection depth values by broad subject fields. The long-term goal of the RLG was to assure that library materials were acquired and preserved for the members’ use. This conspectus method was revised by the Association of Research Libraries and the Western Library Network in the 1990s, and I found the updated collection depth level definitions on the website for the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (www.ifla.org/publications/guidelines-for-a-collection-development-policy-using-the-conspectus-model).

Most of the policies I saw did not use the original conspectus collection depth indicator definitions and had simply taken the idea of prioritizing subject areas for collecting and made it their own. I decided to use the IFLA-revised definitions with some minor modifications and found it to be a good way to organize my subject area collecting goals. Another reason I organized subject priorities in this way is because I thought it would resonate with faculty, who were going to vote on and approve the policy as a whole.

I’ve included the conspectus level section from my collection development policy below. There are six collection depth levels, beginning with zero, which is out-of-scope subjects. Level five is a comprehensive level of collecting and, while I included the definition, there aren’t any subjects that we try to cover comprehensively.

Lastly, I distilled all the subject areas and collection levels into a summary table that provides a handy “at-a-glance” overview. Let me know if you have any questions or would like more information. I’d be happy to help!

Conspectus Collection Depth Indicator Definitions

0 — Out of Scope

The library does not intentionally collect materials in any format for these subjects.

Barbour Library: While there are certainly exceptions to this, materials outside of the LC ranges typical for theological collections (B–BX, DS, PA, PJ, Z, etc.) are not collected.

1 — *Minimal Information Level*

Collections that support minimal inquiries about this subject and include:

- A very limited collection of general materials, including monographs and reference works.
- Periodicals directly dealing with this topic and in-depth electronic information resources are not collected.

The collection should be frequently and systematically reviewed for currency of information.

Superseded editions and titles containing outdated information should be withdrawn. Classic or standard retrospective materials may be retained.

Barbour Library:

- Humanities
- Social sciences
- Professional library literature
- Pittsburgh history and news
- Fiction and poetry with religious themes

2 — *Basic Information Level*

Collections that serve to introduce and define a subject, to indicate the varieties of information available elsewhere, and to support the needs of general library include:

- A limited collection of monographs and reference works.
- A limited collection of representative general periodicals.
- Defined access to a limited collection of owned or remotely-accessed electronic bibliographic tools, texts, data sets, journals, etc.

The collection should be frequently and systematically reviewed for currency of information.

Superseded editions and titles containing outdated information should be withdrawn. Classic or standard retrospective materials may be retained.

Barbour Library:

- American sects
- World religions
- Sociology of religion
- Apologetics and philosophy of religion
- Mythology and the occult/supernatural
- Philosophy (hermeneutics, ethics, ontology, cosmology, epistemology, aesthetics, language analysis, logic, and history of philosophy)
- Anthropology
- Psychology
- Communication
- Leadership
- Popular Christian and devotional works by select authors/publishers

3 — *Study or Instructional Support Level*

Collections that provide information about a subject in a systematic way, but at a level of less than research intensity, include:

- An extensive collection of general monographs and reference works and selected specialized monographs and reference works.
- An extensive collection of general periodicals and a representative collection of specialized periodicals.
- Extensive collections of the works of well-known authors and selections from the works of lesser-known authors.
- Defined access to an extensive collection of owned or remotely-accessed electronic resources, including bibliographic tools, texts, data sets, journals, etc.

The collection should be systematically reviewed for currency of information and for assurance that essential and important infor-

mation is retained, including significant numbers of classic retrospective materials.

Barbour Library:

- Classic literature of Christianity
- Protestant denominations
- Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy
- The church and special groups (i.e., women, African Americans, people with disabilities, youth, etc.)
- The church and social issues (poverty, politics, education, civil rights, etc.)
- Science and theology
- Ecumenism and dialog
- Intersection of special topics and Christianity/religion (art and religion, etc.)
- Writing and research methods, information literacy

4 — Research Level

A collection that contains the major published source materials required for master's-level study and independent research includes:

- A very extensive collection of general and specialized monographs and reference works.
- A very extensive collection of general and specialized periodicals.
- Extensive collections of the works of well-known authors as well as lesser-known authors.
- Defined access to a very extensive collection of owned or remotely accessed electronic resources, including bibliographic tools, texts, data sets, journals, etc.

This includes older material that is retained and systematically preserved to serve the needs of historical research.

Barbour Library:

- Biblical studies

- Language tools for Greek and Hebrew
- Criticism and interpretation
- Biblical archaeology
- Historical studies
 - Church Fathers
 - Medieval church history
 - Protestant Reformation
 - United States church history
 - World Christianity
 - Christian denominational history
 - Reformed/Presbyterian history
- Studies in theology
 - Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant theological traditions
 - Intersectional theologies (feminist, black, liberation, womanist, etc.)
 - Reformed/Presbyterian theology
- Theology in ministry
 - Worship
 - Church administration and polity
 - Homiletics/preaching
 - Christian education
 - Christian ethics
 - Pastoral care and counseling
 - Protestant missions and missiology
 - Social issues (i.e., non-religious treatments of poverty, racism, urbanization, women's issues, political and governmental issues)
 - Spiritual formation

A collection in a specifically defined field of knowledge that strives to be exhaustive, as far as is reasonably possible (i.e., a “special collection”), in all applicable languages includes:

- Exhaustive collections of published materials.
- Very extensive manuscript collections.
- Very extensive collections in all other pertinent formats.
- A comprehensive-level collection may serve as a national or international resource.

Barbour Library: There are no programs or special collections at PTS that merit this level of collection depth.

The following table summarizes the subjects collected and their corresponding conspectus levels:

SUBJECT	CONSPECTUS LEVEL	LC CLASSIFICATION
American religious sects	2	BL, BR, BX
Anthropology	2	GN
Apologetics, Christian	2	BT
Biblical studies: Biblical archaeology	4	BS, DE, DS
Biblical studies: Criticism and interpretation	4	BS
Biblical studies: Greek	4	BS, PA
Biblical studies: Hebrew	4	BS, PJ
Christian ethics	4	Multiple
The church and social issues	3	Multiple
The church and special groups	3	Multiple
Classic/devotional literature of Christianity	3	Multiple
Communication	2	BV, P
Eastern Orthodoxy	3	BR, BT, BV, BX
Ecumenism and dialog	3	BX

SUBJECT	CONSPECTUS LEVEL	LC CLASSIFICATION
Fiction and poetry with religious themes	1	Multiple
Historical studies: Christian denominational history	4	BR, BX
Historical studies: Church Fathers	4	BR
Historical studies: Medieval church history	4	BR
Historical studies: Protestant Reformation	4	BR, BX
Historical studies: Reformed/Presbyterian history	4	BX
Historical studies: United States church history	4	BR, BX
Historical studies: World Christianity	4	BR
Humanities	1	Multiple
Intersection of special topics and religion	3	Multiple
Leadership	2	BV, HD, HM
Mythology and the occult/supernatural	2	BF, BL
Philosophy	2	B, BC, BD, BH, BJ
Philosophy of religion	3	BL
Pittsburgh history and news	1	F
Professional library literature	1	Z
Protestant denominational resources	3	BX
Psychology	2	BF
Roman Catholicism	3	BR, BX
Science and theology	3	BL, BT

SUBJECT	CONSPECTUS LEVEL	LC CLASSIFICATION
Social issues	4	Multiple
Sociology of religion	2	BL
Social sciences	2	H
Studies in theology: Catholic tradition	4	BT, BX
Studies in theology: Eastern Orthodox tradition	4	BT, BX
Studies in theology: Intersectional theologies	4	Multiple
Studies in theology: Protestant traditions	4	Multiple
Studies in theology: Reformed/Presbyterian theology	4	BT, BX
Theology in ministry: Christian education	4	BV
Theology in ministry: Church administration and polity	4	BV
Theology in ministry: Homiletics/Preaching	4	BS, BV
Theology in ministry: Pastoral care and counseling	4	BF, BV
Theology in ministry: Protestant missions and missiology	4	BV
Theology in ministry: Spiritual formation	4	BV
Theology in ministry: Worship	4	BV
World religions	2	BL, BM, BP, BQ
Writing and research methods, information literacy	3	BL, BR, HM, LB

Works Cited

Wood, Richard J. and Katina Strauch, eds. 1992. *Collection Assessment: A Look at the RLG Conspectus*. New York, NY: Haworth Press, Inc.

IT TAKES A VILLAGE: COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IN SUPPORT OF FACULTY AND STUDENT RESEARCH

Katie Benjamin, Duke Divinity School

My comments on collection development will be from my perspective as the director of the Duke Divinity School Library, and so from the perspective of a seminary library collection that is housed within a larger academic institution. Within that framework, I will be gesturing broadly toward some of the collection development strategies we have as a result of that relationship, both as a seminary within Duke and as a seminary within the larger context of regional research universities. Then I will be unpacking a highly specific project we have been working on in terms of collection development to support faculty and student research in the area of the history of contemporary worship movements.

To get a sense of scale and context, the way the libraries are structured at Duke is with a centralized university library that serves our general student body and four professional school libraries, one of which pertains to the Duke Divinity School. And so, while our primary constituents are the divinity school students and faculty, we also support Duke's religious studies department, as well as the interdisciplinary work of students in other departments, particularly history, political science, English, art, and so on. So already it can be seen that we have a duty to collect in support of a wider range of disciplines across the university than just Christianity and its sub-disciplines, but we also have a duty not to duplicate materials held elsewhere. Hence, if you were to visit our main university library, you would find the B to BX call numbers wedged in a very tiny corner of their basement; whereas if you were to visit my library, you would learn that we have a corresponding very tiny corner of our basement dedicated to C through Z.

Duke is also involved in a number of reciprocal borrowing agreements with area libraries; and here I will just touch on the Triangle Research Libraries Network, which brings together the area research

libraries at Duke and North Carolina Central University, both local to Durham, as well as the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and North Carolina State University in Raleigh. In addition to shipping our books back and forth upon request, TRLN supports working groups from its member libraries that focus on collection development. In past years, these efforts have been focused on a Shared Print Collection program, under which books are owned jointly by the participating libraries and stored offsite at the Library Service Center (a Duke Library location that is cost-shared among other members, which currently houses over 3 million books in dense storage and can, at its projected capacity, house 15 million). However, the result of this initiative was that all libraries owned the books and therefore none of them did; and all of our end users had to be annoyed equally to find that a book they wanted was offsite and needed to be requested for delivery to their campus library of choice. As such, the Shared Print Collection initiative was disbanded in 2018 in favor of the Cooperative Print Retention working group, which aims to encourage appropriate duplication of the collections. The best example to reflect these strategies is the East Asian Collection agreement between Duke and UNC. Both institutions have strong East Asian studies departments but, since the 1960s, their libraries have agreed that Duke will collect with a focus on Japanese studies, while UNC will collect with a focus on Chinese studies. Each university has access to the other's collection, each library buys for the other's faculty upon request in its own area of concentration, and each library duplicates the other's collection in terms of books most frequently drawn on for classroom instruction. The Duke Divinity School Library's contribution to this can be seen especially in our robust collection in Japanese Buddhism.

All of this is context for the general collection development strategy we have at the Duke Divinity School Library, where, since we cannot own everything ever published from B–BX, we focus our work under four main headings. The first, and the most immediate and urgent, is always to make sure we own everything our faculty has elected to teach in a given semester and, these days, to make sure we own as much of that as possible in a multi-user electronic format. A second layer of our collection development strategy is general research support, mostly through approval profiles, in order to keep up with the field by automatically receiving books in designated areas and from designated presses. A corresponding third layer is denominational publications: because, as important as the conversa-

tion in the field is among academic voices, so too is the conversation in the various church bodies for whom we train pastors. While Duke Divinity remains an official United Methodist theological school, our student body population has been trending ecumenically for years now, and we support Houses of Study in the Anglican/Episcopal tradition, as well as Presbyterian, Baptist, and more.

I name the fourth category of our collection development strategy as particular research support, in contrast to general. If “general” research support means to reflect where the field has been and is, “particular” research support intends the not un-ambitious goal of reflecting where the field is going—or at least, where the faculty we have the pleasure of collaborating with are headed in their particular research agendas. No approval profile in GOBI is going to help with this. However, to begin to unpack our strategies in this regard, I will use a specific example: one of our faculty is doing his work in the utterly undefined field of the history of contemporary worship movements. No one is collecting for that; I certainly was not when I learned about his current book project. But to make things even more urgent, now the same faculty member has doctoral students, focusing their work on these movements in America as well as in international contexts, particularly Southeast Asia.

So what does collection development look like for these purposes? For one thing, it involves many, many firm orders. This also helps us back-fill the collection with academic materials we have managed to miss. Other purchase requests are for titles I would never in a million years find on GOBI—the complete, published-in-house works of this or that megachurch pastor or manuals of how to do contemporary worship, also published in-house, that are frankly not something I would ever think to order for an academic library. But for these materials, at least we can say we are still “in print” here. We have not yet gotten to the truly ephemeral. In this case, collecting ephemera means tracking down charismatic worship magazines from the 1970s. These are a gold mine for this kind of work, and not just for the articles—for the advertisements as well. The first magazine I was asked to track down in this regard was *New Wine*, a Pentecostal magazine that ran from the 1960s to the 1980s. Believe it or not, Duke Divinity School did not deign to receive this print subscription in the 70s. However, in the case of *New Wine*, the publisher still exists in some format and hosts past editions in a beautifully stable, open access format. Here we can do two things: the first is to make an internal contact with

Duke Libraries' electronic resources management team and request that we add this to our knowledgebase. This would mean that, if you search for the title or ISSN in the Duke Libraries catalog, it will come up together with a link to the external site, through our "Freely Accessible Journals" tool. In other words, this process makes the magazine discoverable, or more easily discoverable, to our patrons. On the other hand, the link is only good as long as the original publisher decides to keep hosting the material. The second recourse available is to reach out directly to the publisher and request permission to download these items from their website and host them in our own digital repository in the interest of preservation. In the case of this resource, we have only undergone the first process.