

Collection Development Policy for E-resources in University Libraries: A Study

Sajini Priya Natarajan

Research Scholar, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India
E- Mail: rsajpriya@gmail.com

(Received 28 February 2018; Revised 18 March 2018; Accepted 10 April 2018; Available online 18 April 2018)

Abstract - This article describes about the Collection Development Policies in University libraries. Collection Development Policy included for Electronic Resources in University libraries, Major Roles in the Selection of Library Collections and the important Selection Tools for Print and Electronic forms, Criteria for Selecting the Book suppliers and Order of Books and Details of the collections in the library for the preceding five years. The Inter library lending/ resource sharing facility for books with other and Subscribe to e-resources.

Keywords: Collection Development, E-resources

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the composition of academic library collections has shifted toward electronic formats, resulting in a more complicated publication landscape to be navigated by selectors. Additionally, the workload of public services librarians has become more weighted toward instruction and research support, putting more pressure on the time of liaison librarians tasked with Collection Development responsibilities. These shifts have prompted academic institutions, including University Libraries, to consider a restructuring of Collection Development responsibilities. This article describes the evolution and implementation of a Collection Development policy for E-resources in University libraries in Tamil Nadu.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Asogwa, Ugwaand Ugwuanyi (2015) explains that “To evaluate the quality of online services in academic libraries in Nigeria. It seeks to assess the functionality of electronic infrastructures, to expose areas where the service needs of users are not adequately provided and to recommend solutions”.

Anand and Byers (2015) describes about “Six years ago as a leading research University in the Middle East, Khalifa University has transformed 90% of its library collection from print to electronic, with nearly 75% of its annual library budget going to pay for e-resources. Managing this transition from paper to a vast digital collection in such a short time has proven to be a challenging evolutionary experience. The Khalifa University Library experience with regard to the transition, with an emphasis on the local challenges of setting up resources on and off campus, the

current state of e-resource management, and future directions in utilizing staff and technology to address e-resource issues”.

Fluvog *et al.*, (2015) explored “How collaboration among libraries, suppliers, and the OCLC Online Computer Library Centre, Inc. (OCLC) cooperative can address some of the problems being faced with the management of electronic resources.

Bullock, Hosburgh and Mann (2015) explains “While librarians, researchers, and the general public have embraced the concept of Open Access (OA), librarians still have a difficult time managing OA resources. To find out why, Bullock and Hosburgh surveyed librarians about their experiences managing OA resources and the strengths and weaknesses of management systems.

Ramirez and Tabacaru (2015) examine “Usage patterns of psychology e-books and equivalent print titles held in Texas A&M University (TAMU) Libraries collections. The authors sought to determine how well PsycBOOKS, a specialized subject-based collection, serves users' needs. Results support evidence-based collection acquisition and management decisions of books in print and electronic formats”.

III. OBJECTIVES

The following are the objectives of the studies.

1. To find out the Collection Development Policies in University libraries
2. To fine out the Collection Development Policy included for Electronic Resources in University libraries
3. Major Roles in the Selection of Library Collections and the important Selection Tools for Print and Electronic forms
4. Criteria for Selecting the Book suppliers and Order of Books and Details of the collections in the library for the preceding five years.
5. To find out Inter library lending/ resource sharing facility for books with other and Subscribe to e-resources

IV. METHODOLOGY

The researcher has selected six University Libraries of Tamil Nadu (Bharathidasan University, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Amrita Viswa Vidyapeetham, Avinashilingam Institute for Home Science & Higher Education For Women, Karunya Institute of Technology and Sciences, Karpagam Academy of Higher Education). For this purpose, review of literature has been collected to find out the contribution in these subjects. The data and information collected were examined with special reference to the impact of Collection Management and Electronic information resources in University libraries. Survey method was adopted to collect the data. The collection of data is a first-hand study made by the investigator. The researcher took a sample of six University libraries for analysis. Among the 40 libraries the investigator has selected only 6 University libraries which are situated near Coimbatore district in order to narrow the study. The information obtained from questionnaire survey was updated through an observational visit to the libraries. The collected data are analyzed using Excel sheet and MS-Word to generate tables, figures, charts, etc. SPSS package is also used wherever necessary.

V. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

TABLE I COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

S. No.	Description	Yes	%	No	%
1	Written Collection Development Policy	6	37.50	0	00.00
2	Regularly Implemented	5	31.25	1	50.00
3	Revised and Updated	5	31.25	1	50.00
	Total	16	100	2	100

The table I describes 'Collection Development policy' in the library. The 'written Collection Development Policy' methods are used by 6 libraries and the percentage is 37.50 and it is the highest among all the categories in the study. The 'Regularly Implemented' and 'Revised and up dated' methods are also used by 5 libraries and the percentages are 31.25 and it is the lowest among all the categories in the study. From this it is clear that the Collection Development policies are used by written collection devilmnt policy by all libraries.

TABLE II COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICY INCLUDED FOR ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

S. No.	Description	Yes	%	No	%
1	Collection Development Policy For Electronic Resources	3	50.00	3	50.00
	Total	3	50.00	3	50.00

The table II describes 'Collection Development policy

included for Electronic Resources'. The 'yes' category there are 3 libraries and the percentage is 50.00. In the 'No' category 3 libraries and the percentage is 50.00. From this it is clear that 50.00 of the libraries in the study do not have Collection Development policy included for Electronic Resources.

TABLE III MAJOR ROLES IN THE SELECTION OF LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

S. No.	Description	Total No.	%	Cumulative %
1	Faculty	6	46.15	46.15
2	Scholars/Students	4	30.76	76.91
3	Library Staff	3	23.07	100
4	Any other	0	00.00	
	Total	13	100	

The table III describes 'major role in the selection of library collections'. The 'Faculty' are 6 in the study and the percentage is 46.15 and it is the highest among all the categories. The 'scholars/students' are followed by 4 libraries and the percentage is 30.76 and it is the second highest among all the categories. The 'library staff' is followed by 3 libraries and the percentage is 23.07 and it is the lowest among all the categories. The 'any other category' no library have respondent. From this it is clear that the major roles in the selection of library collection are faculty.

TABLE IV IMPORTANT SELECTION TOOLS FOR PRINT AND ELECTRONIC FORMS

S. No.	Description	Inf. Sources in Print	%	Electronic Sources	%
1	Selection Tools	4	66.66	2	33.33
	Total	4		2	

TABLE V CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE BOOK SUPPLIERS

S. No.	Description	Total No.	%	Cumulative %
1	Discount	6	17.64	17.64
2	Prompt Service	6	17.64	35.28
3	Variety of Stock	6	17.64	52.92
4	Timely Procurement of Order	6	17.64	70.56
5	Regular Communication and Correspondence	6	17.64	88.20
6	Accepting delayed payments	4	11.76	100
7	Any other	0	00.00	
	Total	34	100	

The table IV describes 'Important selection tools for print and Electronic forms'. The 'Information sources in print' are followed by 4 libraries in the study and the percentage is 66.66 and it is the highest among the categories. The 'Electronic sources' are followed by 2 libraries and the percentage is 33.33 and it is the second among the

categories. From this it is clear that the important selection tools for print and electronic forms are mainly used the information sources in print.

The table V describes 'Criteria for selecting the book suppliers'. The 'Discount, prompt service, variety of stock, timely procurement of order, and regular communication and correspondence are followed by 6 libraries in the study and the percentage is 17.64 each. The 'accepting delayed payment' is followed by 4 libraries and the percentage is 11.76. The 'any other' is not mentioned by the libraries in the study.

The table VI describes 'Order of books'. The 'Quotations' are followed by 4 libraries in the study and the percentage is 36.36 and it is the highest among all the categories. The 'direct from publishers are followed by 3 libraries and the percentage is 27.27 and it is the second highest among the

categories. The 'any other' category is followed by 2 libraries. The 'Net book agreement' and 'consortia' are followed by 1 library each and the percentage is 9.09. From this it is clear that the orders of books by the libraries are mostly done by the quotation based.

TABLE VI ORDER OF BOOKS

S. No.	Description	Total No.	%	Cumulative %
1	Direct from publishers	3	27.27	27.27
2	Net Book Agreement	1	9.09	36.36
3	Quotations	4	36.36	72.72
4	Consortia	1	9.09	81.81
5	Any other	2	18.18	100
	Total	11	100	

TABLE VII DETAILS OF THE COLLECTIONS IN THE LIBRARY FOR THE PRECEDING FIVE YEARS.

Category	Year									
	2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016	
	Print	Elect	Print	Elect	Print	Elect	Print	Elect	Print	Elect
Books	18000	0	22000	4192	31000	3160	29000	0	22000	13300
Foreign Journals	302	0	310	10100	120	11000	120	11000	120	11000
Indian Journals	615	0	730	11000	300	11000	300	11000	300	11000
Abstracting/ Indexing	12	0	12	6	12	12	12	12	12	12
T Journals / Databases thesis/ Dissertations Reference Sources	3400	0	4700	1700	1200	0	1200	0	1200	0
(Dict, Direct, Yearbooks, Almanacs)	700	0	302	112	101	0	112	0	112	0
Audio/video	92	0	60	52	32	0	32	0	32	0
Standards/ Specifications	30	0	0	50	42	0	42	0	42	0
Patents	30	0	0	50	30	0	30	0	41	0

The table VII describes 'Details of the collections in the library for the preceding five years'. The year 2011 – 2012 the print categories the books are 18000, foreign journals are 302 and Indian journals are 615, Thesis/Dissertations are 3400 and Reference sources are 700.

There are no Electronic publications purchased. In the year 2012 – 2013 the Print collections are books- 31,000, foreign journals – 120, Indian journals 300, Thesis/Dissertations 1200 Reference sources are 101. The Electronic collections are books 3160, foreign Journals 11,000, Indian journals 11,000. In the year 2014 – 15, the printed collection books – 29000, foreign journals 120, Indian journals 300, and Thesis/Dissertation 1200. The electronic collections are foreign journals 11,000 and Indian journals 11,000. In the year 2015 -16 the print collections books 22,000, foreign journals 120, Indian journals are 300 and thesis/dissertations 1200. The electronic collection books 1, 33, 00 foreign journals 11,000 Indian journals 11,000.

TABLE VIII INTER LIBRARY LENDING/ RESOURCE SHARING FACILITY FOR BOOKS WITH OTHER

S. No.	Description	Yes	%	No	%
1	Inter Library lending/resource sharing facility for books with other	6	100	0	00.00
	Total	6	100	0	00.00

The table VIII describes 'Inter library lending/ resource sharing facility for books with other'. All the libraries are having Inter library lending/resource sharing facility for books with other and the percentage is 100.

The table IX describes 'Subscriptions to e-resources'. The 'Independently' are followed by 3 libraries and the percentage is 50.00 and it is the highest among all the categories. The 'consortia' are followed by 2 libraries and the percentage is 33.33 and in 'both' categories are followed

by 1 library and the percentage is 16.66 and it is the lowest among all the categories. From this it is clear that the subscriptions to e-resources are independently by 50.00% of the libraries in the study.

TABLE IX SUBSCRIPTIONS TO E-RESOURCES

S. No.	Description	Total No.	%	Cumulative %
1	Independently	3	50.00	50.00
2	Consortia	2	33.33	83.33
3	Both	1	16.66	100
	Total	6	100	

TABLE X IF INDEPENDENT HOW LIBRARY SUBSCRIBES E-RESOURCES

S. No.	Description	Total No.	%	Cumulative %
1	Direct from publishers	3	50.00	50.00
2	Vendor	2	33.33	83.33
3	Aggregator	1	16.66	100
4	Any other	0	00.00	
	Total	6	100	

The table X describes 'If independently how the library subscribes E-resources'. The 'direct from publishers' are followed by 3 libraries and the percentage is 50.00 and it is the highest among all the categories. The 'vendor' category is followed by 2 libraries and the percentage is 33.33 and it is the second among all the categories. The 'aggregator' is followed by 1 library and the percentage is 16.66 and it is the lowest among all the categories. From this it is clear that the 'if independently how library subscribes to E-resources' are directly from publishers.

TABLE XI ACCESSES TO E-RESOURCES RESOURCES

S. No.	Description	Total No.	%	Cumulative %
1	Access in the Library	2	22.22	22.22
2	Remote access through campus Network	4	44.44	66.66
3	Internet	3	33.33	100
4	Any other	0	00.00	
	Total	9	100	

The table XI describes 'Access to E-resources'. The 'Remote access through campus network' was responded by 4 libraries and the percentage is 44.44 and it is the highest. The 'Internet' was responded by 3 libraries and the percentage is 33.33 and it is the second. The 'access in the library' was responded by 2 libraries and the percentage is 22.22 and it is the third. The 'any other' category was not responded by any libraries. From this it is clear that the access to e-resources and accessed by remote access through campus network.

TABLE XII E-BOOKS ON PERPETUAL ACCESS AVAILABLE IN LIBRARY

S. No.	Description	Total No.	%	Cumulative %
1	Blackwell Publisher	6	28.57	28.57
2	Cambridge Book Collection	6	28.57	57.14
3	CRE net based E-Books	2	9.52	66.66
4	Credo Reference	0	0.00	66.66
5	Springer Protocols	3	14.28	80.94
6	Elsevier Publication	3	14.28	95.22
7	Any other	1	4.76	100
	Total	21	100	

The table XII describes 'E-Book on perpetual access availability in library'. The 'Black Well publisher' and 'Cambridge book collection' were responded by 6 libraries and the percentage is 28.57 and it is the highest. The 'Springer protocols' and 'Elsevier publication' are responded by 3 libraries and the percentage is 14.28 and it is the second. The 'CRE net based E-Books' were responded by 2 libraries and the percentage is 9.52. The 'any other' category was responded by 1 library and the percentage is 4.76. From this it is clear that the E-Books on perpetual access available in library are Blackwell publishers and Cambridge book collection.

TABLE XIII SUBSCRIPTIONS OF E-JOURNALS

S. No.	Description	Total No.	%s	Cumulative %s
1	Uncover	0	00.00	00.00
2	Article subjects	6	20.00	20.00
3	Biomednet	2	6.66	26.66
4	Chemport	1	3.33	29.99
5	Science direct	3	10.00	39.99
6	Springer link	4	13.33	53.32
7	Emerald	3	10.00	63.32
8	OCLC	6	20.00	83.32
9	Northern Light	0	00.00	83.32
10	Ebsco	4	13.33	96.65
11	Any other	1	3.33	100
	Total	30	100	

The table XIII describes 'subscription of E-Journals'. The 'article subjects' and 'OCLC' were responded by 6 libraries and the percentage is 20.00 and it is the highest. The 'Springer link' and 'EBSCO' were responded by 4 libraries and the percentage is 13.33 and it is the second highest. The 'Science direct' and 'Emerald' were responded by 3 libraries and the percentage is 10.00 and it is the third among all the categories. The 'Biomednet' were responded by 2 libraries and the percentage is 6.66.

VI. CONCLUSION

The University libraries espoused all the new technologies and electronic resources and are resourcefully used by the Students, Faculty members, Technical and Non-Technical officers, Researchers and others. Utmost Universities are provided with all the advent technologies in libraries which make the effective information tradition. Most of the students responded that they do not have good internet connectivity and speed in their libraries. Although the resources are improving, still there is a lot more that needs to be done at the level of management of the E-resources in collection development. Besides there is need to increase the awareness of the students about the E-resources available in the Universities and how to access them prolifically.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Barstow, D. Macaulay, and Thaar, "How to Build a High-Quality Library Collection in a Multi-Format Environment: Centralized Selection at University of Wyoming Libraries", *Journal of Library Administration*, pp. 1-20, 31 December 2015.
- [2] B.E.Asogwa, C. Ugwa, F.C IandUgwuanyi, "Evaluation of electronic service infrastructures and quality of e-services in Nigerian academic libraries", *Electronic Library*, Vol. 33, No. 6, pp.1133-1149, 2 November 2015.
- [3] Anand, R., and Byers, D.F, "Emerging trends and Technologies in Libraries and Information Services", Proceedings – 4th *ETTLIS International Symposium*, Noida. pp. 13-16, 24 February 2015.
- [4] J. Fluvog, *et al.*, "Meeting the E-Resources challenge through Collaboration: An OCLC Perspective on Effective Management, Access and Delivery of Electronic Collections". *Serials Librarian*, Vol. 68, No. 1-4, pp. 168-172, 19 May 2015.
- [5] C. Bullock, , N. Hosburgh, and S. Mann, "OA in the Library Collection: The Challenges of Identifying and Maintaining Open Access Resources". *Serials Librarian*, Vol. 68, No. 1-4, pp. 79-86, 19 May 2015.
- [6] D. Ramirez and S.Tabacaru, "Evidence-Based Collection Management: A Discipline-Specific Usage Analysis of PsycBOOKS", *Collection Management*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 163-184, 3 July 2015.