THOMAS E. NISONGER


This annotated bibliography concerning collection evaluation in academic libraries focuses on (1) case studies of evaluation projects, (2) newly proposed techniques, (3) attempts to define adequacy in a collection, and (4) overviews of the evaluation process, all published from 1969 to the present.

In the 1980s climate of budgetary constraint, academic libraries more than ever must confront the problem of collection evaluation, in order to be certain that collections are developed as rationally and efficiently as possible, given available resources. As a working bibliographer, the author has found Signe Ottersen's "A Bibliography on Standards for Evaluating Libraries" [College & Research Libraries 32:127-44 (1971)] extremely helpful. Because the coverage of the Ottersen bibliography ends with 1969, a supplement from that date to the present is highly desirable. The present bibliography attempts, in part, to meet that purpose. It focuses on English-language items concerning collection evaluation and collection standards (which constitute one method of evaluation) published since 1969. Unlike Ottersen, material concerning library evaluation and standards in general has not been included unless a significant portion of a particular item deals with collections.

This bibliography concentrates on material relevant to university and college libraries. Studies dealing exclusively with two-year college, public, special, or secondary school libraries have been disregarded except when an especially noteworthy evaluation technique is discussed. Even though they contain much useful information, unpublished items (e.g., reports of the Collection Analysis Project) have been excluded due to limitations of space and because they are generally less accessible to the reader. Doctoral dissertations are included, while master's theses and letters to the editors of journals are not.

An effort has been undertaken to locate the following types of items: (1) case studies of evaluation projects; (2) newly proposed evaluation techniques; (3) overviews of the collection evaluation process; (4) attempts to delineate what constitutes an adequate collection; (5) commentary on standards for evaluation; and (6) miscellaneous material of practical or theoretical interest. One should bear in mind that this is not a comprehensive bibliography but a selection of the most useful contributions. Many of the entries were accompanied by abstracts. However, in all cases original annotations have been written which point out features especially relevant to the evaluation of collections.

Finally, it is evident that no universal agreement exists concerning several key questions in the area of collection evaluation, such as, What is the most efficacious evaluation technique? How does one define collection adequacy? Are quantitative or qualitative methods preferable? Should holdings or delivery capacity be stressed? and Which
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standards, if any, are valid? For this reason, collection evaluation is an intriguing and important topic on which further speculative thought and research is necessary.


The model considers six factors: (1) total units held; (2) number of periodical subscriptions; (3) quality of units held; (4) quality of periodicals; (5) annual additions; and (6) percentage of the institution's budget spent on library materials. It is applied to fifty-five academic libraries in the Pacific Northwest.


Data from twenty Australian college libraries covering acquisitions budgets, holdings, and staff is compared with the 1960 Australian standards. The cost of rectifying the deficits is estimated.


At no point in Australian history has a college of advanced education library met the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education’s provisional standard of fifty books per FTE student and one and one-half periodicals per FTE student.


Employing a checklist format, this document lists the advantages and disadvantages relating to several of the major approaches to collection evaluation. It is concluded that a combination of methods should be employed.


Approximately one-sixth of 3,000 periodical titles were canceled as a result of this project. The primary criteria were coverage by *Index Medicus*, photocopying record, and faculty opinion, in addition to cost factors, reference use, citation studies, and holdings of nearby libraries.


The section on collections emphasizes the need for holdings in all formats. A formula for print material begins with a base of 85,000 volumes. Libraries are rated from A to D.


This checklist, approved by the ACRL Board in June 1979, supplements the “Standards for College Libraries,” adopted in 1975. The library is evaluated by applying a one-to-twelve scale to thirty-two questions, organized into the standards’ eight major headings.


The final draft, which replaces the 1959 “standards,” was approved by the ACRL in July 1975. It contains no significant alterations with regard to collections.

Standard B asserts that the collection should: (1) be adequate to support the university's instructional and research programs; (2) be developed according to a systematic plan; and (3) contain recorded information in all available formats. A methodological appendix contains an explanation of Carter's Library Resources Index with applications to twenty university libraries.


A reorganization of the Florida Atlantic University library led to the development of a performance-budgeting model for the state university system of Florida. In regard to collections, the Clapp-Jordan formula was rejected in favor of a modified version of the Washington State formula.


A method developed at Southern Illinois University, for estimating the monographic holdings in different science subject areas by measuring the shelflist, is presented.


The methods used to evaluate the periodical holdings at James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia, included: checking the Farber and Katz lists plus citations from master's theses, determining the number of titles supporting each department, and analyzing interlibrary loan transactions.


The student is introduced to the basic methods of collection evaluation. To evaluate any type of collection, information concerning three factors is necessary: (1) the materials held; (2) the community served; and (3) the purposes of the collection.


A comprehensive survey of the methods used in collection evaluation in academic libraries is offered along with extensive references to the appropriate literature.


Outlines a checklist of points that should be covered in a comprehensive library survey. Also discusses comparison of circulation with holdings by subject area and how to examine the journal collection.


Computer tapes containing holdings of four unspecified health science libraries are analyzed by subject classification.


Based on a survey of total annual music expenditures and expenditures per FTE student in forty-six U.S. and Canadian university libraries, the author generates three models—varying according to the university's enrollment—for a minimum annual music materials budget.

A number of the best-known collection evaluation methods for academic libraries—each of which possesses "difficulties and shortcomings"—are critically analyzed. The author stresses that the need for duplicate copies should be considered in the evaluation process.


The historical evolution of standards for U.S. college libraries is surveyed from 1929 to the early 1970s.


A report proposing a formula for calculating the maximum size of Australian university library collections is rejected as "dangerous."


The evaluation of the book collection for a six-year planning program at Gonzaga University is described. For each major curriculum area, the number of volumes held was compared to the desired number (according to a modified formula A of the ACRL standards). Next a sampling technique was employed to profile statistically the holdings in each curriculum area.


U.S. Office of Education data concerning collections, staff, budget, and services from 1,146 American college libraries is compared with the ACRL's 1975 "Standards for College Libraries." Most libraries do not meet the standards in these four areas.


Guidelines to be utilized by the bibliographers in conducting comprehensive collection evaluations in discrete subject areas at the State University of New York at Buffalo libraries are outlined. Suggested methods include subjective appraisal, checking bibliographies in scholarly works, and measuring the shelflist.


The monographic acquisitions from 1965 to 1977 are analyzed in terms of subject classification, language, and date using CATLINE (the NLM's online computerized catalog) data.


The author believes the standard for Australian college library collections in the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education's second report is unrealistically low.


The holdings of the National Library of Medicine, the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, and the South Central Regional Medical Library Program consortium are compared in four subject areas by means of CATLINE plus three other databases.


An overview of the methods used in collection evaluation is offered. The author states that no single method is fully adequate by itself, but all can be helpful when supplemented by other approaches. The chapter
concludes with a brief summary of steps which can be employed in an evaluation project.


The shelflist was employed to determine the number of books supporting each of twenty-three curriculum areas; each area’s percentage of the books listed in the 1972 ABPR annual was calculated; and faculty opinion was surveyed. Finally, the data was correlated to determine deficient subject areas.


The author contends that the standards issued in 1970 by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education are totally inadequate, especially as applied to the education library’s collection.


After summarizing the use of statistical measures, list checking; user opinion, direct observation, and applying standards, the author contends no method is better than another.


At the University of Nebraska at Omaha library, LC classification numbers were assigned to every course listed in the university catalog, and the shelflist was checked to determine how many titles support each course. This figure was then compared to the number of students enrolled in the course.


Instead of checking a bibliography to determine how many titles the library holds, the inductive method entails beginning with a sample of titles (held in the collection) and checking standard bibliographies and reference works to ascertain how many times each title is listed.


This paper presents a statistical sampling technique for describing the fundamental characteristics of a book collection, such as, publication date, country of origin, language, type of publisher, format, and edition.


Rejecting the contention that an adequate collection must be large, Gore argues that collection adequacy should be judged by performance, i.e., the percentage of time the patron finds the book he wants on the shelf.


This essay outlines the standards on collection size prescribed by a 1969 report of the ACRL-ARL Joint Committee and by the Clapp-Jordan formula. The author concludes that until some future point when library networks can provide physical access to materials, quantitative standards will remain the best method of judging a collection’s quality.
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The utility of then-current standards on collections for college and junior college libraries is questioned because the standards are couched in general terms that do not represent anything measurable. Gross quantitative standards based on estimates of published material would be more helpful.


Based on the assumption that usage reflects need, data gathered from several hundred U.S. academic libraries was subjected to a twelve-variable correlation and multiple regression analysis to determine which variables influence circulation. Predictive multiple regression equations were used to calculate the recommended yearly acquisition rate in total books as well as books per student.


The 1975 revision of the Southern Association’s 1962 library standard is described. The new section on resources recognizes the emergence of multimedia, microform, and nonprint material as a significant part of the collection. The utilization of standard bibliographies and checklists to assess collection quality is recommended.


A number of collection evaluation approaches are briefly surveyed to help library administrators choose the methods that best meet their needs. The author claims an evaluation project should begin by examining the university’s goals.


Current standards for university libraries in the world’s industrial nations are summarized. The author feels that standards on collection size are not related to what figure is required, but rather to what figure the authorities will accept.


Nineteen studies dealing with collection evaluation in academic libraries are abstracted. The author concludes that (1) statistical techniques have established some empirical basis for qualitative evaluation methods; (2) the available standards are based on the “best” practice that is not empirically testable; and (3) analysis of citations is becoming established as a useful method.


The post–World War II standards for academic libraries in Japan are analyzed, including the 1953 “principles” for national university libraries as well as 1956 and 1963 statements concerning private universities.


Using computer-generated databases, the collection of the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio is compared with that of the University of Texas Medical Branch and the National Library of Medicine in terms of subject coverage. With respect to currency, the center’s collection is compared with that of the National Library of Medicine.

There are three facets to evaluating a library's ability to provide documents. These are the evaluation of (1) the collection; (2) the catalog; and (3) document delivery. Strategies for conducting each type of evaluation are given.


Lancaster discusses three basic approaches to collection evaluation: the quantitative, the qualitative, and evaluation by use. His major emphasis falls on use studies. Numerous summaries of other scholarly investigations are presented.


The author argues against the assertion that an undergraduate library should contain no more and no less than 100,000 volumes.


Two surveys were conducted at the University of Bath to determine what follow-up actions faculty members took on bibliographical references they encountered. Thus, one can measure what proportion of potential (as opposed to actual) demand was fulfilled by the library's holdings.


Numerous techniques for collection evaluation are suggested, including a technique devised by the author for in-depth evaluation of a specific discipline. In the author's technique, references are randomly selected from a critical bibliography and checked against the holdings. After repeating the process through four levels, an 80-40-20-10 scoring system is applied.


This chapter focuses on the purpose, principles, and procedures of evaluation in college libraries, including the use of standards, statistics, and surveys. It is stressed that quantitative standards can not be used to fully assess a college library book collection.


The development of standards for U.S. academic libraries is reviewed from the ACRL "Standards for College Libraries" in 1959 through the efforts to devise standards for university libraries in the late 1960s. Particular attention is paid to formulas for collection size.


Numerous methods of quantifying the size of the undergraduate collection in terms of volumes and growth rate are illustrated with complete statistical details.


Linear regression analysis is employed to evaluate the Clapp-Jordan formula using data from the thirty-six largest Ph.D.-granting graduate schools in the U.S. If the formula errs, it errs in underestimating the required number of books.


McInnis proposes that research collections be evaluated by checking citations taken
from a random sample of currently published research in a single discipline against the library's holdings. The “scientific” approach as well as the low cost of implementation are offered as justification.


Formulas for minimal total holdings and yearly expenditures are proposed for teacher college libraries in Australia. The most intriguing takes the arithmetic mean of the Clapp-Jordan formulas for two-year and four-year colleges to derive a standard for three-year colleges.


It is contended that standards for current book acquisition rates in college libraries should be based on book production and the curriculum, rather than on the number of students, as in the 1959 ACRL standards for college libraries.


Students were asked to complete questionnaires as they left the library to determine how often they found the books they sought. The staff subsequently sample-checked non-located titles to ascertain if they were held.


The Clapp-Jordan formula is applied to the Oregon State University Library and then extended to include price factors. After comparisons with other libraries, the extended formula is proposed as a general evaluation tool.


Moran contends that, according to logical and linguistic analysis, the concept of adequacy cannot be meaningfully applied to a university library collection.


This work outlines the history of collection evaluation in American university libraries beginning with the 1933 University of Chicago survey. A collection evaluation program at Stanford in which graduate students are hired to do bibliographical checking is discussed in detail.


Mosher presents a general overview of collection evaluation, with summaries of the major approaches and steps to be taken in conducting an evaluation.


Intended for public libraries, the technique propounded here compares a subject area’s percentage of total books in the collection (measured by the shelflist), i.e., supply, with the percentage of total circulations (based on statistical samples), i.e., demand.


The development of standards for public, school, and university libraries in Canada from the 1930s to the early 1970s is summarized. The author concludes that Canadian library standards have been short-lived because they contribute to the development of new objectives that require revised standards.

Nine specific methods for collection evaluation are recapitulated. The author notes that it is always possible to devise one's own evaluation method instead of relying on those previously published.


An experimental testing of the Lopez method is described. Inconsistencies in the results raise questions about the technique's reliability, although the technique does evaluate the collection's depth.


Sophisticated statistical analyses are applied to the results of administering Orr's document-delivery test in ninety-two U.S. medical school libraries. The authors develop a model for ascertaining a library's “virtual” capacity (what it can provide the user) as distinct from its "basic" capacity (what it holds).


The capability index of Orr's document-delivery test—previously used only in biomedical libraries—was experimentally implemented in two library school libraries. It was concluded that Orr's device is also applicable to this field.


The authors offer a formula, developed at the Arizona State University Library, which uses automated circulation statistics to determine the required number of volumes per faculty member as well as per graduate and undergraduate student. To implement the method, one must first ascertain through a survey that users are satisfied with the present collection.


Nine early surveys of U.S. academic libraries (Harvard, Dominion College, Iowa State, Rollins, Battle Creek, Union Theological Seminary, University of Denver, Marygrove, and Rosary) are described.


This kit is intended to assist all types of libraries in Wyoming with self-evaluations. The collection is evaluated using an ad hoc checklist of 119 books plus 14 journal titles.


The need for research methods to evaluate innovation in libraries is stressed. Five data-gathering techniques are summarized: (1) experiments; (2) models; (3) case studies; (4) comparative statistics; and (5) surveys.


The methodological difficulties inherent in several standard approaches to collection evaluation are discussed, with emphasis on their shortcomings. The best evaluation tool is an experienced and intelligent librarian “preferably with a sense of humor.”


This general discussion begins with a distinction between explicit demands on the collection and true needs, and ends with a list of ten collection evaluation exercises.

The educational monographic collection of Srinakharinwirot University (in Thailand) was evaluated through questionnaires to faculty as well as undergraduates. Statistics were compiled and reading lists plus other checklists were compared against the holdings. Also, faculty were asked to rate the usefulness of titles randomly selected from the shelflist.


A “failure survey” was conducted at an unspecified British university library. More than 1,000 patrons were interviewed as they left the library to analyze why they failed to obtain needed books. The proportion of failures due to (1) titles not held, (2) titles not available, and (3) reader failure was ascertained.


To determine the correlation between the size of a university library collection and its ability to support research, citations from faculty publications at universities with large library collections (Michigan and Illinois) were checked against the holdings of their own library, the other large library, and a smaller one (Colorado State). The two large collections supported the research of each other's faculty equally well, and both supported their faculties' research better than did the collection of the small library.


The size of the collection at Sir George Williams University in Montreal is compared to the required levels specified by the Clapp-Jordan formula, the Washington State formula, and the CACUL (Canadian Association of College and University Libraries) standard.


Early surveys of the Rutgers University, Williams College, and Beloit College libraries are analyzed.


Strayer asserts that citation checking represents a creative method of collection evaluation. Several variations are discussed, including possible computer applications. Because it measures quality, the citation checking method is considered an improvement over quantitative methods.


Various statistical techniques (ratio, regression, discriminant and principal component analyses) are applied to ARL and ACRL data for 196 university libraries, which are rank-ordered according to composite data for ten variables, such as total holdings, volumes added, expenditures, etc. Stubbs concludes that derived minimal levels seem “very much like quantitative standards.”


This paper analyzes the use of surveys as a technique for evaluating American university libraries. Four methods of conducting surveys are depicted: (1) the historical; (2) the descriptive; (3) scientific management; and (4) the experimental.

The report recommends for Texas academic library collections a modified version of the quantitative standards contained in the 1965 Higher Education Act.


Following a brief review of a selected number of formulas for academic library collections, a bibliography is included which lists sources that can be utilized as checklists to evaluate the holdings in English and American language and literature.


Data are tabulated from a questionnaire sent in July 1969 to the eight black college libraries in Texas (seven responded) to ascertain to what extent they met the ACRL “Standards for College Libraries” in regard to staff and resources.


Statistics demonstrating that a small percentage of the holdings account for most of the circulation are used to question the assumption that a good academic library must be large.


After describing the status of academic libraries in Arkansas, Turner asserts that “volume count” can no longer be the sole criterion for measuring a collection’s adequacy.


Based on the assumption that, for university research libraries, the current acquisition rate is more significant than total collection size, a model for determining the acquisition rate of current material for university libraries supporting Ph.D. programs is proposed.


The problems encountered in various attempts to establish standards for U.S. university libraries are reviewed.


In phase one of this project at the University of Colorado libraries, the holdings in medieval studies, art history, political science, physics, and Slavic studies were surveyed by sample-checking bibliographies. In phase two, standard bibliographies were checked in entirety to fill gaps in U.S. and British social and literary history.


For a journal evaluation project at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Library in Boulder, Colorado, the authors devised a “balance index” that correlates usage with shelf space. In addition, the standard journal evaluation techniques were used.


A computer was utilized at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Environmental Research Laboratories Libraries to compare circulation with inventory for specific LC call numbers (minus the author Cutter).


In this approach faculty members mark, on an LC classification table for a subject, the courses corresponding with each class and provide keywords describing their courses, which are then linked through LC subject headings back to the classification ta-
ble. The shelflist is consulted to determine the number of volumes supporting each course so that deficiencies can be remedied.


Numerous quantitative methodologies for library assessment are analytically summarized, including the Clapp-Jordan formula, Voigt’s acquisitions model, Orr’s document-delivery system, Goldhor’s “inductive method,” and Mostyn’s “supply-demand” model.


A fifteen-space field on the Faxon Company’s computerized list of 4,000 Georgia Tech periodical subscriptions was used to record data. Based on usage, accessibility, availability, cost, and format, each title was placed in one of five categories, ranging from “essential” to “irrelevant.”


Academic, school, and public library standards in numerous countries (with emphasis on Europe and the Anglo-American democracies) are summarized and compared. Withers notes that standards written for one nation often influence the development of standards in another.


An expanded version of the author’s 1970 study, this extensive monograph surveys the current standards covering virtually all aspects of library service in more than twenty countries.