Collection Development, Organization and Services of Central Universities' Libraries in Uttar Pradesh (UP)

Abstract

Collection Development encompasses all plans formulated for the systematic and rational building of a collection. The term includes a group of activities i.e. assessing the users’ needs, evaluating the present collection, determining selection policy, coordinating selection of items, re-evaluating and storing parts of the collection, and planning for resource sharing. A collection development policy involves selection and acquisition (procurement) of library materials to meet both present and future users’ requirements which is constrained by limited financial resources, diversity of users’ information needs and availability of vast sources of information.

The present study specifically deals with the policy aspects and dimensions of collection development, organization and services from the viewpoints of the librarians as well as the users, comprising Faculty Members, Research Scholars and the Post Graduate Students. The study has been made meaningful by taking up the studies of four central university libraries of UP i.e. Maulana Azad library, AMU, Sayaji Rao Gaekwad BHU Central Library, Varanasi, Allahabad University Library, Allahabad and Baba Bhim Rao Ambedkar University Library, Lucknow.

The time span of the study is taken from 1985 to 2005-06 as IT applications were introduced in Indian libraries from 1985. The culled up
data through sets of questionnaire used in the study are primary in nature. Some of the data are however secondary too.

From comprehensive review of literature on the subject matter it can be inferred that despite the size and variety of literature available in this sphere there is still dearth of relevant and appropriate literature pertaining to the policy of collection development, organization and services. It is also realized that very few work has been done on the usage of IT and IT Enabled Services in the libraries.

The following objectives have been pursued for the purpose of the study.

- To bring out information regarding the collections in select central university libraries located in U.P. and also to examine the budget for printed documents as well as on-line databases/resources.
- To examine and study in detail the collection development policy of the select referred university libraries in the terms of printed and electronic documents and revision of collection development policy.
- To critically study the selection criteria, acquisition process and to simultaneously examine the weeding out or de-selection criteria of the documents.
- To study at length the methods adopted by libraries for assessment of users’ community needs, collection evaluation and also organization of collection.
- To study and analyze the services provided by the libraries and level of users’ satisfaction about the library collection, organization, facilities and services both traditional as well as, IT enabled services.
- To make a comparative analysis of collection development, organization and services and also to identify the current status of collection development organization and services of the four central university libraries under study.
- To study the application of Information Technology (IT) in collection development, organization and services in terms of house keeping activities as well as IT-based services provided to the users.
In pursuance of above-mentioned objectives the following hypotheses have been postulated and tested:

- The Null hypothesis (H₀) of the study assumes that the select libraries of i.e. the four central universities, AMU, BHU (old centralized) ALU and BBRAU, (newly centralized) are not perusing the collection development and organization in terms of provision of separate budget for online and printed databases and other documents, assessment of users' needs, proper collection, plan and revision of development policy for electronic and printed documents, selection and evaluation criteria and their identification, methods for acquisition, participation in resource sharing, and weeding out the documents. Whereas the alternative hypothesis (H₁) presumes that the select libraries of the four central universities such as, AMU, BHU, (old centralized) ALU and BBRAU, (newly centralized) are equally likely in pursuance of the above said portfolios of collection development and organization.

- The Null Hypothesis (H₀) of the study assumes that the select libraries of the four central universities, are inadequate in providing the basic service requirements such as, specific system for classification and cataloguing, 24x7 professionals for reference desk, proper information services, reprographic, microform, Translation, CAS, SDI, Bibliography, CD/DVD ROM, online, UGC Infonet services, Inter library-loans, loose circulation and training for users. Whereas the Alternative Hypothesis (H₁) presumes that the select libraries are having a wide range of aforementioned service packages.

- The Null Hypothesis (H₀) of the study assumes that the select libraries are lacking in IT and IT Enabled Service applications, such as, DVD ROM services, online service, Mini Computer, CD Drivers,
OPAC terminals, Computer network, CD network, licensed operating system, licensed word collections, Broad band services, and other computerized services. The Alternative Hypothesis (H₁) nevertheless presumes that the select libraries are equally having wide range IT application.

➢ The Null Hypothesis (H₀) of the study surmises that the select libraries are not pursuing the collection development pattern in terms of authority and responsibilities, participation, reporting, organizations, and policy determination etc. Whereas the alternative hypothesis (H₁) presumes that the select libraries are adequate enough in collection development organizational pattern.

➢ The Null Hypothesis (H₀) of the study assumes that the users of select libraries are not satisfied with the adequacy of library collections, such as, inadequate availability of general books, Text books, Reference books, Periodicals / Journals / Magazines, Reports, Non-Book materials. Patents / Standards / Specifications, Theses / Dissertations, Seminar and Conference papers. Whereas the alternative Hypothesis (H₁) presumes that the users of the select libraries are relatively satisfied with the adequacy of library collections as referred above.

➢ The Null Hypothesis (H₀) is surmised on the fact that the users’ overall assessment in terms of physical facility, library collection and organization, library human resource, services, and IT enabling, of the select libraries are highly dissatisfied. Whereas the alternative hypothesis (H₁) presumes that the overall assessment of the users in terms of collection development organization, are relatively content and satisfied.

It is cogently demonstrated from analyses that print and electronic document collection in AMU and BHU is larger than ALU and BBRAU.
AMU and BHU as a matter of fact are the flagship universities among Indian Universities with more funding than the newly centralized universities of ALU and BBRAU. However, it is also discernible that ALU has larger number of books; periodicals etc. than BBRAU because of the fact that ALU has been the oldest and star university of UP before assuming the central university status. The total numbers of theses and dissertations that have been completed are larger numbers in ALU than in AMU and BHU. It has been perceived from the analyses that BHU has a significant attribute of bound volumes of journals numbering around 1 lacs. This feat has not been achieved by any other central university library.

Further other print documents, specially the current journals, are found to be in considerable number at AMU and BHU. More interestingly it has unfolded through the analysis that AMU library is the only library that has a collection of maps, charts, diagrams, patents, standards, specification and rotographs. It is also observed that as far as size of the collection of electronic documents are considered; AMU is at the top followed by BHU. The other and newly centralized university libraries ALU and BBRAU have a deplorable scene. Only ALU has an on-line internet database numbering 75 and some CD-ROM databases.

AMU and BHU are making wholesome endeavors to garner and develop print and electronic documents in sync with the users' need to sustain the intensity of challenge of knowledge revolution and globalization. Current primary and secondary Indian and foreign journals have been collected by AMU, BHU and ALU. On the other hand BBRAU either has no such space or the respondent is unwilling to share the information. AMU, BHU and ALU have participated in UGC-Infonet consortia. The BBRAU has not participated in UGC-Infonet consortia. AMU, BHU, ALU and BBRAU have budgetary provision for on-line
journals and databases. In fact AMU, BHU and ALU use different modes to procure on-line journals and databases through UGC-Infonet consortia. BBRAU modified the use of the method. Along with Information Technology AMU, BHU and ALU adopt alternative methods to acquire on-line journals and databases nullifying some print subscriptions. However, the budget for print and on-line journals of AMU, BHU, ALU and BBRAU is inadequate.

AMU, BHU and ALU assess the users' needs from time to time and for that they adopt assessment of the users' needs based on collection use. BBRAU negated this kind of assessment. AMU adopts the method of assessing users' needs based on requisition from departments and students. AMU infact adopts the method of assessing users' needs based on requisition from departments and students. AMU, BHU, ALU and BBRAU libraries do not have clear cut policy as regards assessment of users' need. AMU and ALU have collection development policy whereas the BHU and BBRAU have no such collection development policy.

Authority of creating and approving collection development policy in the AMU lies with the librarian and acquisition librarian. In case of ALU, it lies with library committee. In case of AMU for bulk purchase there is a purchase committee. Only AMU disclosed the fact of existence of revision of collection development policy and it has a separate collection development policy for E-documents as well. All the libraries under review, feel the need of appropriately putting in place a future strategy or policy with regard to collection development.

It is observed from the analysis that there is a cardinal authority responsible for selecting documents in almost all the libraries. AMU, BHU and ALU follow certain yardstick for selecting and evaluating quality documents, such as, subject relevance, users need, currency authority, completeness, uniqueness of contents, cost effectiveness.
All the libraries have adopted both approval system and confirmed order system for acquisition of documents and they also acquire documents through publishers, distributors and gift/exchange. Weeding of documents in terms of obsolescence of materials has only been done by the AMU on an annual as well as adhoc basis. Mainly AMU and BHU adopt criteria for evaluation of collection. AMU, BHU and ALU are providing reference services, information service, bibliography service, online service, CAS, On-line journals/database to their users. BBRAU has only book borrowing service. Other services are not available. CD/DVD-ROM service is being provided by BHU and ALU. Only AMU is providing Microfilm service. Translation service, SDI, Inter library loan services are not being provided by any library. AMU, BHU, ALU have maintained separate periodical section and also circulate loose issues of periodicals. AMU and ALU also have the facility to access on-line journals/databases through campus intranet for users within the library. AMU, BHU and ALU have provided computer related training to staff and users too.

In AMU, BHU, ALU and BBRAU the collection development in-charge (acquisition librarian) are not administratively in-charge of collection development. AMU and BHU have a collection development in-charge i.e. acquisition librarian. Acquisition librarian report to university librarian and university librarian report to Registrar in all the libraries of India as well as in AMU and BHU. All the librarians under survey select text book for purchase, they consider lists given by faculty members, students, and recommended by the Departments. AMU and BHU collection development librarians have control over personnel whereas ALU and BBRAU have given no response. Most librarians serve on the committees like purchase committee, book selection committee and library committee. BHU committee members have been selected through nomination, whereas AMU, ALU and BBRAU have given no response. No librarians however, have complete control on collection development.
activities. In selection of documents they solicit advice from faculty. AMU, BHU, ALU and BBRAU have control over a portion of funds. The acquisition librarians (collection development In-charge) of libraries were questioned regarding their involvement in overall library policy but they have no voice in such matters. Acquisition Librarian (Collection Development In-charge) or librarians of BHU, ALU and BBRAU are dissatisfied with the way their libraries have organized collection development.

So far as the services are concerned only AMU has OPAC terminals. AMU, BHU and ALU have computer network. Only BHU and ALU have CD-network. AMU and ALU are using Libsys software and BHU are using Genlib for maintaining their collection, management and services. The computerized library operations i.e. Acquisition, Circulation, OPAC and Serial Control are not used by BHU, ALU and BBRAU. In AMU, BHU and ALU cataloging and retrospective conversion are being made use of. Budgeting and statistical report modules are not used by any library. Only ALU has digitized the collection of books approximately by 50%. AMU and BHU have digitized 100% of their manuscripts collection. They have also digitized 15% and 10% pages from rare journals. AMU, BHU and ALU are the members of INFLIBNET along with it, BHU and ALU are also the members of DELNET.

ALU and BBRAU are lacking in the collection development organization as compared to the other two old centralized universities i.e. AMU and BHU. The test of hypotheses of the present study has covered six aspects in which four are being presented on the basis of librarians’ and acquisition Librarians’ responses as regards the different aspects of collection development organizations and services and remaining two aspects are related to the users’ assessment about collection development, organization and services.
The first hypothesis pertaining to collection development in terms of provision of separate budget etc. is showing some noteworthy results. The survey results and hypothesis test support the systematic improvement in collection development of newly centralized universities. However, it is a fact proved by the testing of the hypothesis that old centralized universities are better placed in terms of all the parameters of collection development. Furthermore, there exists a positive relationship between the old centralized and newly centralized universities. Among the newly centralized university ALU was established and structured in pre-independence period and availed maximum benefits within its state legislature. It is also recognized that both the newly centralized institutions such as ALU and BBRAU should have the financial and infrastructural support of the government on priority basis.

The second hypothesis is concerned about the comparison between the old and new centralized universities pertaining to the organization and services etc. give an account of some concrete results. It has been found from the statistical estimation that all four universities are good. A few services ALU has been found to be competitive with the old centralized universities. However, the BBRAU takes the back seat in almost all the services which should essentially be provided by the academic libraries. The test of hypothesis observes that newly centralized universities are not lagging far behind the old centralized universities in providing the requisite services notwithstanding the fact that BBRAU is not adequately providing the services as classified under the study. The hypothesis testing basically shows positive results as the negative deviations related to BBRAU are being compensated by positive attribute of ALU, which is one of the traditional and old universities of India.

The third hypothesis makes a comparison between the old centralized and newly centralized universities in IT and IT based services
orientation in terms of IT and IT enabled service applications, etc. It reveals that there is a difference between the two old centralized and newly centralized universities especially in BBRAU the de-novo centralized university. It has to do a lot in the sphere of providing IT and IT enabled services to the users. The lack of planned funding, inadequate budget plans and the time constraint for the up-gradation of IT and IT enabled services are the major reasons attributable to this backdrop.

The fourth hypothesis presents the factual description as regards the organizational pattern of collection development in the four universities under review. From the statistical estimation it has been concluded that there is a conspicuous difference between the two categories that the newly centralized universities are greatly lagging behind the old centralized universities in organizational pattern of collection development.

The fifth hypothesis concerns the users' assessment about the adequacy of library collections. The research found that the library collection in the all four central universities is adequate enough for their users as per statistical estimation. It is also being revealed that the organized collection strategies of old centralized universities are not comparable with the newly centralized universities. However, the users of the newly centralized universities are also satisfied with their existing infrastructure.

The sixth hypothesis is related to the users' overall assessment of the libraries. It was observed that the overall satisfaction levels of the users' regarding old centralized universities are good. However, the satisfaction level of users' from newly centralized universities is tilted towards the average.
The following Suggestions and Recommendations have been offered:

- Libraries should spend more on E-resources.
- Libraries should subscribe more and more to primary printed and electronic journals.
- Libraries should also participate in consortias at national as well as international level.
- Libraries are also required to spend more on e-journals.
- Online indexing services should be subscribed for all the subjects.
- Users' needs should be proper assessed from time to time to determine the needs of the users.
- The competent library authorities should be clear as to who is responsible for creating and approving of collection development policy.
- Collection development policy should also be revised from time to time according to the need and situation of the library.
- The libraries should maintain a separate collection development unit.
- A separate specific post of Collection development In-charge (CDI) should be created in the libraries.
- Selection of documents should be done in the light of users' needs.
- In the selection of documents, selectors must be careful about the quality and relevance of subject matter.
- Libraries should also follow proper weeding out criteria.
- Collection evaluation must be done by library staff annually.
- Library committee should meet regularly.
- Full time librarian is a necessity for libraries.
- Professionals for reference desk are necessary.
- Libraries should provide and inform about Current Awareness Services (CAS) and Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) to their users regularly.
- Libraries must introduce translation services and document delivery services in their libraries.
• Libraries should organize workshops/seminars regularly on different aspects of library management.
• Feedback should be sought from the users and the services need to be evaluated regularly to decide their utility.
• In information age society libraries must be equipped with Information Technology Enabled Services (ITES).
• Libraries must be fully computerized
• On-line Public Access Catalogue (OPAC) should be available in BHU, ALU and BBRAU libraries.
• Web-OPAC should be started in all the libraries under study.
• CD-ROM workstation should be available in the libraries.
• Old and important materials should be digitized
• Library should acquire high-speed connectivity to overcome the problem of slow downloading.
• In-house databases should be developed by the libraries
• To provide on-line services efficiently and effectively, number of computers should be increased in the library in all the universities.
• The staff of library must be skilled enough to assist the users when they face any problem in accessing on-line services.

The present study is an attempt to compare collection development, organization and services of four central university libraries of UP. However, in future, research should be conducted to compare collection development, organization and services of central universities libraries' with some other premier institutes of India, such as, IIM, AIIMS and IITs.

Furthermore, working practices of libraries in India can be compared with the libraries of some important Institutions of the world. Mainly, comparative study of Indian libraries with the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge Universities would surely provide an opportunity to bring out deficiencies in the policy pertaining to collection development, organization and services of Indian universities.