INTRODUCTION

It has been stated that the selection of library materials is, in part, a "private, cognitive activity."* The privacy is inherent in each selector's uniqueness within an organization. Ordinarily the person charged with responsibility for development of collections in a subject, language, or geographic area is the library's resident expert in that field; he or she knows more about it than any colleague in the library (and perhaps more about the range of publishing in the field than any faculty colleague). Nonetheless, collection specialists and managers need ways to assess the effectiveness of an individual's work and the appropriateness of the collections being developed and managed. Expertise cannot operate in a vacuum, but must be related to the goals of the library and the university, and to the limits and constraints the institution faces.

The cornerstone of the individual librarian's selection policies must be the Collection Development Policy Statement of the General Library, a document which relates the Library's collecting goals to the academic programs of the campus. This policy was published in January 1980, and will soon undergo revision. The process of revision will be a Library-wide project in which all selectors will be asked to participate, reviewing policies in relation to their own areas of responsibility. Each specialist will also be asked to prepare a supplementary statement elaborating on unit-, area-, or discipline-specific requirements. These statements will be combined with the unit's data extracted from the revised CDPS to form tailored collection development policies for each unit or area of collecting responsibility.

While a systematic, structured evaluation of collections may be the best measure of the success of the Library's collection development program, such evaluation is so costly that it can ordinarily be undertaken only for selected areas. Other approaches are needed for regular assessment and improvement of collection activities. This paper attempts to formulate questions which can:

1) assist collection specialists to monitor and evaluate their own performance;
2) help supervisors clarify their understanding of each specialist's work, and thereby improve performance evaluation.

The questions admit of a variety of acceptable answers, and the answers will certainly vary with the specialists' responsibilities and personal strengths. However, all of the questions represent important elements of the collection development and management process, and reflect concerns which should stimulate a continuing dialogue between specialists and their supervisors.

COLLECTION MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES:
A FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSMENT AT UCB

I. The selection process:
   A. Scope of selection
      1. Who are the collection's primary users? How many faculty, graduate students? From what departments? What other on- and off-campus demands does the collection serve?
      2. Is the selector aware of developments and changes in the disciplines served? Are the research methods and strategies of the disciplines understood? How is continuing awareness of research directions maintained?
      3. How is the Library's Collection Development Policy Statement used? Are there any other written statements of collecting policy for the particular areas of the collections?
      4. How does the selector identify collection needs and communicate them for consideration in the Library's policy and budget planning?
   B. Methods of selection
      1. Current collecting:
         a. What are the essential selection tools which must be consulted regularly for development of the collections of current monographic imprints in the selector's field? of serials? of nonprint materials?
         b. Which additional sources should be consulted periodically for expanded knowledge of the disciplines served, critical evaluations of current literature, understanding of developing trends, etc.? Are these regularly reviewed?
         c. How is the impact of new technology on the discipline(s) monitored? How are machine readable data files, online indexes, electronic journals, etc., identified and assessed?
         d. What other sources of information are used in selection? How are users' recommendations communicated? Are they solicited? Are any formal mechanisms employed?
         e. Are approval plans used? Blanket orders? What systems have been devised for monitoring them? Are there other areas for which approval plans should be considered?
f. How does the collection specialist interact with Acquisition Department staff, and also with Serials and Government Documents Departments, to determine the best method of acquisition for materials (e.g., when to use exchange, when to place a standing order for materials dispersed among units, etc.)

2. Retrospective collecting:
   b. Have any planned programs for systematic retrospective collection building been undertaken? Are these for core collections? Special collections?
   c. Have any programs of retrospective collection development been planned contingent on funding?

C. Monitoring selection:
   1. How does the selector routinely monitor his/her own success in collection development—i.e., the adequacy of current collecting for Berkeley program needs? (User feedback? Use statistics? Comparison with accession lists of other libraries? Consultation with colleagues at other libraries? Spot checks of RLIN, OCLC, or other current lists? Other?)
   2. Have any formal evaluations of areas of the collections (e.g., checking of standard bibliographies, shelflist counts, written evaluations by faculty or other experts, etc.) been undertaken?

   Have areas in particular need of evaluation been identified? Are any systematic evaluation projects planned for the next two years? What method of analysis (checking bibliographies, engaging expert consultant, etc.) is planned? What, if any, additional support is needed for projected evaluation studies?

   3. What means, formal and informal, are used to solicit advice from users regarding the collections? To inform them about the collections?

   4. What means are used to determine adequacy of collections to support new or changing programs and research in the discipline?

D. Interlibrary cooperation
   1. What formal cooperative reliances have been developed for the particular areas of the collection? How is the cooperative agreement implemented?
   2. Have informal cooperative reliances been worked out with selectors in neighboring institutions? How are these implemented?
3. What level of communication is maintained with peer collection specialists at Stanford? The other UC campuses? Other RLG libraries? Other relevant collections?

II. Collection management:

A. Preservation

1. Has any systematic preservation review of any or all of the collection been undertaken?

2. Have areas of the collection which are in special need of systematic preservation review been identified? What support does the unit or selector need to work with the Conservation Department in such a review?

3. In what ways does the selector interact with the Conservation Department? Is this interaction regular and continuing, or occasional?

B. Deselection

1. Is there a continuing or periodically repeated program of review for storage or withdrawal or discard? What criteria are applied in this decision-making? Who decides?

2. Has consideration been given to the possibilities for replacement of print materials with microform or other compact storage medium?

C. Analysis of collection management data

1. Is use made of circulation statistics and other collection use data?

2. What other collection management data is gathered and analyzed (e.g., growth by class, ILL requests, etc.)?

D. Fiscal concerns

1. Budgetary management

   a. How are budgetary needs determined? How are they documented in annual budget requests?

   b. Are expenditures on monograph funds regular throughout the budget year?

   c. In times of tight budgets, are purchases prioritized, and desiderata lists maintained?
d. Are expenditures kept within budget allocations? Have fund overages or shortfalls been regularly experienced? To what is this attributable? Are budgetary overages or shortfalls communicated promptly to the department head and the AUL?

e. Are serials lists controlled, with very selective addition of new titles, and cancellation of unneeded titles as they are identified?

2. Additional support for collections

a. Have efforts been made to acquire supplemental support for the collections by seeking and encouraging gifts from individuals, academic departments, etc.?

b. Have grant proposals been developed? Have these proposals been prepared in cooperation with Library development staff? With faculty or organized research units? Have they been successful?

III. Support for the collection development and management processes:

A. Time devoted to collection development

1. How much time (per week, averaged over the year) is devoted to selection?

a. Is this time adequate for maintenance of current collecting levels?

b. Is it sufficient to permit some collection analysis and retrospective collection development, when funds are available for these purposes?

c. Is selection accomplished with some regularity throughout the year, or batched at infrequent intervals?

2. How much time (per week, averaged over the year) is devoted by the collection development librarian to preservation and deselection activities?

3. Is some of the librarian's time devoted to routine bibliographic checking or other clerical work in support of collection development and management? How much time (per week, averaged over the year)?

B. Are there major obstacles to the achievement of the defined goals for the collections? What are the obstacles? Can remedies be suggested?
Since the institution of peer review in the early 1970s, librarians in the UC system have been evaluated according to criteria stated in the pamphlet *Librarian Policies and Procedures* (Berkeley: General Library, University of California, 1981, 46 p.), where the procedures for review on the Berkeley campus are detailed on pages 31-41. The four areas of a librarian's performance evaluated for merit increase and promotion review are:

a) professional competence and quality of service within the Library;
b) professional activity outside the Library;
c) University and public service;
d) research and other creative activity.

Reasonable flexibility is exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of the latter three criteria. However, superior professional ability and its demonstration in performance of the duties of the primary job assignment are indispensable for promotion to the ranks of Associate Librarian and Librarian. Since virtually all Collection Specialists perform a variety of services in addition to developing collections, their collection development performance evaluation will constitute only a part of their overall evaluation.

In a real sense the collections themselves are a benchmark by which the collecting activities of the selectors can in the long run be judged. The present collections amassed by large research libraries are tributes to the perspicacity of past selectors. Those charged with the excellence of resources today cannot afford to wait for the verdict of the ages. It is in the best interests of both Library managers and Collection Specialists that present practice be assessed regularly: by Collection Specialists in their own evaluations of personal performance, in collegial discussions with their Library peers, in consultations with the faculty, and in periodic meetings with their department heads.

In an effort to assist Collection Specialists to monitor and evaluate their own performance and to help supervisors clarify their understanding of each Specialist's work and thereby improve performance evaluation, the AUL/CD in conjunction with Collection Development Department Heads has prepared *Collection Development and Management Processes: A Framework for Assessment* (October 1986). In preparing documentation for promotion or merit review dossiers, both the supervisor and the librarian being reviewed should consider the Specialist's performance within the context of the responsibilities outlined in the present Guide and the appended framework.

In making choices toward the furthering of individual career goals and enhancing professional competence, Collection Specialists will increase their effectiveness if their professional activities outside the Library, their university service, and their research activity complement their assigned duties and strengthen their overall professional performance.