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Because the mission of smaller academic libraries serving fewer than 10,000 full-time enrolled students is mainly to serve the curriculum-based needs of students and faculty, collection management in these libraries needs to be directly related to changes in the curriculum of the parent institution. A look into applicable collection management literature, combined with one library’s experience, offers insights about effective curriculum-based collection building in a smaller academic library setting. To achieve efficiency, collection managers must maintain up-to-date knowledge of changing instructional and research needs at their institutions, the needs new programs have for library materials, appropriate collection assessment tools, and the tasks involved in a focused expansion project. By optimizing consultations with faculty and evaluation procedures scaled to its needs, the library at North Georgia College & State University, a modestly sized academic institution, established a model for becoming an active participant in new course and program planning during the application stage, ensuring appropriate library support for new courses and programs of study.
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INTRODUCTION

The literature on academic collection development tends to cover issues regarding a library’s entire collection, a particular medium, or tools and
processes suitable for use by large research libraries, with only a few library scholars targeting collection building to support particular academic subject areas or the special needs of smaller academic libraries serving student populations of fewer than 10,000 full-time enrolled students. On the topic of dedicated collection expansion, one of the most helpful articles focuses on the experiences of Trinity University Library in San Antonio, Texas, which doubled the size of its collection in the 1980s (Werking 1991). On the topic of collection analysis to ensure program support, one of the most helpful details the post-expansion evaluation of the health sciences collections completed by the University of Nevada at Las Vegas (UNLV) Libraries (Sinha and Tucker 2005). Though excellent resources for all collection managers, the two articles above focus on the needs, practices, and tools of large academic research libraries, like most of the pertinent literature. The current article, by contrast, will focus on collection-building efforts at a smaller university library, where an important goal of the collection development program is to ensure that the library will be able to respond with appropriate levels of support for new courses and academic programs as they are added to the curriculum.

THE INSTITUTION AND ITS NEEDS

With an enrollment that grew from just over 4,500 full-time students in 2006 to just over 5,000 in 2008 (NGCSU 2008), North Georgia College & State University (NGCSU) in Dahlonega is a growing regional university that serves students primarily from the northern area of the state (NGCSU University Relations 2005). NGCSU’s Library offers a modest print collection of approximately 150,000 volumes, and during 2006, the course application year covered in this article, the planned materials budget was just over $231,000 (NGCSU 2005). As enrollment has risen and as the educational mission of the institution has continued to evolve, NGCSU has seen a number of curriculum additions, especially in the areas of international relations, business, and foreign languages. Because such additions can greatly shift the demands placed on a modestly sized library collection and because budget requirements to acquire new materials may be substantial, library management and staff at NGCSU have found it necessary to develop tools and processes that ensure library involvement in the curriculum addition process. Though NGCSU’s practices parallel to some extent those described by Reeta Sinha and Cory Tucker in their article on library involvement in new program review at UNLV (Sinha and Tucker 2005), certain processes need to be scaled differently, simpler evaluation tools are often preferable, and responsibilities need to be distributed differently in a smaller academic library, with its smaller staff and budget and its curriculum-driven collection policy.

During the spring of 2006, NGCSU faculty submitted applications for the following curriculum additions: an introductory course in Chinese, intended
Building the College Library Collection

as the basis for a sequence of Chinese language courses; an undergraduate major in international relations; and a masters of business administration (MBA) program the classes of which would be held at a satellite campus in a neighboring county. All were ultimately added to the curriculum. This article represents a synthesis of pertinent literature with practices developed or refined by library staff at NGCSU’s Stewart Library during the new-course application cycle from 2006 to 2007. It focuses on effective planning practices during the new course or program approval process and seeks to integrate a variety of perspectives on how small academic libraries can grow and tailor their collections to support the expanding curricular needs of their parent institutions. Topics considered include knowledge the library needs in order to plan an expansion, a model for gaining this knowledge, required actions, an effective order in which to perform these actions, and suggestions about follow-through. The treatment of these topics also includes an examination of how accreditation requirements, budget, and changing technologies affect collection development as it relates to curriculum growth.

KNOWLEDGE NEEDED

There are many things a library needs to know in order to manage a collection, including two that are particularly important when preparing for an expansion: where the institution is going and what materials will be needed to support a new course or program.

Where the Institution Is Going

Academic library collection managers need to be among the first people on campus to know about new program initiatives. According to Willis Bridegam, “The astute college librarian will learn of departmental ambitions at an early stage when it is still possible to comment and perhaps influence the nature of the proposals” (Bridegam 1991, 79). Some directors, such as NGCSU’s Shawn Tonner, have taken library involvement in the proposal process a step further by having a “library costs” line item included on the college’s course and program review form (NGCSU 2009). First introduced in the 2006 version of the form, this section reads as follows:

This proposal has been reviewed by the library director concerning the adequacy of library materials available for the proposed course. **Date:**

If library materials to support this proposal are inadequate, the library director has confirmed that the estimated cost of acquiring the necessary materials is: $_____ **start-up and** $_____ **ongoing.** (NGCSU 2008)

The inclusion of library collection review and budget estimates, via this short section in the course and program review form, effectively involves
the library in every curriculum addition decision and provides administrative
decision makers with vital budget planning information. In the case of a
single course application, the library performs a microanalysis of all types
of library materials needed to support teaching and student research in the
relatively narrow subject range covered. In the case of a new academic
program application, the library performs a comprehensive macroanalysis of
all relevant subject areas, all material types, and the holdings of selected peer
institution libraries already supporting similar programs (Tonner 2009). The
information on costs, ultimately presented as the two dollar amounts on the
completed form, is the result of a complex process of consultation between
faculty members and library staff about materials and access needs, followed
by analyses of library holdings, consortial access, collection gaps that must be
filled, and special needs of the particular course or academic program being
proposed. Figure 1 shows a completed review form for a business course.

Including the library in the review process explicitly connects the new
program or course with a budget projection for the supporting library col-
lection expansion. This strengthens the library’s position when making a
funding request for the expansion start-up, and it ensures that the library
has a documented basis on which to apply for additional funding to meet
ongoing costs for adequate curricular support. The fundamental reason for
the library to participate in the review process is that the budgeting practices
of academic institutions tend to limit future expenditures in any particular
area. If library funding for a dedicated collection expansion is not allotted
as part of the original course or program approval process, it can be nearly
impossible to obtain later. Budgetary rules at smaller institutions such as
NGCSU generally allot an annual library purchasing amount to each aca-
demic department. The library allotment for a newly established program
needs to be much larger in the first year than in any subsequent year; with-
out a mechanism providing for additional one-time start-up spending, the
library runs the risk of lacking the funding to add appropriate resources to
support the new program. In this situation, the library would be obliged to
shift funding from the allotments of other programs to purchase adequate
materials or to submit a separate library funding application, possibly at the
state level in the case of NGCSU, in order to meet new program needs at
start-up. Participation in the new course and program review process is one
of the more effective ways for academic libraries to ensure that they can
adequately respond to the needs of a new course or program.

Materials Needed to Support a New Course or Program

The library collection manager needs to collect information on a regu-
lar basis about topics currently being taught, teaching methods, and top-
ics of current faculty research. In addition, librarians and faculty need to
Building the College Library Collection

Course & Program Review Form

North Georgia College & State University

Department: Mike Cottrell School of Business
Course: BUSA 2528

Credit Hours: 1-3
Type of Action (Check ONE):
Course: X Addition
Program: Addition
Other Change in Department Requirements:

If course, check categories affected:
_____ Core Requirements
_____ Core Electives
_____ Major Requirements
_____ Electives
_____ Other (Specify)

Term Effective: Year Summer 2009

Catalog Description (For courses, include Co- and Prerequisites; for programs, provide Plan of Study.)

Rationale for Addition, Deletion or Revision: Attach to this form

Primary Professor Teaching the Course (if applicable): varies

*Please indicate the amount of a course fee if applicable: $_______
Please note if the course fee already exists and has been approved by the BOR.

This proposal has been reviewed by the library director concerning the adequacy of library materials available for the proposed course.

If library materials to support this proposal are inadequate, the library director has confirmed that the estimated cost of acquiring the necessary materials is: $500 (7-8 books) _______ start-up and $250 (3-4 books) on-going.

Department Head (Required)

Date

Dean (Required)

Date

Prof. Edu. Com. (Recommendation, if applicable)

Date

Graduate Council (if applicable)

Date

Academic Activities Committee (if applicable)

Date

Academic Vice President (Required)

Date

Revised: 11-14-2008

FIGURE 1 Course and program review form.
exchange information about emerging new library and research support products in order to determine the usefulness of those products to the institution.

Donald Frank et al. advocate the concept of “information consulting” by librarians. In this model based on existing management consultancy practices, the “consultant-librarian” discovers user needs by actively soliciting information from them and markets value-added library-based information services to them (Frank et al. 2001, 93–94). The consultant-librarian’s relationship with each faculty member provides information about book, journal, media, and data resources needed for instructional preparation, student research assignments, and faculty professional development. This information enables the library to tailor materials and services to meet the faculty member’s specific needs.

Knowledge gained from the consulting process can also be fed into the collection development information gathering process so that materials can be acquired as faculty and student needs shift. When a new course is added to the curriculum, the professor can be asked to provide a consultant-librarian with a syllabus, which is a helpful guide to planning library access to appropriate books, journals, and data resources for instructional preparation and student research assignments, as well as any media selections needed for classroom and research use. Sample syllabi provide information about homework and writing assignments and outline the scope of the material taught in the course. For example, a librarian can learn from Professor Dlynn Armstrong-Williams’s East Asian Political Systems syllabus (www.ngcsu.edu/academic/Bus_Gov/Ps_cj/Syllabi/Spring%202009/EASyllabus20091.doc) that the library will need to support this course with appropriate materials for students to use in writing term papers, policy papers, and article-based class discussions about Japanese and Chinese government topics. When Armstrong-Williams was developing the program of which this course is a component, two library staff members reviewed sample syllabi and program planning documents, and we consulted with Armstrong-Williams to determine the periodical databases, statistical databases, and print materials needed to support the courses in such a program. The consultant-librarian model, practiced at even a moderate level, ensures that each new course or program will be well supported. The hour or two required for a faculty consultation regarding future needs for library materials is highly valuable to both parties in terms of knowledge exchange and ability to plan effectively.

Library scholars and managers agree that consultation with faculty is vital, and experience shows that it is especially important in planning library support for new courses. Mary and John Scudder point out that in order to meet library responsibilities for building a strong collection, the academic librarian “requires extensive faculty involvement in the selection process” (Scudder and Scudder 1991, 140). Frank makes faculty consultation
an integral part of the consultant-librarian model (Frank et al. 2001, 91). Myoung Chung Wilson and Hendrik Edelman describe the particular need for collection development librarians to gain “an understanding of the intellectual ... structure of the user community,” particularly in cases in which varied component subjects have coalesced into newer interdisciplinary programs (Wilson and Edelman 1996, 197). In practice, NGCSU’s Library uses the new course and program review process to set the stage for constructive exchange and collaboration between faculty and librarians. As new majors and fields of study are developed in colleges and universities, faculty consultation is a valuable mechanism to ensure corresponding library collection development. Faculty and students in newly added fields of study, such as NGCSU’s newly approved MBA program, will enjoy measurable benefits from collection-building practices informed by knowledge that faculty provide about the subject areas from which scholars in this multidisciplinary field draw their research literature.

Because the NGCSU library does not collect comprehensively or use approval programs, it relies partially on faculty members to request materials such as specialized data sets, Web applications, periodicals, media, and print resources as well as to participate in the selection process on an ongoing basis. This faculty participation in collection development functions in conjunction with a discipline liaison librarian program, the ongoing collection development program, and the new course application process. Faculty members are encouraged to submit requests for all types of materials found in Choice Reviews Online as well as in publications, publisher catalogs, and Web sites that serve their disciplines.

Once the range of materials needed is known, the library is ready to perform a Library of Congress (LC) class evaluation of its own collection and of selected aspirant peer libraries already supporting academic programs or courses comparable to the planned local addition. Aspirant peer selection should be based on both a reputation for strength in the particular area of study under consideration and a reputation for library excellence. Faculty consultation can also be helpful in developing a short list of aspirant peer institutions. Their knowledge of programs in their own disciplines at other universities, their experiences with interlibrary loan, and their on-site use of libraries at other institutions can all helpfully inform the aspirant peer selection process. NGCSU integrates information about the scope of particular academic programs at other institutions with library-specific user numbers and Carnegie Class to identify a small selection of aspirant peer libraries that excellently support academic programs similar to those being proposed locally.

The collection analysis itself involves developing a list of pertinent subjects and corresponding LC class number ranges, searching the holdings of the home library and of two or three selected aspirant peer libraries for book and media holdings in those ranges, and analyzing the results for timeliness.
and completeness of coverage. Great care should be taken with book and media collection evaluations, especially when treating subject areas such as languages and literature in which books still maintain a vital role in the dissemination of scholarship, or area studies, in which primary resources in non-text and nontraditional media form the basis for scholarship. In the current environment, evaluation of journal titles and databases available has become a high priority, with special attention given to coverage both for titles held or accessed and for years available.

These specific evaluations serve both to judge the magnitude of library acquisitions required to support the new course or program and to ensure that the institution can financially afford the library resources needed to continue to meet regional accreditation requirements as well as any program-specific needs. NGCSU is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). SACS criteria at the time of the expansion described in this article specified that every college and university library must provide “resources that are appropriate to support its teaching, research, and service mission” (SACS 2001). The SACS Commission on Colleges has recently approved revised language regarding library requirements as follows: “The institution, through ownership or formal arrangements or agreements, provides and supports student and faculty access and user privileges to adequate library collections and services and to other learning/information resources consistent with the degrees offered” (SACS 2006). The new wording demonstrates that those involved in the institutional peer review process are engaged in an effort to adjust SACS library standards to keep up with innovative trends toward use of full-text electronic databases, consortial borrowing, and enhanced interlibrary loan. Standards and verbiage vary among regional accreditation bodies, and some regional requirements are more specific than others. Library collection managers thus need to maintain an up-to-date knowledge of applicable regional accreditation standards in order to ensure that their collections continue to meet those standards, even as the academic programs they support grow and change. Paul Coleman and Ada Jarred have found that the Association of College and Research Libraries “Standards for Libraries in Higher Education” meet or exceed the criteria of all regional college accreditation boards in the United States (Coleman 1994, 275), making this group of documents a must-use resource for academic library planners. Furthermore, it is important to look beyond basic accreditation requirements to special and developing needs, such as remote access to books and journals for satellite and distance education programs, for example (Appleton 2004, 246). Newer media types such as e-book collections should be considered by collection managers responsible for meeting such needs (Tonner 2006), and innovative modes of access such as document delivery on demand should be examined where economic resources and the breadth of journal-based materials needed are at odds (Carroll and Brink 2006).
CONSIDERING THE BEST TOOLS TO USE

Requiring faculty to include a full-scale estimate of library costs in new course or program applications is the most effective means of ensuring that the library is included in the planning and approval process. Informal procedures may be sufficient in some situations, especially where an approval plan is in place and can be supplemented by vendor-provided subject analysis, but formal requirements work more consistently where library materials are purchased on an ad hoc basis, because they compel faculty to meet with library planners and share their own professional materials selection tools. As mentioned above, curricular tools used by faculty, such as course lists for new programs (Scudder and Scudder 1991) and syllabi for new courses, are valuable collection-building tools, as they indicate concrete instructional and research support needs (Tonner 2006). Faculty members have generally been very willing to share these documents with their respective liaison librarians at NGCSU in recent years, possibly in part because the more formal course application requirement has introduced the concept of library support for curriculum into the local institutional culture.

A key resource in the comparative evaluation process is the right tool for searching and comparing the online public access catalogs (OPACs) of the home institution and the selected aspirant peer libraries. Depending on the scale of the evaluation, the budget of the home library, and the reliability of peer participation in WorldCat, OPAC data collection and analysis can be done in a number of different ways. A powerful collection comparison and analysis tool such as WorldCat’s Collection Analysis module is most appropriate for large-scale evaluations (Lakos 2007, 438) and for subject areas that adhere closely to OCLC Conspectus subject divisions (Davis et al. 2008, 238). (More information at http://www.oclc.org/collectionanalysis/about/default.htm). Jennifer Beals recommends the use of brief test methodology based on WorldCat records for performing limited subject collection analyses over multiple institutions in a consortium (Beals 2006). If the library belongs to a consortium, as NGCSU belongs to Georgia’s GALILEO, it may also be worthwhile to inquire whether the consortium’s central office can generate certain complex multi-institutional analytical reports that cannot be generated locally. After taking into account subscription costs and scale issues, managers of smaller libraries may find that data gleaned using local and consortial catalog searches, WorldCat’s simpler functions, and straightforward searching of aspirant peer OPACs are sufficient for their purposes. Whether high-powered or relatively simple, the various collection evaluation tools provide holdings data for the generation of spreadsheets and comparative charts that form an integral part of the new course or program application package, supporting the validity of projected “library costs.”
Journal collection evaluation is a bit trickier, as comparative searching at other institutions is generally not possible due to licensing protections. Peer library home pages offer clues about their licensures, and newer resources have made peer library serials evaluation easier than it was only a few years ago. Catalog add-ons such as Serials Solutions (http://www.serialssolutions.com) and federated search software integrate electronic journal holdings and other materials into the publicly accessible pages of most academic libraries. Unfortunately, analysis using WorldCat tools still does not reveal full details about serials title holdings and date ranges, so examining holdings on the peer institution’s library Web site is still a good idea. Additional information can generally be obtained by directly contacting serials managers at peer libraries (Tonner 2006). The home library’s locally and consorionally licensed journal databases should be trial-searched for adequacy of coverage using subject terms developed in consultation with faculty, and the list of serials titles owned or accessed should be measured against an “ideal holdings” list of subject-related titles generated using subject bibliographies and collection tools such as Katz’s *Magazines for Libraries*. Metz and Gasser explain how this process can be streamlined using Bowker’s Serials Analysis System (information at http://www.ulrichsweb.com/ulrichsweb/analysis/help/USAS_FAQ.asp) (Metz and Gasser 2006).

Subscriptions to statistical or informational databases and government publications should also be analyzed as necessary. UNLV includes both categories in the assessment process (Sinha and Tucker 2005, 368–370), an example libraries of all sizes would do well to follow. With U.S. government resources increasingly available only via the Internet, the process of locating these resources is now basically independent of the budgeting process, but including it in the new course review process would ensure that a complete view of projected information needs is formed.

Throughout the evaluation process, librarians should note gaps in subject coverage and add titles and prices to a wish list for acquisition. Once evaluations are completed, it is useful to develop a holdings and access “score,” the percentage of the ideal holdings list already owned or accessed. This score is a good indication of both short-term and long-term library acquisition needs in the focus subject area. One can generate a score using the aspirant peer with the most comprehensive support level or a published “best” list such as Katz’s as the ideal. In the case of NGCSU’s business management collection evaluation, the numbers from Tables 1, 2, and 3 below show the following ratios: cataloged books and media, NGCSU: 1,801 items/University of California, Los Angeles: 6,967 items (26%) and journals, NGCSU: 282 current + 120 embargoed (divided by 2)/Katz’s recommended: 564 (61%). None of the suggested specialized databases were held. The NGCSU library would not need to plan to achieve an overall 100% score, as that would not be in line with the overall holdings level or user numbers. Raising the number of locally available book and media titles, especially electronically available
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TABLE 1  Library Catalog Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Heading</th>
<th>NGCSU LC Titles</th>
<th>UCLA Titles</th>
<th>Univ Michigan Titles</th>
<th>Univ Minnesota Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance—U.S.</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business—U.S.</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting—U.S.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Business</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Motivation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Information Systems</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>1,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business Enterprises</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Marketing—U.S.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>6,967</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>7,557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

titles and those published in the last five years, to the 30% level (about 400 additional titles) and ensuring access to 100% of appropriate titles via interlibrary loan would be a desirable start-up goal, with an allowance to move above the 30% level (100 additional titles) in the long term. Increasing local journal access to 78% (about 100 titles) and ensuring interlibrary loan access to 100% would be a start-up goal, and maintaining this level an ongoing goal with cost increases attached. The addition of carefully selected periodicals and other types of databases tailored to actual curricular needs would be a start-up goal with an ongoing subscription expense attached. These goal figures should be determined by library collection development staff, keeping curricular needs and accreditation factors in mind. Budget estimate amounts

TABLE 2  Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals by Subject</th>
<th>Number Listed</th>
<th>NGCSU Journals With 100% Electronic or Print Access</th>
<th>NGCSU Journals With Partial Access (Current Issues Embargo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Taxation</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising, Marketing, &amp; Public Relations</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, Administration &amp; Human Resources</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3  Databases and Electronic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database subscriptions</th>
<th>Budget Pricing</th>
<th>UCLA</th>
<th>U. of MI</th>
<th>U. of MN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Company Resource Center</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Board Research Reports</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Affiliations</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datamonitor (now MarketResearch)</td>
<td>$8,000-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EconLit</td>
<td>$1,834</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factiva</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Market Information Database</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GMID Plus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMID Core $9K)</td>
<td>$9,000–18,000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investext Plus</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LexisNexis Statistical</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIS International +</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference USA</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard &amp; Poor’s NetAdvantage</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Street Journal online</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningstar</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TBD = to be determined at a later date.

can then be generated using start-up and ongoing goals. Table 4 shows the estimated start-up and ongoing costs for library support estimates.

Standard collection development resources such as Resources for College Libraries and Best Books for Academic Libraries remain valuable to developing core title lists for new programs. Appropriate subject bibliographies suggested by faculty or by reference staff can add a more focused view, as can subject- or area-specific guides, ranging from article to book length. (Some outstanding examples are included in the “Selected Collection Development Tools” list at the end of this article: Klopfer’s article on Internet reference sources and Hazen’s book on area studies collections.) Planners should also study marketing materials, reviews, and other selection aids for all relevant material types and genres. They should not hesitate to contact vendors directly when needed, particularly in the area of databases, to obtain

TABLE 4  Library Assessment for Proposed MBA Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Budget Pricing Start-up Costs</th>
<th>Budget Pricing Ongoing Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Books &amp; media</td>
<td>$30,000 400 titles @ $75/title</td>
<td>$7,500 100 titles @ $75/title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Journals</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000 + 8% annual cost increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>$20,000 100 titles @ $300 each</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the fullest information possible. The American Library Association’s *Choice Reviews Online* is an excellent tool for developing current and retrospective title lists. Though the site’s LC subject heading search function is not always adequate for this particular purpose, searching by academic subject or by “words in review” is very effective. Susan Herzog recommends using Baker & Taylor’s *Title Source* online searchable database and provides lists of other highly useful selection tools (Herzog 2004, 154–158). Media reviews should be sought as needed from a variety of sources, including professional journals serving the pertinent academic discipline. Analyses of e-book providers and services, such as Dennis Dillon’s study conducted at the University of Texas libraries, provide important decision-making information, as do direct marketing materials obtainable from e-book vendors such as EBSCO and NetLibrary (Dillon 2001). Careful perusal of available e-titles will help collection managers consider the relative costs and benefits of purchasing or leasing individual titles or collections. In evaluating what resources the library must acquire in order to adequately support a new program or course, it is important to be open to using a wide variety of collection development tools, as this process requires both broad and deep knowledge of what is available from the full range of print, electronic, and other media.

**STEPS IN THE PROCESS OF PLANNING A SUBJECT-FOCUSED COLLECTION EXPANSION**

There are no hard and fast rules for how to structure an expansion, but the following order of actions has proven successful over time at NGCSU. Without offering a fixed how-to guide, the following order of operations is intended as a functional model. First, learn about needs by meeting with the faculty member applying for approval of a new course or academic program. Second, compile “ideal collection” lists using bibliographies, reviews, and journal index searches. Review these lists with the faculty member to adjust focus and determine needed additions or deletions. Third, evaluate home library holdings against these lists, looking for existing coverage as well as gaps in coverage. Fourth, compare home library holdings to those of aspirant peer libraries, considering raw numbers, scope of coverage, and the ratio of materials to faculty, number of courses planned, and expected enrollment numbers. Fifth, estimate costs for adding needed materials to the library collection, keeping in mind both start-up and ongoing expenses. Include all material types and include expected price increase rates in the budget planning document. Tables 1 through 4 are budget and collection planning documents covering books and media, journals, and databases for a subject-specific collection expansion to support a proposed MBA program at NGCSU. They were included in library support documentation for the MBA program application submitted by NGCSU to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia in 2006.
The library catalog comparison data in Table 1 were collected using the following methods: Cataloged monograph holdings of each institution were searched using LC subject heading samples that match the proposed NGCSU MBA program course offerings. In addition to the peer comparisons, *Choice Reviews Online* (www.cro2.org) was searched using the following parameters: Subject, “Business”; Copyright years, 2001–2007; title rating, “essential” or “highly recommended”; and recommended audience, “upper division or graduate.” NGCSU held 65 of the 420 titles (15%) in the resulting *Choice Reviews Online* list.

For the journal evaluation summarized in Table 2, a different method was used. As no reliable method of comparing journal holdings among schools was found at the time, librarians settled on the alternative method of comparing NGCSU print and electronic journal holdings in target areas to those listed in Katz’s *Magazines for Libraries* (2006). Though this somewhat primitive technique based on Katz’s was used in 2006, NGCSU’s Library has recently been using the Bowker Serial Analysis System to more effectively analyze local and consortial periodicals access. Tools for peer analysis outside the GALILEO consortium remain limited.

Database and electronic resource holdings were evaluated by comparing selected title holdings of all the aspirant peer institutions. The databases and electronic resources shown in Table 3 are held by a majority of target comparison institutions, with 2006 price information shown where available.

Finally, a library cost estimates document showing start-up and ongoing costs for acquiring and maintaining materials in the needed subject areas and in resource types appropriate for a satellite campus student population was generated (Table 4).

The budgeting process used at NGCSU brings together all information gathered, translating the gap between the current collection and the ideal collection into a more concrete buying plan with a price tag attached. To make the budget document useful as a financing tool as well as a planning tool, it is important to treat all material types realistically. Collection managers need to budget for books and media by multiplying the current average cost per item by the number of items needed. (Average cost per item or subscription year may be found in publications such as *The Bowker Annual: Library and Book Trade Almanac* and Katz’s *Magazines for Libraries.*) Collection managers must also consider the effect of inflation on ongoing expenses and budget for journals and databases, keeping in mind that new licenses may need to be negotiated and current title bundles replaced with larger ones or augmented with additional ones. In planning for journal additions, it is important to keep in mind current annual price increase percentages, determined using both statistical resources such as Association of Research Libraries reports and recent library expenditure data. The most recent average annual rate of increase published by the Association of Research Libraries was 7.5% (Association of Research Libraries 2006),
but annual increases can fluctuate widely. Current information on journal pricing may be obtained directly from serials vendors (many are listed in the American Libraries Buyers Guide [http://americanlibrariesbuyersguide.com]), and price trends are tracked in professional publications such as Library Journal (see Van Orsdel and Born 2008). Budgeting for informational and statistical databases is done by tallying individual costs, again allowing for increases. When adequate budget planning information is made part of the course or program application process, the library is in a much better financial position to acquire needed materials once the course or program is approved.

**COMPLETION OF THE PROCESS**

Applications for new courses or programs can take from months to years to move through the approval process. For this reason, budgeting for inflation and price increases is extremely important. Once the application process is complete, if the course or program is approved, funds will be assigned for library acquisitions and purchasing of materials can start, based on the start-up, or core, portion of the prepared ideal collection list. Decisions about approval plan use need to be tailored to the dynamics of the individual library. Libraries already using approval plans should meet with vendor representatives to build criteria related to the new course or program into the library purchasing profile for ongoing collection building. Because of its exclusive focus on new publications, approval plan buying is not always appropriate for the initial purchasing effort. When working with a small budget, Wanda Dole cautions against use of approval plans at all (Dole 1991, 160), and Ann Niles notes that use of such plans is counterproductive when faculty are directly involved in the selection process (Niles 1991, 168). Should a course or program not be approved, the library should still keep all documentation on file for several years, as institutional budgetary constraints or overall curricular missions do change over time, and a re-application in the future is possible. At the time of re-application, additional evaluation will be necessary to produce a timely statement of library needs, but even after several years have passed, the original documents can be used as the basis for a new evaluation.

**ONGOING SUPPORT FOR THE NEW COURSE OR PROGRAM**

When using the consultant-librarian model, contact with faculty remains important after the new course or program has been approved. Aggressive marketing of new library materials and services to faculty members and program administrators is quite important, and the establishment of “consultant-faculty partnership” relations increases opportunities for student information literacy instruction (Frank et al. 2001, 93–95). Experience at NGCSU confirms
that collegial relationships between library collection managers and faculty are particularly valuable in the context of new academic program support and the introduction of new library materials and tools, which both faculty members and students may need to learn how to use. As new media types and access methods are acquired, training faculty and students in their use is essential. For example, Appleton’s study cited above focuses on the current need to include instruction in the use of e-books in student information literacy training (Appleton 2004, 21). This particular need will surely be replaced in the future by the need for instruction in using as yet undiscovered library material formats. Once materials acquisition is under way, collection managers should continue to reevaluate the collection supporting the new course or program over time. Collection managers need to continue to consult with faculty, take note of unforeseen gaps, monitor newly published materials, and build upon the core collection to approach as nearly as possible the ideal collection described in planning documents.

CONCLUSION

In smaller academic libraries, the focused building of the collection to support a new course or academic program begins with the application process, as faculty members gather information about the feasibility of additions to the curriculum. Ideally, a librarian, whether a discipline liaison, collection manager, or library director, is involved in the application process, so that realistic, concrete budget projections for collection expansion form an integral part of the application. This is most likely to happen when a library funding requirement is built into the application process and when a collegial relationship exists between librarians and faculty. Under these conditions, a straightforward sequence of steps can be followed, leading to the creation of a clear library budget requirement to support the new course or program and to the compilation of an ideal collection list. The list can then be used to guide both start-up and ongoing materials acquisition once the new course or program has been approved. As with so many areas of academic library management, clear policy, proper planning, and deliberate use of tools and processes go a long way toward ensuring a successful course- or program-focused collection expansion.
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