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Presentation objectives:

• Discuss the current situation in the use of geospatial collection development policies by Map/GIS librarians in the western world
• Outline the basic characteristics of policy texts implemented in Map/GIS libraries of the western world
• Support the wide use of a common policy text by Map/GIS libraries in order not only to cover their user’s information needs but also to develop fruitful co-operations
Outline

• Collection Development: old trends in new style
• Policies
• Current situation in geospatial collections
• Policies’ characteristics
• Conclusions
Collection Development is a dynamic process aiming:

- To users’ needs satisfaction,
- The use of new technologies,
- Development of cooperative schemas,
- Reflect the variety of forms that carry information,
- Raising economic sources (Sanchez Vignau & Meneses, 2005)
- Demonstrating libraries’ impact and value in the educational mission and in institutional effectiveness (Johnson, 2018)
Factors affecting Collection Development

- Economic crisis
- Publications’ increased number
- The variety of forms that carry information
- Technology development

(Sanchez Vignau & Meneses, 2005; Nabe, 2011)
Collection Development Policy is....

“a procedure that allows identifications of weakness and abilities of the collection in terms of user needs and resources of the community it serves”

(Evans, 1987, p.13)

“a process not only related to the creation of a physical collection, but more so in the sense of providing access to information”

(Tucker & Torrence, 2004)

“text that defines the scope of a library’s existing collection, plan for the continuing development of resources, identify collection strengths, and outline the relationship between selection philosophy and the institution’s goals, general selection criteria and intellectual freedom”

(ALA, 1987)
In Literature CDP is defining as:

- “Tool” (Bostic, 1988; ARL, 1989; Wood & Hoffmann, 1996)
- “a contract” between the library and its users which clearly demonstrates to the organization members what to expect from the library” (Gorman & Howes, 1989)
- “a training tool for the new staff” (Jenkins & Morley, 1999, p.8)
- “the vehicle through which the library will achieve its service goals to its users” (Ikem, 1995)
- «a guide to the libraries’ sources for the academic community» (Olatunji Olaojo & Akewukereke, 2006)
- “libraries without CDP are like enterprises without business plan” (Johnson, 2014)
Reasons for CDP implementation

Poor funding of academic libraries requires a balance between:
- the provision of educational and research material
- books and journal in print and electronic format
- current needs, but also
- meeting future needs

(Jenkins & Morley, 1999, p.7)

Needs that a CDP covers:

1. Material selection for the collection
2. Future planning
3. Public relations (users/institution stakeholders)
4. Broader cooperation with other libraries

(Vickery, 2004)
In order to be acceptable a CDP should reflect:

- Institutional culture,
- The assessment of its needs,
- Its objectives,
- The implementation,
- The administrative control,
- The evaluation performed

(Ikem, 1995)
The implementation of a CDP is affected by:

The institutions’ in which operates purpose statement or strategic plan  
(Svenningsen & Cheperon, 1998)

Constraints on libraries’ budgets

Development of electronic resources and networks  
(Branin e.a., 2000)

Consortium expansion  
(Thornton, 2000)

Staff reduction  
(Colvin, 2009, p.10)

Access issues

Copyright and data security issues

Social factors  
(Boxall & Anderson, 2005)
Collection Development Policy role for the parent Institution

- To describe what is going to accomplish,
- To be an effort for services and programs improvement,
- To denote a logical and organized change,
- To ensure decision making,
- To normalize activities

(Olaojo & Akewukereke, 2006)
In the digital era...

“the basis for policy development in the digital library environment comes from the policies set for traditional information environment, incorporating all these aspects that determine the proper collection function, and taking into account the specific features of the digital environment”

(Sanchez Vignau & Presno Quesada, 2006)
Collection Development Policy text components

- Mission statement
- Goals and objectives
- Selection
- Clientele & Special Collections
- Special areas & Legal issues
- Collection maintenance
- Subjects
- Consortia, cooperative agreements & networking
- Revision Statement

(Futas, 1995; Jenkins & Morley, 1999, p.7)
Related Researches

- 1977 (ARL)  ▶ 29% of 70 libraries had written policies
- 1980 (Bryant)  ▶ 43% of libraries had some texts
- 1989 (Taborsky & Lenkowski)  ▶ 58% had written policy (some were mission statements)
- 1995 (Futas)  ▶ 1/3 of academic libraries in USA did not have written policy
- 2007 (ARL)  ▶ 98% of libraries had librarian with relevant to CDP responsibilities
Since policies are so important which are the reasons that most libraries ignore it?

- Collection evaluation
- Inflexibility and non-response to changes (Hazen, 1995)
- Twice time required for their maintenance

Snow (1996) characterizes it “as a part of the librarianship religion” and reports... a research (Cohen, 1988) : from 5 academic libraries of Alabama only 1 had written policy (as a cause mentioned: lack of money and staff time)
Librarian’s skills for developing a CDP

- Commitment to the library
- Analysis skills
- Communication skills
- Economic skills
- Administrative skills
- Ethical values
- Continuous learning
- Vision

Familiar with:

- Scientific communication
- New technologies
- Copyright issues
- Evaluation issues

(Phillips, 2003)

(Pastine, 1998)
Factors affecting geospatial collection development in a library

• Library’s intention to highlight and demonstrate its geographic information
• Staff availability and equipment to support the collection
• Familiarity to GIS
• Whether library is a public information repository

(Stephens, 1997)
Geospatial Collection Development Policy

Literature suggests:

“a library must implement a geospatial collection development policy” (Lamont, 1997; Larsgaard, 1998; Stone, 1999)

“Geospatial collection development policy is not consistent with the library’s traditional collection development policy. GIS users are not necessarily part of the same user community of the printed collection” (Florance, 2006)
For an effective geospatial policy development is recommended:

• Observation and recording of user needs for some time before the necessary actions are taken
• Record issues related to:
  ▶ requested types of data
  ▶ geographical areas of interest

(Larsgaard, 1998; Stone, 1999; Martindale, 2004)
Literature reveals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveys for GIS services implementation in libraries</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>GIS services implementation percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARL, 1999</td>
<td>64/72</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone-Muilenburg, 2001</td>
<td>67/1310</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinikin and Hench, 2005</td>
<td>22/138</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinikin and Hench, 2005a</td>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabaldon and Repplinger, 2006</td>
<td>31/103</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garza, 2006</td>
<td>69/100</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good, 2009</td>
<td>~90%</td>
<td>~90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardakosta and Kapidakis, 2011</td>
<td>95/133</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the availability of geospatial collection policies?
Which are their specific characteristics as they emerge through their published texts?

**Sample Size:** 136 Libraries with geospatial collections from USA, Canada, Europe, Australia and New Zealand

**Survey tools:**
- research in library’s website
- e-mail
- content analysis

**Time:** November 2013 – April 2014
Results (1)

Geospatial Collections
Policies in Map/GIS Libraries

- No policy: 21%
- Policy: 39%
- No answer: 40%

Map/GIS Libraries with policies and membership in Map/GIS Library Association/s

- 1 membership: 47%
- 2 memberships: 13%
- 3 memberships: 6%
- No membership: 34%
Results (2)

Policy texts categorization

Policy types in terms of extent

- Concise Policy: 56%
- Extensive Policy: 38%
- Outline Policy: 6%

- Library Collections: 15.1%
- Cartographic & Geospatial Material: 37.7%
- Geospatial Collection: 15.1%
- Data: 3.8%
- Subject Categories: 28.3%
Results (3)
Geospatial Collections Development Policies Characteristics

1. General information (Table 1)
2. Information about the "Collection" (Table 2)
3. Information about "Data" (Table 3)
4. Information about “Data availability and Open Access” (Table 4)
5. Information about "Partnerships" (Table 5)
6. Information about "Other Sources" (Table 6)
7. Information about the "Geographic/Geological Collection Assessment" (Table 7)
8. Information about "Related Policies" (Table 8)
Results (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No of texts</th>
<th>Percentage (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creation Date/Approval/Update Date</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy Text Author/Contact person/Subject Librarian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy Purpose</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>History of the Collection</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic Program Information</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GeoCollection’s Location</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Special Policy Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Policy Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. Information about Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No of texts</th>
<th>Percentage (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collection Guidelines:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Priorities</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language/s</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication Dates</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographical priorities/range</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>File Formats and Types</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material type included/excluded</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chronological Range</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale range</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collection Scope</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Collection Description</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Selection/Evaluation &amp; Priorities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Collection’s Strengths</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Classification and Intensity level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results (6)

### Table 3. Information about Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No of texts</th>
<th>Percentage (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use/Licensing Agreements</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metadata/Documentation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Weeding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Information about Data Availability and Open Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No of texts</th>
<th>Percentage (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Government/Public Sources (e.g. Municipalities)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deposit Programms (e.g. FDLP, USGS, Canadian Topographic maps &amp; data)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commercial Vendors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Free Data Sources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Consortium Agreements</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non Profit Agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Locally produced Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results (7)

Table 5. Information related to Cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No of texts</th>
<th>Percentage (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cooperative Arrangements</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Other Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No of texts</th>
<th>Percentage (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Other related collections in the Library</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other related collections in the area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Information about Geographical/Geospatial Collection Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No of texts</th>
<th>Percentage (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collection Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deselection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collection assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Information about Related Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No of texts</th>
<th>Percentage (n=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Related Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• Despite the significant percentage of identified policies, Map/GIS libraries do not use or publish policy texts. It seems to be a lack of use of library policies as a collection development tool for managing geospatial information.
• The development of a Map/GIS collection is a dynamic and multi-level process with many stakeholders (staff, administration, users, partners).
• The enormous communicative power of the internet is not exploited since libraries do not post policy texts on their web pages.
• The participation of libraries in Map/GIS Libraries Associations seems to enhance the geospatial collection development policies.
Suggestions

• The common use of the “Guidelines for a Geospatial Collection Development Policy”, by those libraries that want to develop geospatial collections in order to fulfill their users’ information needs, or by those Map/GIS Libraries that want to improve their organizational structures and gain better communication for their collections to the wide audience.

• Take part in the research for the development of an “Online Directory of Map/GIS Libraries worldwide” https://tinyurl.com/ydhwouep
Thank you!
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