

Collection development in agricultural university libraries in Karnataka: A study

Srivivasa V¹, Hemantha Kumar G.H^{2*}, Sreenatha Gowda M.S³, Yethi Raju B.N⁴

²⁻⁴Assistant Librarian, ¹University of Agricultural Sciences, Bengaluru, ²Veterinary College, Bengaluru, ³College of Sericulture, Chintamani, Kurboor, ⁴M.S. Ramaiah Medical College, MSR Nagar, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

***Corresponding Author: Hemantha Kumar G.H**

Email: ghhemanth@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study covers on six agricultural universities in Karnataka and focus on professionals, semi-professionals and administrative staff of sample collection. Collection Development contains print media, non print media and budget granted State + ICAR grants and also university-wise expenditure on Books, Journals (Printed) & e-Resources (CeRA) in agricultural university libraries in Karnataka during the year 2011-2016.

Keyword: Collection Development, Agricultural Universities, Library Budget.

Collection development definitions

Many authors have defined the term 'Collection Development' in their own ways.

According to Vignau (2005), collection development is "a process which assumes that the information needs of the users are satisfied in economic fashion and inside of a reasonable period of time using resources as much internal as external to the organization".

According to Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science collection development (CD) "is the sum total of library materials- books, manuscripts, serials, government documents, pamphlets, catalogues, reports, recordings, microfilm reels, micro cards and microfiche, punched cards, computer tapes etc that make up the holdings of a particular library".

Collection development is a set of interrelated activities involved in building and maintaining a collection of library resources to serve the needs and wants of its clients (Kennedy, 2006).

According to Mosher (2011) "Collection Development is a compelling and convenient determination of library materials, shaping a deliberately built branch of knowledge, or be set at the appropriate time course by bibliographic specialists do the examination important to guarantee the synapses joining many choice delicate materials, the capability to make the parts fit entirety".

Collection development in university libraries

Collection development can be described as the ways of building up and improving upon a library's information resources (Horava 2005; Lamb 2004) stated that the major benefit of good library collection is that it helps the libraries to review the strength and the weaknesses of their collection. Showing the importance of collection development in libraries, Ranganathan's Fifth Law of Library Science stated that 'Library is a growing organism' (Khurshid 2000). This indicates that the library is expected to build its collection to meet the information needs of its various users. Horava (2005) stressed the importance of collection development as an important aspect of library service that promotes libraries. Nnadozie (2006) defined

collection development as a planned, continuous and cost effective acquisition of quality and relevant materials to meet the needs of the users and objectives of the university libraries. Collection development is the vehicle through which library the users can measure activities.

University library plays a vital role in education and research programme of a university. Libraries are considered to be the heart of educational institutions. They play a very important role in teaching, learning and research activities environment. The main objective of any library is to support the teaching, learning of the parent institution. The last two decades have dealt with exciting changes and growing importance of information systems and electronic resources. Librarians have made every effort and revised criteria for the selection of materials in new formats while also maintaining traditional collections. Collection development is an important aspect for any library. ICT and electronic information is increasing, along with the printed books on the shelves.

Functionally, collection development involves the efforts like plans, goal to be set, making the decisions, allocation of financial sources and acquisition of materials. Therefore, collection development has been regarded as the most challenging and the most vital activities carried out by academic libraries.

They are three important functions of a library, namely collection, storage and dissemination of information. The collection reflects on the use of the library and effectiveness of other two functions. Libraries today face a challenging task of meeting unlimited information demands of their users with limited financial resources.

E-resources is the wave of future, it will be an ongoing challenge to libraries for years to come. By engaging in careful planning including preparation of e-collection development policy, employing sound selection criteria and monitoring use of resources, libraries will be able to meet the challenge (Vaishnav 2010)

Collection development in the present dynamic environment is a challenge for every university library as various issues like interdisciplinary nature of research, information explosion, production and availability of

information sources, multimedia, automation of library system, physical deterioration of documentary resources, changing concept of ownership to access, library networks, internet services and financial constraints affects their activities and services (Maheswarappa and Tadasad 1997).

Components of collection development

Many authors have differently described the components of collection development. Some authors have explained them as functions of collection development; some elaborated them as elements of collection development and other few have considered them as processes of collection development. Thus, collection development can be cluster of different components, which collectively takes the shape of whole holdings of any library. These components are:

1. Selection
2. Acquisition
3. Resource sharing
4. Collection evaluation
5. Weeding
6. Users’ analysis

Objectives

The main objectives of the study are to investigate the Collection Development in Agricultural University Libraries of Karnataka. The basic objectives are as under:

1. To know the existing book acquisition policy and procedures in university libraries
2. To know the existing Procedures of books and Journals selection a and how the libraries are following them in their book acquisition polices and procedure in University libraries;
3. To know the problems involved in book and non-book acquisition programs of University libraries;
4. To find out the differences between their book acquisition policies and procedure of the six Agricultural Universities of Karnataka selected for the study.
5. To know whether the Library Collection is meeting the users’ needs (Students and Faculty members) to meet their academic activities.
6. To know whether the existing Collection Development policies meeting the University requirement.
7. To ascertain whether collection evaluation techniques are adopted to detect any shortfall and limitations in developing a need based and live collection.
8. To know the fund allocation methods for different departments in university libraries under study.
9. To study the collection development pattern book and of non-book material.
10. To suggest measures for improving the collection development

Research Methodology

Comprehensive review of literature covering the period 2006-2016 and Survey method was employed to study existing and previous Collection Development Activities in Agricultural University Libraries in Karnataka.

To provide an insight to design the objectives of the study with clear vision to proceed, a pre-structured questionnaire was framed to collect the feedback from the librarians. Personal interviews were also conducted wherever clarification and additional details were needed. Data collected was subjected for statistical analysis to prove objectives and hypotheses.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses are a type of generalized supposition formulated by the researcher by the process of intuitive reasoning. After the formulation of hypotheses, it is tested for validity. Below noted hypotheses have been formulated for the present study on collection development in agricultural university libraries in Karnataka.

1. Collection development of a library depends entirely upon library’s acquisition programme, including its acquisition policy, procedure and its selection methods.
2. All the six universities have a Collection Development policy revised regularly in view of the availability of e-Resources and online resources.
3. All the six university libraries are striving very hard to balance between print and electronic resources.
4. All the six universities are entering into consortia subscription because it is most economical way to acquire e-Resources.
5. Faculty and students of the six universities are familiar with the currency and easy access of e-Resources and prefer to use them for their research activities.

Library of any academic institution can be measured for its quality by considering the collection development, organization, management and use of the library collection/resources by the user community. Library can achieve this by strengthening its collection through proper planning, selection, appropriate budget provision, acquisition, organization, presentation, rendering service and continuous annual evaluation of these activities. There should be no gap between the user needs and relevant collection development.

The need for the study, objectives, methodology, and limitation of the study, overview of “Collection Development” in libraries and review of literature are dealt in the earlier chapters.

The present study gives an analysis and interpretation of data collected through questionnaire and interview survey conducted at the following six agricultural universities of Karnataka.

Table 1.1: List of agricultural universities in Karnataka

S. No	Name of the University	Year of Establishment	URL
1.	University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore	1965	www.uasbangalore.edu.in
2.	University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad	1986	www.uasd.edu
3.	Karnataka Veterinary Animal and Fisheries Sciences University, Bidar	2005	www.kvafsu.edu.in
4.	University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur	2008	www.uasraichur.edu.in
5.	University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkote	2008	www.uhsbagalkot.edu.in
6.	University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, Shivamogga	2012	www.uahs.in

Table 1.2: Library staff in agricultural universities in Karnataka

S. No.	Name of the University	Professionals	Semi-Professionals	Administrative	Others	Total
1.	UASB	4	2	7	9	23
2.	UASD	6	6	3	8	19
3.	KVAFSU	1	3	-	2	6
4.	UASR	5	1	2	4	12
5.	UHSB	4	1	1	2	9
6.	UAHS	3	1	-	5	10

Table 1.2 shows the staff position at the six agricultural universities under study. Though UAS (B) has large member (23) of staff UAS (D) has better professional staff position with six professionals and six semi professionals. KVAFSU though established in 2005 has only one professional and three semi-professionals as compared to UAS (R) established in 2008 and UHSB established in 2008 and UAHS established in 2012 have 5, 4 and 3 professionals respectively.

Table 1.3: Library users in agricultural universities in Karnataka

S. No.	Users	UAS-B	UAS-D	KVAFSU-B	UAS-R	UHS-B	UAHS-S
1.	Faculties (Teachers & Scientists)	616	345	45	202	54	97
2.	Research Scholars	283	204	15	102	45	45
3.	PG Students	475	459	60	261	128	92
4.	UG Students	1159	1451	350	602	286	455
5.	Non-Teaching Staff	252	189	40	272	20	47
6.	Others (Diploma Students)	-	31	-	66	-	-
Total		2785	2679	510	1505	533	736

Table 1.3 shows the library users' community details of the six agricultural universities under study. UAS (B) has the maximum number followed by UAS (D). KVAFSU has the least number. This may be due to the fact that this university was established in 2005. In the university campus, it offers limited course of Bachelor degree, Post-Graduate and Doctoral degree programmes in the specialized subject field of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry, Dairy and Fisheries Sciences. The teaching activities are carried out in seven colleges under the jurisdiction of this University.

Considering the different categories, UAS (B) has the maximum faculty members followed by UAS-D and UAS-R. Likewise, UAS-D has the maximum number of UG Students with UAS-B occupying the second position with UAS-R and UAHS in the third and fourth position, respectively.

The following table gives the total collection (Books, Journals, and Reports etc.) of all the libraries as on 2016.

Table 1.4: Total Collection details in Agricultural Universities in Karnataka

S. No.	Collection	UASB	UASD	KVAFSU	UASR	UHSB	UAHS
Print Media							
1.	Books	134653	113144	12565	54707	8829	20533
2.	Gift Books	13215	6255	-	4520	1205	1010
3.	Reference Sources (Ency, Dict, Direct, Yearbooks, Almanacs)	-	-	1862	-	38	68
4.	Indian Journals	200	103	35	110	53	58

5.	International Journals	50	277	05	65	3	8
6.	Journals (Bound vol.)			3369	9256	2513	214
7.	Reports	18789	5219	1500	239	1000	57
8.	Pamphlets	11302	8309	712	-	-	-
9.	Bibliographies						
10.	Standards	-	-	-	1500	-	-
11.	Theses/Dissertations	11016	11479	1350	2108	209	195
12.	Maps/Atlases	78	75	140	15	15	10
13.	Text Book Bank(General)	805	281	1240	-	-	-
14.	SC/ST Book Bank	1722	1318	2350	2432	-	2807
15.	ST Book Bank	1192	-	-	-	-	-
Total		193022	146460	25128	74952	13865	24960
Non Print Media							
16.	Audio/Video Cassettes	235	-	25	-	25	-
17.	CD- ROMs/DVD	319	1	2	150	215	91
18.	Microfilms/Microfiches	167	-	-	-	-	-
19.	On line Databases	2	2	-	3	-	-
20.	On line Journals	512	-	450	30	3	-
21.	Any other (e-books)	1809	49	1050	96	1159	452
Total		3044	52	1527	279	1402	543
Grand total		196066	146512	26665	75231	15267	25503

Table 1.4 depicts the total library collection both print and non-print formats of the 6 agricultural universities under study UASB leads in total print collection followed by UASD. UASR occupies the third position. However, in case of non-print media UASB is in first position followed by KVAFSU, UHSB and UAHS, respectively. It is very surprising UASD occupies the last position with only 52 non print media collection.

Table 1.5: Collection Development programme details during the year 2011-16 of Agricultural Universities in Karnataka

S. No.	Collection	UASB	UASD	KVAFSU	UASR	UHSB	UAHS
Print Media							
1.	Books	4031	18129	2150	15985	8829	6935
2.	Gift Books	960	553	-	800	1205	151
3.	Reference Sources (Ency, Dict, Direct, Yearbooks, Almanacs)	182	485	1862	-	38	68
4.	Indian Journals	200	103	33	110	53	86
5.	International Journals	218	522	05	65	3	21
6.	Journals (Bound vol.)	3961	-	1094	8856	21	210
7.	Reports	1338	415	220	239	1000	57
8.	Pamphlets	1849	250	60	-	-	-
9.	Bibliographies	2	-	-	-	-	-
10.	Standards	78	-	10	15	15	6
11.	Theses/Dissertations	1316	1905	76	2108	181	195
12.	Maps/Atlases	805	281	140	-	-	174
13.	Text Book Bank(General)	805	281	240	-	-	-
14.	SC/ST Book Bank	597	1318	124	2432	-	2807
15.	ST Book Bank	385	-	-	-	-	-
Total		16727	24242	6014	30610	11345	10710
Non Print Media							
16.	Audio/Video Cassettes	235	-	23	-	25	-
17.	CD- ROMs/DVD	319	1	3	-	215	91
18.	Microfilms/Microfiches	167	-	-	-	-	-
19.	On line Databases	2	2	-	3	-	-
20.	On line Journals	512	-	100	4	3	-
21.	Any other (e-books)	1089	49	1000	96	1100	452
Total		2324	52	1126	103	1343	543
Grand Total		19051	24294	7140	30713	12688	11253

Table 1.5 depicts the different resources both print and non-print media added during the years 2011-16. As can be seen in the table UASR leads in total print collection by adding 30610 different print resources; followed by UASD (24242), UASB (16727), and UHSB (11345). UAHS (10710) and lastly KVAFSU (6614). However, in case of non-print media UASB (2324) is in first position followed by UHSB (1343), KVAFSU (1126), UAHS (543), UASR (103) and lastly UASD (52).

Collection development facilitates strategic plans like short medium and long term planning for development of collections to meet organization’s mission and goals and offers appropriate infrastructure for learning, teaching, research programmes in universities.

Periodicals are very essential in institutions of higher learning as they contain recent data on experiments and nascent ideas for further research. They play an important role in communication of scholarly information. However, the currency of content in printed journals is affected by time and space factor.

Table 1.6: Periodicals subscribed by the Agricultural Universities in Karnataka

S. No.	University	Periodicals		
		Subscribed	Gift	Exchange
1.	UASB	182	82	55
2.	UASD	380	44	31
3.	KVAFSU	44	-	-
4.	UASR	187	42	-
5.	UHSB	71	10	-
6.	UAHS	125	-	5

Data as on December 2016 regarding periodicals subscribed by the six agricultural universities under the study presented in table 1.6 UASD has subscribed 380 journals while UASR taken the second place with 187 journals titles. On the other hand, UASB subscribed to only 182 titles. May be because UASB has well established CeRA consortium for e-journals. Only UASB (55nos.) and UASD (31 No’s), have periodicals exchange programme as they have their own journal publications which has enabled them to enter into exchange programme.

Table 1.7: Newspapers subscribed by the agricultural universities in Karnataka

S. No.	University	English	Kannada	Hindi
		Subscribed	Subscribed	Subscribed
1.	UASB	5	7	-
2.	UASD	6	9	-
3.	KVAFSU	6	5	1
4.	UASR	5	9	1
5.	UHSB	4	11	-
6.	UAHS	3	6	-

The figures in Table 1.7 reveal that the universities are catering to the general information needs of not only students and faculty even to the non-academic personnel. Newspapers provide day-to-day global current affairs. Much emphasis is given to Kannada being the official state language.

Library Budget

Good meaningful collection and efficient library service depends on sound financial resources. University Library does not exist in isolation but blended with the aim and objectives of the parent university. In case of Agricultural Universities, the sources of funds are state government grants, ICAR grants and special grants (if any) from ICAR–World Bank joint ventures.

Table 1.8 and 1.9 gives the break-up of grants received by the individual universities from the State government and ICAR respectively.

Table 1.8: University-wise State Grants Sanctioned for Agricultural University Libraries in Karnataka (2011-2016)

S. No.	University	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Total
1	UAS(B)	6695000	7000000	2500000	1000000	2815000	20010000
2	UAS(D)	9300961	9982664	7007227	7696890	6100000	40087742
3	KVAFSU	1500000	1200000	2000000	1500000	1000000	7200000
4	UAS(R)	3000000	4000000	6000000	6000000	4540900	23540900
5	UHSB	784000	200000	500000	1000000	2000000	4484000
6	UAHS	0	60512	3262300	2658500	3000600	8981912

*Budget Allocation is only for collection development of Books, Periodicals and e-Resources

Table 1.9: University-wise ICAR Grants Sanctioned for Agricultural University Libraries In Karnataka (2011-2016)

S. No.	University	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Total
1	UASB	5719000	750000	2279016	1550000	0	10298016
2	UASD	1499771	8869000	5890136	1826499	0	18085406
3	KVAFSU	6400000	6000000	5000000	6600000	115000000	139000000
4	UASR	3000000	5000000	6000000	5798541	3840900	23639441
5	UHSB	0	1000000	850000	3500000	1078000	6428000
6	UAHS	0	360500	3405321	2742276	2918639	9426736

*Budget Allocation is only for collection development of Books, Periodicals and e-Resources

It is observed that the State government has given preference to UASD followed by UASR. Not much preference has been given to KVAFSU. On the other hand, ICAR is liberal with KVAFSU to encourage Veterinary, Animal and Fisheries Sciences and being the only university catering to the needs of the whole Karnataka state in these disciplines. Among agricultural sciences, UASR has received higher grants as compared to others.

For any university, good quality library resources help to attract and retain academic high flyers and contribute to the prestige of an institution.

Table 1.10: Total University-wise Budget (State Grant + ICAR Grant) in Agricultural Universities in Karnataka (2011-2016)

S. No.	University	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Total
1.	UASB	12414000	7750000	4779000	4255000	2815000	32013000
2.	UASD	10800732	18851664	12897393	9523389	6100000	58173178
3.	KVAFSU	7900000	7200000	7000000	8100000	116000000	146200000
4.	UASR	9000000	14200000	13000000	12898541	9881800	58980341
5.	UHSB	784000	1200000	2350000	4500000	3078000	11912000
6.	UAHS	0	421012	6667621	5400776	5919239	18408648

*Budget Allocation is only for collection development of Books, Periodicals and e-Resources

Table 1.10 shows the total financial assistance received by the six universities from different funding agencies during the period 2011-2016. All six universities are hybrid libraries having both conventional print format as well as modern digital format reading materials. Expenditure details towards the purchasing of Books, Journals and e-resources of all the six universities are shown in the following tables.

Table 1.11: University-wise Expenditure on Books in Agricultural University Libraries in Karnataka (2011-2016)

S. No.	University	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Total
1.	UASB	2883981	2056336	1402204	339976	677222	7359719
2.	UASD	2910700	10019000	5746100	2027500	100000	20803300
3.	KVAFSU	5900000	6000000	6000000	6200000	6700000	30800000
4.	UASR	947026	1849056	6084493	4307064	994246	14181885
5.	UHSB	720000	969633	672650	215135	2563680	5141098
6.	UAHS	0	20000	300000	1224116	1905900	3450016

Table 1.12: Percentage of amount spent on Books during 2011-2016

S. No.	University	Total Budget	Spent on Books	Percentage
1.	UASB	32013000	7359719	22.98 %
2.	UASD	58173178	20803300	35.76 %
3.	KVAFSU	44250000	30800000	69.60 %
4.	UASR	58980341	14181885	24.04 %
5.	UHSB	11912000	5141098	43.15 %
6.	UAHS	18408596	3450016	18.74 %

Percentage-wise expenditure made on the purchase of books by the universities out of the total grant sanctioned by the state government and ICAR; it is clear from the above table. KVAFSU has spent highest 69.6% of grant towards purchase of books may be due to meet the organization’s mission and goals and to offer appropriate resources for learning, teaching and research programmes in their respective universities UHSB has spent 43.15% followed by UASD 35.76 %, UASR (24.04%), UASB (22.98%) and UAHS (18.74%).

The amount of money spent by the higher education institutions to access academic journals is of high interest to the academic community, and academic libraries in particular are responsible for the vast majority of journal purchases.

Table 1.13: University-wise Expenditure on Journals (Printed) in Agricultural University Libraries in Karnataka (2011-2016)

S. No.	University	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Total
1.	UASB	2198163	1939160	2168768	1972389	1063350	9341830
2.	UASD	5000000	5982700	5891300	6095900	5000000	27969900
3.	KVAFSU	300000	300000	350000	300000	350000	1600000
4.	UASR	150000	2000000	2200000	2500000	300000	7150000
5.	UHSB	22800	72000	71000	371000	375000	911800
6.	UAHS	0	0	0	500000	500000	1000000

Table 1.14: Percentage of amount spent on

S. No.	University	Total Budget	Spent on Journals	Percentage
1.	UASB	32013000	9341830	29.18 %
2.	UASD	58173178	27969900	48.08 %
3.	KVAFSU	44250000	1600000	3.615 %
4.	UASR	58980341	7150000	12.12 %
5.	UHSB	11912000	911800	7.65 %
6.	UAHS	18408596	1000000	5.43 %

Journals during 2011-2016

The above table shows the percentage-wise expenditure made on the subscription of journals. UASD is spending nearly 50% of its total grant (48.08%) towards journal subscription followed by UASB with (29.18%), UASR (12.12%), UHSB (7.65%), UAHS (5.43%) and KVAFSU with only (3.615%).

Table 1.15: University-wise Expenditure on e-Resources in Agricultural University Libraries in Karnataka (2011-2016)

S. No.	University	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Total
1.	UASB	4412606	3498017	158940	979758	1073978	10123299
2.	UASD	2600000	2300000	960000	1000000	1000000	7860000
3.	KVAFSU	200000	0	0	0	6700000	6900000
4.	UASR	112000	315300	307000	384600	434100	1553000
5.	UHSB	0	60000	160000	60000	1350000	1630000
6.	UAHS	0	0	987000	0	786024	1773024

It is appreciable that all the six university libraries are making efforts to provide wide access to international information resources in addition to access through CeRA. The characteristic feature of e- resources are easy access to information, high compact storage, ease of multiplication, manipulation of content from one media to another, ease of transmission and storage. However, the selection of e-resources in academic libraries is more complex as compared to the conventional print resources, Network compatibility, hardware/software strength of search engines, access points including remote access are the chief indicators for the adequacy of e-resources. Because of the soaring, cost of e-resources the librarians are resistant to go ahead with procurement processes. The consortia efforts like CeRA have come to the aid of librarians to some extent. The importance of electronic information resources in the academic libraries continues to grow. The librarians have to give preference to e- resources as the users' demand is increasing constantly. This affects the procurement of print collections. With the increasing demand for e-resources from the users, communities and the escalating subscription prices and license charges for e- resources, it is a general opinion of all the six university librarians that separate budget be made for e-resource and print collection taking into consideration the users' demand for information resources.

Table 1.16: Percentage of amount spent on e-Resources during 2011-2016

S. No.	University	Total Budget	Spent on e-resources	Percentage
1.	UASB	32013000	10123299	31.62 %
2.	UASD	58173178	7860000	13.51 %
3.	KVAFSU	44250000	6900000	15.59 %
4.	UASR	58980341	1553000	2.63 %
5.	UHSB	11912000	1630000	13.68 %
6.	UAHS	18408596	1773024	9.63 %

The above table shows the percentage of expenditure out of total budget on e-resources in six agricultural university libraries during 2011-2016. These include e-books as well as e-journals subscribed by the libraries in addition to e-journals accessible

through CeRA. UASB is spending 31.62% of its budget towards e-resources to satisfy its user’s community, which is nearly 3000 members.

Budget allocation in libraries varies depending on various factors. Adequacy of allocated funds to meet the expected needs of the users is an important factor in providing effective collections for use. The opinions of librarians on the adequacy of current budget for developing collection are analyzed in the following table.

Table 1.17: Sample population and response details of the Faculty

University	Teaching Faculty				
	Total Population of Faculty	Sample Size	Sample selected And Questionnaire distributed	Response Received (No)	Response Rate
UASB	616	20%	123	116	94.30%
UASD	345	20%	69	63	91.30%
KVAFSU	45	20%	10	10	100.00%
UASR	202	20%	40	32	80.00%
UHSB	54	20%	12	12	100.00%
UAHS	97	20%	19	15	78.94%
Total	1359		273	248	90.84%

Table 1.17 shows that there are totally 1359 faculty members in six Agricultural Universities of Karnataka who are members of their respective university libraries. For the present study 20% of the population of (273) from each university were selected randomly to whom questionnaires were distributed; and 248 responded (90.84%)

Table 1.18: Sample population and response details of Research Scholars

University	Research scholars				
	Total Population of Research scholars	Sample Size	Sample selected And Questionnaire distributed	Response Received (No)	Response Rate
UASB	283	20%	56	51	91.07%
UASD	204	20%	40	36	90.00%
KVAFSU	15	20%	10	8	80.00%
UASR	102	20%	20	16	80.00%
UHSB	45	20%	10	10	100.00%
UAHS	45	20%	9	9	100.00%
Total	694		145	130	89.65%

Table 1.18 shows that there are totally 694 research scholars in six Agricultural Universities of Karnataka who are members of their respective university libraries. Out of this 20% (145) from each university was selected randomly for the present study; and 130 (89.65%) research scholars have responded.

Table 1.19: Sample population and response details of Post Graduate students

University	Post Graduate Students				
	Total Population of Post Graduate Students	Sample Size	Sample selected And Questionnaire distributed	Response Received (No)	Response Rate
UASB	475	20%	95	81	85.26%
UASD	459	20%	92	78	84.78%
KVAFSU	60	20%	12	12	100.00%
UASR	261	20%	52	46	88.46%
UHSB	128	20%	26	25	96.15%
UAHS	92	20%	20	19	95.00%
Total	1475		297	261	87.87%

Table 1.19 shows that there are totally 1475 Post Graduate students in six Agricultural Universities of Karnataka who are members of their respective university libraries. Out of

this 20% (297) from each university was selected randomly for the present study; and 261 (87.87%) have responded.

Collection development aims at developing academic library to acquire most important intellectual resources.

Library extends importance to all its readers and encourages them to develop a lifelong habit of good reading. In the present study, in addition to the structured questionnaire, personal interviews were also conducted, wherever needed, with the respondents, seeking clarification regarding certain trends observed while analyzing the data.

An overview of the present study, observations of the Researcher and suggestions for improving the collection development process are presented in this chapter. Efforts are made to present a draft model of Collection Development Policy Document.

Suggestions of the researcher

A review of the collection development management undertaken by the present researcher at the six agricultural universities in Karnataka and the views of the users on the strength and utility of the collection and accessibility have helped to identify the areas where improvement is required. The below noted areas may be considered for this purpose.

1. University Librarians have to redefine their collection development policy and give more emphasis on e-resources. Ratio between print and electronic documents needs to be defined to strike a balance, as a large majority of university libraries are hybrid libraries.
2. A separate electronic resource management section to be created in the library. The e-Resources procurement is a complex process with its puzzling licensing agreements.
3. Library staff must be knowledgeable and approachable by the user to meet latest information requirements. Library staff has to take initiatives to install confidence and trust among the user community. This presupposes continuous training programmes for the library staff in the use of digital library soft wares, CD-ROM collections and utilization of software to manage e-Resources.
4. Libraries must play a vital role in respect of Open Access Initiatives (OAI) by way of arranging awareness programmes. With this, the scientific community can publish in Open Access Journals and expand their visibility.
5. The present study revealed that all six-university libraries provide their services mostly through manual means. They concentrate on conventional services. In order to gain maximum efficiency and provide better service with available resources to the clientele the principles of Total Quality Management (TQM) be implemented.
6. Faculty and research scholar also can aid the efforts of library staff by actively participating in the collection management activities. This will encourage non-users also to become regular users.
7. There is growing demand for e-Publications over print format both books and journals. Such branches of disciplines are to be identified and efforts made to strike a balance in the print and e-format collections. The library budget must be enhanced in proportion to

the rising costs of books and e-publications and journal subscriptions.

8. Grey literature like thesis and dissertations, conference/seminar proceedings, research/technical reports and bulletins etc. are of immense value to scientists and research scholars. Librarians have to give special attention to procure such publications.
9. Power failure and low speed of internet are the main problems faced by the users while accessing e-resources. Therefore, powers-that-be have to take necessary measures to increase the speed of internet broadband as well as physical facilities provided in the libraries.
10. Though the users of University Libraries i.e., faculty, research scholars and postgraduate students are an elite group, their knowledge levels of e-information resources are generally superficial. They need in-depth knowledge to make better use of e-resources in the library. For this, Information Literacy programmes basic and advanced – are to be designed and implemented.
11. Libraries have to take advantage of latest technologies like blogs, wikis, podcasting, RSS to publicize about their information resources and services. This will ensure sharing of resource and create 'libraries beyond borders'.
12. There is a deep gap to achieve a desirable level of knowledge exchange, knowledge management, saving costs, time management and correct information flow. The librarian obligations should pay more attention to them and fulfill their professional activities with more efficiency effectiveness, correctness and accuracy.
13. In depth studies on duplication of e-journal titles and databases between different types of consortia must be undertaken.

Conclusion

Library collection Development is one of the most important and challenging activities of the library profession. This survey study has proved all the six Agricultural Universities of Karnataka are striving very hard to balance its collection development activities by providing quality and useful resources to its user community. Library committee plays an important role in framing the LCDP by framing policies and formulating programmes to implement them for effective execution. The main major functions of LCDP are:

1. Identify procedure to acquiring new materials.
2. Allocating budget to meet various needs,
3. Frequent review of acquisition policies in order to meet changing needs,
4. Storage planning,
5. Stock verification,
6. Weeding and preservation policies

Strict implementation of LCDP implies building up of quality collection to meet the objectives of the parent body / University.

Source of Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Abe, Marijana. Inventory of library collections: Introductory overview. *Knjiznica* 2014;58(4):13-39.
2. Booth, Austin H. and O'brien, Kathleen. Demand-driven cooperative collection development: Three case studies from the USA. *Inter lending and Document Supply* 2011;39(3):148-55.
3. Chandela A.S and Saikiab, Mukesh. Challenges and opportunities of e-resources. *Ann Libr Inf Stud* 2012;59(Sep):148-14.
4. Dempsey, Lorcan; Malpas, Constance and Lavoie, Brian. Collection directions: The evolution of library collections and collecting. *Libraries Acad* 2014;14(3)(Jul):393-423.
5. Fought, Rick L; Gahn, Paul and Mills, Yvonne. Promoting the library through the collection development policy: A case study. *J Electron Resour Med Libr* 2014;11(4): 169-78.
6. Gohell, (B.M) and Parmar (R.D). Collection development in the university libraries of Gujarat State: An evaluative and comparative study: *PEARL - A J Libr Inf Sci* 2013;7(2):128-32.
7. Hender, Gail Y and Gudenias, Jean. Developing collections with Get It Now: A pilot project for a hybrid collection. *Med Reference Ser Quarterly* 2016;35(4):363-71.
8. Kannappanavar B.U and Praveenkumar K. Manpower planning in Agricultural Science university libraries in India. *J Med Commun Stud* 2010;2(3): 062-6.
9. Kirkwood, Rachel Joy. Collection development or data-driven content curation? An exploratory project in Manchester. *Libr Manag* 2016;37(4/5):275-84.
10. Lehman, Kathleen A. Collection development and Management. *Libr Resour Technical Serv* 2014;58(3)(Jul):169-77.
11. Maddison, Tasha. E-resource discovery: A collection development strategy for engineering e-books. *Issues in Sci Technol Librarianship* 75(2014).
12. Mahapatra, R.K. Use of Consortium of e-resources in Agriculture (Cera) in Central Library of Odisha University of Agriculture & Technology: A study. *Asian J Libr Inf Sci* 2013;5(3-4):39-47.
13. Pandita R and Singh S. Collection building trend among the institutes of higher learning in India: A preferential race between print and electronic resources. *Collection Building* 2016;35(4):119-216.
14. Patel S, Collection development in academic libraries, *Int J Libr Inf Sci* 2016;8(7): 62-7.
15. Saunders L. Academic libraries and apos; Strategic plans: Top trends and under-recognized areas. *J Acad Librarianship* 2015;41(3):285-91.
16. Vandale, Susan and Minchew, Tessa. It is not just about budget cuts: A study of print periodical usage and a subsequent cancellation project at a small academic library. *Serials Rev* 2014;40(3):203-6.
17. Weiss Andrew. Examining massive digital libraries (MDLs) and their impact on reference services. *Reference Libr* 2016;7(4)(Oct/Dec): 286-306
18. Yang, Daryl. Collaboration in a time of change. *Serials Libr* 2014;6(1-4):303-13.

How to cite this article: V Srivivasa, KGH Hemantha, GMS Sreenatha, RBN Yethi. Collection development in agricultural university libraries in Karnataka: A study. *Indian j Libr Sci Inf Techno* 2019;4(2):71-80.