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Abstract
This research discusses about the practice of ‘the Collection Development Policy’ in the Indonesian Supreme Court Library; it aims to identify the real situation and advances suggestions to enhance its performance. This research is a qualitative research using a case study. Based on action as the manifestation of ideas or rationale, this research kept track of the librarians’ ideas about the collection development policy and its practice. The method used in collecting data is in-depth interview and literature studies. The intermediate result is discussed further using the perspective of collection development policy as suggested by Evans. The result found gap and hindrance in the present ‘collection development policy’ practiced by the Supreme Court Library that needs to be advanced and furnished. This research suggests the collection development model to be used by the library.
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1. Introduction

Collection is a main product of library which is presented to the user. Needs to be a good mechanism for selecting and acquisition of collection so appropriate to the needs of the user. Mechanisms in the acquisition of the collection refers to collection development activities. Libraries should doing collection development activities in some period be guided with policy. Evans (2005) said that regardless of digital or printed sources basically the good collection development policy has the same groove or cycle. The library collection development process is based with certain principles and dealing with acquisition activities to add to holdings of library materials in the library every year or periodically. Of course, there are measures taken in the development or construction of this collection.

Most libraries do not have a policy document which up to date, or do not make effective use when they have it. Including the Library of the Supreme Court that also haven’t
a written policy, but only have a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) regarding the acquisition and weeding that guide them in making collection development activities. This procedure try to examine how its establish and applied. And the differences with a policy. Other than that, the Library of the Supreme Court also did some elements of the development collection but unrealized its policies. Policies require a certain amount of accurate and reliable information for a final decision in the implementation of the policy will be crucial for optimal service quality.

2. Literature Reviews

2.1. Policy

Pauline Atherton as quoted by Vignau (2005, p. 13) defines the policy as a formulation or a general statement of purpose which helped translate the objectives of the planning to realization, provide administrative guidance for decision-making and implementation (Atherton, 1978).

2.2. Collection development

Library collection is one of the main factors to supporting the existence of the library. Collections means the number of books or other literature in a field or a kind collected by a person or organization. According to Evans (2005, p. 11) the development of collections is a process to ensuring information in the library is appropriate to the needs of the population that is served properly and economically, as well as using sources of information both inside and outside the institution.

2.3. Collection development policy

According to Evans (2005, p. 49) a collection development policy is a library planning guide in developing and maintaining its collections. As every good planning, collection development policies should reflect and link other library plans, especially those with long-term and strategic characteristics. Collection policies should also be up to date in support of mission and library goals.

The collection development policy is a policy that has the characteristics:

1. Not stand alone but related to other planning.
2. Flexible, the policy should always be updated in line with the dynamics of the organization and the users its served.

3. Related to long term planning in line with the vision and mission of the institution.

4. The needs of library users are the key element.

5. It is an agreement from various parties.

6. Covers two categories that to inform and protect.

There are several key elements in the collection development process described by Evans and Saponaro (2005): user needs assessment, selection policy, acquisition, weeding and collection evaluation.

2.3.1. User needs analysis

Evans (2005, p. 20) says that library services and collections should be developed based on an understanding of the information services that needed and desired by a community which is served. The data that collected about the user is valuable to formulating policies, selecting activities, and evaluating projects. In assessing each collection should include a consideration of how the collection can meet the expectations and user needs. Then Evans (2005, p. 45) describes the information audit is one of the assessment techniques for special libraries. The approach taken in the audit of this information is by in-depth interviews with individuals or groups, then have a structured record of everyday activities. The focus is on decision-making, discussion topics, letters and memos received, forms that processed. This approach assumes that everyday activities will become a regular pattern and can be identified by librarians to be specific information needs.

2.3.2. Selection

The selection policy is different with the collection development policy, it is part of a collection development policy that generally contains general statements about collections, selection functions, and what are the benchmarks in selection activities ([9], p. 204). This policy is required to help the selector select the required collection.
2.3.3. Acquisition

One of the main tasks of the library is to provide library materials that related with the needs of users, so users feel satisfied because the needs are met, therefore the availability of useful collection for users is depend on librarians in selecting and acquisition library materials. Clayton and Gorman (2001) define acquisition as the work of several methods to provide access to the information needs of users. The basic principles of acquisitions are quite clear: a library needs to develop procedures for obtaining information as quickly and economically as possible. Once defined, this procedure is carried out by staff support, only under the professional general director. Acquisition activities in the library collection can be done through several ways, among others:

A. Purchase

Purchase that is usually done by the acquisition division with open purchase order that offered to the vendor. There are several ways to do in the purchase of a collection that Disher (2007, p. 97) says is buying from vendors and jobbers, from bookstores and from publishers.

B. Gift

Libraries generally receive gift from three sources, namely individuals, corporations, and associations. The association also includes other social institutions, government, councils and library groups relations not included in individual groups and corporate bodies (Gorman, G. E and Howes, 1991).

C. Resource Sharing

To fulfill the needs of users who may not be obtained from one library then the need for doing resource sharing. Resource sharing is a kind of cooperation with other libraries or other sources of information that may have advantages of the lack of a library.

ALA’s Glossary in Evans (2005, p. 340) defines resource sharing as “activities engaged in jointly by a group of libraries for the purposes of improving services and/or cutting costs. Resource sharing may be established by informal or formal agreement or by contract and may operate locally, nationally or internationally. The resources shared may be collections, bibliographic data, personnel, planning activities, etc.”
2.3.4. Weeding

H.F. McGraw is quoted by Evans (2005, p. 296) defined weeding as “the practice of discarding or transferring to storage excess copies, rarely used books, and materials no longer use.” Weeding is to:

(A) To save space.
(B) To improve access.
(C) To save the budget.
(D) To leave room for new collections.
(E) To get online sources.

2.3.5. Collection evaluation

Collection evaluation is necessary to find out how well the quality of library collections relates to their relevance to user needs. Collection evaluation is conducted with the aim to know the strengths and weaknesses of the collection, and to modify the collection development policy to improve the suitability of the collection to the needs of users [8].

Collection evaluation means assessing and measuring the usefulness or usefulness of the library collection to its users. The Evaluation Approach (George Bonn ‘Evaluation of The Collection’) quoted from Evans (2005: 318) includes:

(a) Compiling statistics on holdings
(b) Checking standard lists-catalogs and bibliographies
(c) Obtaining opinions from regular users
(d) Examining the collection directly
(e) Applying standards (which involves the use of various methods mentioned earlier), listing the library’s document delivery capability, and noting the relative use of a particular group.

2.4. Special library

The Supreme Court Library is a special library because it stands under its main institution, namely the Supreme Court institution and serves the main users of employees
in the Supreme Court. Then the library of the Supreme Court also concentrates on the priority of certain subjects that is the law subject for its collections. According to Mount and Massoud (1999) special libraries are “information organizations sponsored by private companies, government agencies, non-profit organizations, or professional associations.” The Special Libraries Special Interest Working Group (SIWG) states that “Special Libraries are libraries that aim to meet the needs of professional or academic groups regarding particular subject or activity information.” Special libraries can be found in government ministries, departments, hospitals and private companies. The role of each specific library is to support the needs of user or client information so that they can achieve the mission and objectives of the organization.

3. Research Method

Approach applied in this research is qualitative approach. Qualitative research is a process of inquiry to understand social problems based on the creation of a complete holistic picture formed in words, reporting the informant’s views in detail, and arranged in a scientific setting [6]. Pickard (2007: 239) said that the application of qualitative analysis purposes is to generate a hypothesis based on the data collected and interpretation of the data.

The subject of this research is librarian of the Supreme Court library while the object of research is the collection development in the Supreme Court Library. The informants that chosen to be interviewed are those who are authorized in the development of the collection, in this case the purchase of books and other library materials in the Supreme Court’s library. Informants amounted to 5 people. Of this total 3 people have law education background but have certification of librarian, 2 people have background of Library Science Diploma which each are taking bachelor’s degree of library science and bachelor’s degree law, and 1 person status is not civil servant but with background of library science.

To obtain research data, data techniques used are as follows: 1. Observation, 2. Interview, 3. Document Analysis. The raw data that has been collected subsequently enters the analysis phase. Before carefully analyzed, the data in the form of interview results made transcript (copy in writing). Then the data is classified based on research objectives. Further data are analyzed by comparing the patterns that the authors expect based on the literature with the patterns found in interview data and observation.
4. Discussion

4.1. The Supreme Court library profile

The Supreme Court Library aims to assist the smooth implementation of the duties for the judges, judges, experts, and researchers or law information seekers by utilizing information technology which becomes the factor of the speed in the presentation of information.

4.1.1. Vision

Realizing the management and development of the Library of Justice and information services through the Supreme Court’s policy with electronic and documentation facilities.

4.1.2. Mission

A. Realizing the acquisition of library materials and preparing materials for the development and development of the Court Library

B. Publishing, reproduction, binding and dissemination of library materials and other legal materials either through print media or electronic media

C. Collecting, cataloging, and presentation of legal data and other legal materials.

4.2. ‘Collection development policy in the supreme court library’

Policy is the planning concept of an organizational goal. The collection development policy in the Supreme Court library starts with the concept of librarian understanding about collection development itself. The meaning of librarians about collection development then harmonized with the collection development practices that have been done. From the idea to the application of the collection development that has been done in the library of the Supreme Court turned out to cause some obstacles that must be faced.
4.2.1. Librarian’s understanding of collection development at the Supreme Court Library

The librarian’s interpretation about collection development in the Supreme Court library is the purchase collection activity only that have done annually. This collection purchase is based on the demand of library users especially requests from Supreme Court judges. The purchase and addition of this collection amount is aimed to keep up with the times by updating the current collection quality. The head of the library said that the acquisition was devoted to legal subjects to support the performance of the supreme judge in performing his judicial duties. This is in accordance with the role of each special library is to support the needs of user or client information so that they can achieve the mission and goals of the organization. The limited concept of the collection development that librarians state causes distortion of irregularities to the notion of the proper collection development. The collection development which they do is very minimal action from the collection development activities.

4.2.2. Collection development practices at the Supreme Court Library

Collections development practices that carried out at the Supreme Court Library have contain some elements of collection development as described by Evans (2005): user needs analysis, library selection, acquisition through gift, resource sharing, and weeding and collection evaluation. Some elements have been regulated in written regulations such as Acquisition SOP. Weeding is written in Weeding SOP (Standard Operating Procedures). There are also some other collection development elements that have been done but have not been pre-installed in a written regulation such as gift and resource sharing. This is because the librarian has not realized that activities are part of the collection development process so that the collection development process is not comprehensive.

Here is a concept mapping of the collection development according to librarians of the Supreme Court Library and the practice of collection development that has been running. These concepts and practices were then compared to Evans’ collection development policy theory that resulted in obstacle analyzes.

1. Collection Development Concept
Supreme Court Library

1. Based on direct request from user
2. Collection Development is only through purchases based on SOP for Acquisition
3. Collections acquisition is conducted to support the vision and mission of the MA institution

Evans Theory

1. Collection development is carried out to ensure information in the library according to the needs of the population served
2. Organize collections appropriately and economically
3. to know the map of strengths and weaknesses Library collection

Analysis

Collections development are made only through purchases that are guided by Acquisition SOP so other elements of the collection development does not done properly

2. User needs analysis

Supreme Court Library

1. Proposed book purchases based on current issues about law
2. Proposed titles of books from users.
3. The proposal noted by the librarian and will then be considered for acquisition.

Evans Theory

1. In-depth analysis through observation, interview
2. Formal and informal source analysis
3. Focus Group Discussion (FGD)
Analysis

1. Have not done all the components of user needs analysis in depth
2. Only based on user suggestions does not reflect actual needs

3. Selection

Supreme Court Library

1. Publisher catalog from internet
2. The printed catalog is from the vendor
3. Note from user request.

Evans Theory

1. Publisher catalog
2. Books reviews, reviews from newspapers, magazines, and internet
3. Famous author

Analysis

1. Only rely on catalogs from publishers or vendors
2. Confused to determine the collection to be purchased if no suggestions from users

4. Acquisition

Supreme Court Library

1. Purchase through a vendor
2. The purchase is held once a year

Evans Theory

1. Purchases through vendors, publishers, bookstores
2. Vendors are selected

Analysis

1. Waiting too long for fund until can be used
2. Did not have a reserve fund to make a purchase while the required book is urgent.

5. Gift

Supreme Court Library

1. From individuals and the institution
2. All gifts are received instantly during legal subjects

Evans Theory

1. The librarian reviews the expired collection from gift or is in a state of disrepair and does not match with library priorities
2. There is a written statement about the gift

Analysis

1. There is no written statement to arrange the gift giving
2. The collection from gift is abandoned because library shelves are getting narrower

6. Resource Sharing

Supreme Court Library

1. Ever done
2. Conducted if there is a request from the user and the book does not belong to the MA library
Evans Theory

1. Cooperation of a group of libraries
2. Resource Sharing may be established by informal or formal agreement or by contract
3. Resources are divided into collections, bibliographic data, librarians, planning activities

Analysis

1. There is no policy that governs resource sharing, especially about the limitations of library collections that can actually be overcome with resource sharing

7. Weeding

Supreme Court Library

1. Ever done but not yet routine
2. The book weeded is the excess of the copies
3. Digitalization is done on books that are often borrowed and have only one copy
4. Weeding that was done is remove the collection from the shelf and move it to the archive in Pulo Mas.

Evans Theory

1. out of date collection.
2. The collection has been physically damaged.
3. The needs of users in the library community are changing.

Analysis

1. Digitalization becomes one of the regulatory criteria in weeding activity.
2. Weeding has not been done routinely because lack of time and there are concerns that old books are still being used.
8. Collection Evaluation

Supreme Court Library:

1. No evaluation has been done yet
2. The data needed for evaluation is not yet owned by the Supreme Court’s library.

Evans Theory

1. Collection of statistical data of all collections owned
2. Used of collection survey
3. Checks on standard lists such as catalogs and bibliography also change.

Analysis

1. Evaluation of the collection has not been done so that the impact on the difficulty in doing weeding assessment
2. No evaluation of the collections has an impact on the maturation of the overall collection development plan

4.2.3. Acquisition SOP as a written rule

The Supreme Court Library does not yet have a written collection development policy. The collection acquisition process through purchases based on Acquisition SOP. After tracing the making of SOP as a manifestation of the policy carried out by one person without any negotiations. The SOP never have evaluation and review for performance improvement of collection development practices. Whereas a policy is an agreement from various parties to jointly improve the collection development.

The making of SOP is based on the previous rule and completed with the work experience of the librarian. Regardless of the literature review or the model example of a collection development, the information that required in a collection development policy is poorly met. So there are obstacles and lack in the collection development process.

SOP that owned by the Supreme Court Library serve as guidelines in their collection development policies. As a policy guide the SOP certainly has flaws that cannot include
the function of a policy. In essence SOP contains a working mechanism rather than a policy. Policy is a formulation that reflects the philosophy, planning and objectives to be achieved by the library.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1. Conclusion

The Supreme Court Librarian actually understands that collection acquisition based on the needs and demands of users. But the understanding of the collection development is contrary to the practice that occurred in the Supreme Court library. This is due to the analysis of user needs as the main focus in the process of collection development has not been done in depth so it does not reflect the actual needs of users.

The Supreme Court Library does not yet have a formal collection policy: written policy, signed by the leader, and circulated as a policy to be adhered to. The collection development practice is understood by the librarian and is realized only through the purchase of the collection. During this the collection development is done by referring to Acquisition SOP and Weeding SOP so it can not cover all elements of collection development activities. Finally, user analysis which not depth and solely on SOP leads to gaps and constraints on other collection development practices such as selection, acquisition through purchases, gift, resource sharing, weeding, and collection evaluations there are not doing properly.

5.2. Recommendation

Recommendation that can be given in this research is:

1. Librarians of the Supreme Court Library should be able to analyze user needs more deeply through information auditing: observation, interviews with users, identifying the other sources of information related to their needs

2. Some other selection tools may be considered for use such as magazine or internet reviews, well-known authorship in legal subjects, or by reflecting on legal collections held by other institutions that more up to date and more complete.

3. Gift and resource sharing must be governed by written policies

4. The Supreme Court Library must be firm to carry out routine weeding process. This is done to find out weakness and excess library. Collection evaluation can be
started by collecting a collection that is owned, then focus on the user with the survey of the used of collection. Collection evaluation is essentially useful as an assessment for subsequent acquisition.

5. The process of collection development which based on Acquisition SOP cannot cover all collection development activities so the library need to proposes a simple model of collection development policy. Collection development policy is expected to be a reference for libraries in conducting collection development activities. Collection development policies should be easy to understand and communicative. If the library of the Supreme Court has a written policy of collection development, this policy must be informed to users and the general public putting it on the library website. A policy is not frozen, communicative and open to all input in accordance with the dynamics of the needs of users and organizations. Because essentially collection development oriented to user needs.
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