

April 2021

Weeding into Outreach: A Case Study using an Urban Community College's Reserve Collection

Jeffrey Delgado
CUNY Kingsborough Community College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ulj>



Part of the [Community College Leadership Commons](#), and the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Delgado, J. (2021). Weeding into Outreach: A Case Study using an Urban Community College's Reserve Collection. *Urban Library Journal*, 26 (2). Retrieved from <https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ulj/vol26/iss2/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by CUNY Academic Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Urban Library Journal by an authorized editor of CUNY Academic Works. For more information, please contact AcademicWorks@cuny.edu.

Weeding into Outreach: A Case Study using an Urban Community College's Reserve Collection

Cover Page Footnote

I would like to thank the circulation staff at Kingsborough Community College as well as the Intercultural Center for their assistance with this project

Weeding into Outreach: A Case Study using an Urban Community College's Reserve Collection

By Jeffrey Delgado

Abstract

Urban community college students face an increasing financial constraint as skyrocketing textbook prices have in recent years forced students to absorb more and more expenses in order to gain access to class materials. College libraries play a crucial role in facilitating access to textbooks through their reserve collections. Library policies, however, do not always assist students in the most practical way. In this case study, the weeding of a reserve collection that was overloaded with duplicate copies and older editions of popular textbook titles led to a giveaway event where students were allowed to keep copies of textbooks for themselves. This study demonstrates an additional method by which the library can assist students in their academic pursuits, while emphasizing the critical role of the academic library to new and current students.

Keywords

Weeding, reserves, library event, collection development, student success

Author Biography

Jeffrey Delgado is an Assistant Professor/ Reader Services Librarian at Kingsborough Community College of the City University of New York. A product of the CUNY system, he holds a Master's degree in History and Master of Library Science from Queens College. He serves as both the Reserves and Archives Librarian.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank the Circulation staff at Kingsborough Community College as well as the Intercultural Center for their assistance with this project.

Introduction

Urban community colleges face an increasing problem, as their low-income students grapple with spiraling textbook costs. Librarians strive to acquire and loan the best and most accurate sources of information for their patrons. However, few colleges attempt drastic measures to provide suitable alternative formats to help cash-strapped students. Today, Open Educational Resources (OER) initiatives spearhead this effort, but what exists to supplement OER throughout the campus while also

promoting the library as a patron-first institution? This article proposes a simple yet radical idea in weeding reserve textbooks that are out of date, worn, or not circulating and creating a textbook giveaway for all students.

The fear of weeding and discarding materials lives within every librarian. Although weeding and removal of material within a collection is common practice, many institutions and librarians are reluctant to discard material even if it could serve a different purpose. Reserve collections, for example, are the backbone of any academic library. They allow students who face increasing tuition rates and the exponential rise in book costs to access material for their courses while avoiding the purchase of costly textbooks. Academic libraries stand steadfast and loyal to their constituents through the collection and circulation of reserve material. However, this collection does not differ from others in the library: Weeding reserve materials makes way for new editions, titles, or technology. However, the indiscriminate discarding of an extensive collection of high-priced books is, in the author's opinion, a huge mistake.

This paper will demonstrate an alternative method to weeding and discarding materials from the Kingsborough Community College's Reserves collection. This paper illustrates how the weeding took place and how the weeded books provided fuel for the "Textbook Giveaway" event. Lastly, this paper demonstrates how this event helped foster a better connection between the librarians and the students of Kingsborough Community College.

Background

Kingsborough Community College (KBCC), a part of the City University of New York (CUNY), is a small commuter college serving its community in Manhattan Beach, Brooklyn. CUNY is considered the largest urban university in the United States, consisting of 11 senior colleges, 7 community colleges, and 7 graduate schools, and serving some 275,000 degree-seeking students (City University of New York, 2020). KBCC has been a campus within the CUNY consortium since 1964. As of the 2018-2019 academic year, the enrollment of the college reached 15,051 in the fall/winter semesters and 14,645 in the spring/summer semesters (Kingsborough, 2020). KBCC represents a true start in higher education for many foreign-born students since more than half of KBCC students are foreign born, representing over 142 countries and 72 different languages (Kingsborough Community College, Institutional Research, 2019). Fifty-eight percent are full time students, over one-fifth are 25 years old or older and more than 40% come from households with annual incomes of under \$20,000 (Kingsborough Community College, 2019). According to an analysis done by The Balance of the United States Census 2019 HINC-01 the definition of low-income households falls between \$20,000-\$44,899 annually. This is based on a median income amount of \$68, 703. The mean household size range from 1.88 to 2.88 with earners ranging from .63 to 1.05 (Bureau, 2020)

KBCC offers over 50 academic programs granting two-year associate degrees in subjects including Accounting, Biology, Business Administration, Culinary Arts, Early Childhood Education, Fashion, Maritime Technology, Nursing, Tourism and Hospitality, and Website Development (Kingsborough, n.d.). To support these various curricula, the library must house books that meet the needs of students in the plethora of degree options. Its Circulation and Reserves divisions are located behind an integrated workspace, staffed by eight College Assistants and two full-time librarians. One librarian is the head of access services while the second is the head of the Reserves collections. In previous years, the joint Circulation and Reserves department was supervised by a single librarian and an Office Assistant who coordinated the Reserves collection. The two-librarian system came into effect in the spring of 2019. The Reserves collection housed over 5,000 books before the author came into the position of Reserves manager. The excess of these books became the root cause for this weeding project.

Reserves Collection

The Reserves collection in the KBCC library mirrors many other reserve collections throughout academia. The primary use for this collection is to support students by providing reading material that is directly required for their classes. The collection provides students with the opportunity to access their course materials without having to purchase them from the college's bookstore or Amazon. The material in the Reserves collection was selected by the Office Assistant in the Circulation department. Before the project in this case study, reserve materials were acquired by cooperation with the college bookstore. The bookstore would produce a list of textbooks requested by faculty for their courses in the upcoming semester and share the list with the Office Assistant, who would purchase any books not already in the Reserves collection and any updated editions to Reserves titles currently held. This process is not the same anymore as the primary vendor of the books has changed from the bookstore to an outside vendor.

Reserve books can be borrowed by a student with a valid ID card and can be used for 4 hours inside the library building only. Due to past incidents of thievery, the official policy of reserve books restricts students from taking the book outside of the library building. The KBCC library also has books that can be taken out for the semester. These titles, while technically under the umbrella of "Reserves," are not included in the textbook giveaway.

Under the supervision of the Office Assistant, the Reserves collection consisted of several copies of outdated editions of popular titles. For example, there were over 12 copies of *Macroeconomics*, a popular custom textbook. At least 75% of these copies were in poor condition, yet the Office Assistant kept purchasing a surplus of copies for the same title from our bookstore vendor. Investigation of the circulation records for these copies showed that only three or four of the books were being borrowed while the others remained stagnant. This discrepancy existed for many of the titles

in the Reserves collection. The collection had never undergone a rigorous weeding process; rather, small numbers of reserve textbooks had been put on semester loan. During fiscal year 2015, the Reserves collection had over 38,000 transactions (Kingsborough, 2016). While this illustrates the popularity of the collection, it does not explain the need for dozens of copies of the same title.

Literature Review

Book Giveaways

The literature that exists on library book giveaways tends to focus on prizes given away in conjunction with a contest or a program incentive. These types of events are not applicable to the type of textbook giveaway described in this case study. After a necessarily brief review of material on giveaways, this review of literature will tackle three major themes: OER and textbook prices, reserve collections, and weeding practices.

Material weeded from a collection tends to be either destroyed or placed in a giveaway section of the library. According to the Collection Management Committee of the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI), the effectiveness of weeding collections within academic libraries can “stimulate circulation, save space, enhance appeal, and respond to curricular needs” (2014, p. 2). They provide several case studies, one of which occurred at Dominican University in River Forest, Illinois, where the library placed weeded materials on a giveaway table for students and faculty to simply take away. No case study has used a reserve collection to move books into giveaway status. Moreover, little has been discussed about giveaway “events” rather than simple giveaway tables or other spaces in the library.

OER and Textbook Prices

Textbook prices have been increasing historically throughout higher education. Between 1986 and 2004, prices rose over 186% in the United States (Government Accountability Office, 2005, p. 9). Furthermore, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016), textbook prices increased 88% between 2006 and 2016. This sharp increase in textbook prices burdens students who cannot afford these in conjunction with the various other financial obstacles they face. In 2016, the Student Public Interest Research Groups (Student PIRGs) reported that 50% of community college students used their financial aid money for purchasing textbooks (Senack and Donoghue, 2016, p. 6). This statistic is worrisome since many community college students depend on that financial aid money solely for tuition. It is also alarming for those students who do not qualify for financial aid.

A longstanding tradition within higher education calls for faculty to choose the titles for their courses individually, although there are cases in which departments

use the same title across course sections. Unfortunately, more than 90% of the time faculty will choose their books independently and often without regard to textbook prices (Koch, 2006, pp. 2-3). This tendency not to seek out less expensive or even open access textbooks creates a gap in which students struggle to obtain the materials needed for their classes. Open Educational Resources are thought to be the solution to this increase in textbook prices, though with every solution comes its own set of problems.

Open Educational Resources were initially conceived by UNESCO in an attempt to provide easy, free, and universally used textbooks for students in response to the sharp increase in textbook prices. The name emerged at the 2002 UNESCO Forum on the Impact of Open Courseware for Higher Education in Developing Countries. Ideally, OER would be the solving measure for the problem of rising textbook prices. However, according to Morris-Babb and Henderson (2012), a 2009 survey of over 2000 faculty members and administrators in Florida found that “only 7 per cent of that group were ‘very familiar’ with open-access textbooks, while 52 per cent were ‘not at all familiar’ with open-access textbooks” (p. 151). Currently, at Kingsborough, there are only seven courses spread across three departments that have implemented some type of OER syllabi. Needless to say, although the rapid popularity of OER is of unquestionable value, implementation within this community college is very slim, raising the question of how an institution can support students faced with high textbook prices, given its inability to implement numerous OER-supported courses.

Reserve Collections

Reserve collections are unique to academic libraries because they are crucial resources that assist students in accessing needed textbooks. Robert Sommer and Marina Estabrook (1990) discuss the rising price of textbooks and the lack of faculty awareness of these prices. These authors conclude that the library may need to play a role in educating faculty on these costs. Academic libraries are continuously adapting to the increase in textbook prices by transitioning into OER and electronic reserves. However, these measures do not diminish the vital role physical reserve collections play in academic libraries. Several campuses have published on their reserve collections, dealing with open and closed reserve collections and the increase in their sizes (Crouse, 2008; Pitts-Noggle & Rafferty, 2017).

Reserve collections can be considered as either traditionally closed with books held behind the circulation desk to be checked out by a staff member, or open with books located in the stacks where students can retrieve them themselves. As Pitts-Noggle and Rafferty (2017) assert, the benefits of an open reserve system are greater than those of a closed system. The Kingsborough Community College Library runs on a closed reserve system; its 38,000-plus transactions in 2015, noted above, illustrate the importance of a physical collection within an institution that does not have adequate OER or electronic reserves.

Weeding Practice: What Do We Weed and Why?

How important are reserve textbooks? The reserve collection at an academic library consists of textbooks purchased by the library for students to use, giving them access to expensive titles that most students would not want to purchase. This practice, though simple, is extremely important for the functionality of academic libraries as many face the steady rise of textbook prices and an inability to provide appropriate and inexpensive textbook material.

In recent years, OER have become the popular alternative to physical reserve collections. Encouraging faculty to use freely accessible journals, textbooks, and other books in order to alleviate the burden of textbook prices for students is difficult. The lack of awareness is pointed to as the top difficulty for OER implementation (Cuillier, 2017). In addition, KBCC offers several classes that incorporate custom textbooks that are not readily available through normal means. Consequently, the campus bookstore is the sole vendor of these custom books that range from \$150 to \$200 each. Lastly, these custom titles often come only in loose-leaf binder packaging; the physical integrity of the package diminishes in a relatively short time, creating unattractive material with missing pages. Due to the lack of a successful OER initiative at KBCC, the Reserves collection at the library is the primary source for student textbooks. However, without proper management of this collection, the reserve materials become stagnant and a nuisance for both circulation staff and library patrons.

Librarians are reluctant to weed their collections due to backlash from community members, library staff, and library patrons. This backlash is caused by the lack of communication between librarians in charge of weeding and the rest of the population, a lack which creates clashing stories involving weeding projects.

Generally, the literature agrees that creating space is the primary reasoning for weeding (Gregory, 2019; Slote, 1997; Vnuk, 2015). Stanley Slote (1997) describes the need and functionality of weeding within every library. He separates the collections within a library into either “core collection or weedable collection” (p. xix). Vicki L. Gregory and Rebecca Vnuk, each citing Slote, uphold the need to make this distinction. Consequently, the librarian must conduct a thorough evaluation of the collection within the “weedable” portion of the library’s holdings. According to these authors, there are seven reasons to weed any collection:

1. To stimulate circulation
2. To save space
3. To save time
4. To enhance appeal
5. To establish credibility
6. To respond to community needs and interest
7. To make room for new technologies and formats

Following this rubric of reasons to weed, it cannot be refuted that weeding is an essential aspect of modern collection development. As noted above, even a collection that is crucial to student success, such as a reserve collection, becomes unappealing, overgrown, and burdensome to both patrons and circulation staff when left without weeding.

Ethical weeding encourages librarians and library staff to create a plan before implementing a weeding practice in their institutions. The reality of the matter is that many libraries and library staff focus simply on the main collection, i.e., stack material. Although the reserve collection is generally the most circulated in the library, few librarians mention the need for weeding within it. The CREW method (Continuous Review, Evaluation, and Weeding) has been used in libraries since 1976 (Gregory, 2019). It recommends six general criteria for considering weeding an item from the library's collection, forming the acronym MUSTIE:

1. M= Misleading (factually inaccurate)
 2. U= Ugly (worn beyond mending or rebinding)
 3. S= Superseded (by a new edition or by a much better book on subject)
 4. T= Trivial (of no discernible literary or scientific merit)
 5. I= Irrelevant (to the needs and interests of the library's community)
 6. E= Elsewhere (the material is easily obtainable from another library)
- (Larson, 2012, pp. 52-53, 57-59)

The CREW Method has been updated and is freely accessible through the Texas State Library and Archives Commission where a manual is provided (Larson, 2012). According to this manual, there are three things to keep in mind when promoting weeding within a collection:

1. The years since the book's latest copyright date (age of material)
2. Maximum permissible time without usage (last time the book was checked out)

3. One or more negative factors represented by the MUSTIE guidelines
(Larson, 2012, p. 57)

The importance of reserve collections, the slow adoption of OER, the rise in textbook prices, and the development of weeding methods are all crucial to the understanding of the project in this case study. Synthesis of established weeding standards created the criteria needed to weed the reserve collection. The relationship between textbook prices and reserve collections illustrate the impact such collections have in academic libraries. All speak to the vital need for weeding methods within reserves in order to bolster student access to textbooks. Therefore, this synthesis should be implemented using the librarian's discretion as to the age of the book and/or when the book was last checked out. The parameters by which the Reserves collection at KBCC was weeded will be discussed in the following section.

Methodology

Faculty have the power to fight the purchase of costly books. However, the library must also promote a way to assist patrons in their studies by providing them free access to textbooks. Thus, staff of the KBCC Reserves collection work directly with the bookstore and with department heads to maintain a collection that reflects the content of current courses. However, prior to the appointment of the Reserves librarian in spring 2019, there was no effective weeding policy. Reserves had grown into an immense collection with little or no weeding done by previous Reserves managers or office assistants. The collection was faced with little space for new acquisitions and a cohort of older textbooks and numerous copies of single titles. Moreover, as mentioned previously, the existence of a weeding policy did not come to fruition until this project. The Reserves librarian became the integral person to commence and continue this project, establishing a weeding policy and working with Circulation department staff to develop a new weeding process.

Although some of the reserve books were older editions, they were still beneficial to KBCC students. Many professors encourage students to seek out older editions of textbooks in order to assist them with costs. However, not all professors allow this leniency. Moreover, about a third of the books that were candidates for weeding were newer editions with excess copies on the Reserves shelves. These titles were of extreme importance due to their popularity.

Weeding is standard practice in all libraries. Ideally, a librarian must create a weeding plan and consult the rest of the library staff in preparation. According to all library literature that dictates best practices for a weeding project, a set of criteria is crucial to fulfillment of this plan. As mentioned previously, the literature on weeding focuses on general collections within the library, not the reserve collection. Therefore, the KBCC library had to use a combination of previously discussed methods in choosing its most appropriate and effective weeding tactic.

Using the MUSTIE criteria and the formula exemplified by the Texas State Library and Archives Commission, (Larson, p 58) the Reserves librarian created and used this “mixed method” and specified the years that would appropriately reflect the collection. The weeding criteria, therefore, were as follows:

1. Remove textbooks that are older than 2014;
2. Remove textbooks that have not circulated since 2014;
3. Remove books that are in terrible condition or are in excess in the collection or show any other attributes within MUSTIE; and
4. Remove excess copies of the same title.

The beginning of the weeding process focused on reserve books that were older than 2014. Once these books were taken out of the collection, they were assessed by how often they had circulated. If a book was older than 2014 but recently borrowed, the book would stay in the Reserves collection. However, if there were multiple copies of the same title and only one or two copies were consistently taken out, the remaining excess was removed from the collection. Using MUSTIE as the basis for the remainder of the books was simple. The Reserves librarian focused on “Ugly,” “Superseded,” and “Elsewhere” to weed the remaining reserve books. If the collection held older editions of a reserve book – a 5th edition of a history book which was already available in its 8th edition, for example – the older editions were removed.

The weeding took place over the winter semester of 2018 and the summer semester of 2019, when use of the library was at a minimum. Aside from creating these criteria for the removal of books, the Reserves librarian consulted the Circulation staff in order to establish which books were most popular. The Circulation staff consists of eight College Assistants, who know the popularity of the textbooks they loan regularly. With their recommendations and approval of the weeding project, the Reserves librarian was able to remove close to 800 books from the Reserves collection. Of these books, 755 books were in decent condition. The rest were in poor condition and were immediately discarded.

The total number of books grew to such a substantial number that simply discarding them would not have been ethical. The number of books that were weeded from the collection was so large that there was plenty of material to host two separate giveaway events. The spring textbook event had a total of 475 books to be given away. The fall event, augmented by faculty donations, had over 600 books to be given away. The collaboration between faculty and the Reserves librarian yielded a surplus of 1,000 books for the event. They consisted of older editions of popular titles such as *Art: A Brief History*, *Macroeconomics* and *Bio 33 Laboratory Manual*.

Requesting the assistance of the Office of Student Life and the Intercultural Center, the library used a multipurpose room for the giveaway events. Titled “Textbook

Giveaway: Good Home to Lonesome Textbooks,” each occasion was animated by the idea was that the books that had been weeded out of the Reserves collection could be usefully offered to students during the first week of classes during the spring and fall semesters of 2019.

The Reserves librarian created a survey for students to fill out after attending the textbook giveaway. The data generated would be pertinent to the reflection of the library in the eyes of the students. Through SurveyMonkey, a QR code was created to hand out to students on the day of the textbook giveaways. Along with the QR code, a link provided by SurveyMonkey and shortened into a TinyURL provided another way for students to access the survey. This dual method of accessing the survey proved very effective when getting the results. Moreover, the ease of accessing the survey was especially talked about during the event and will be discussed further in the next section.

The following questions were asked in the survey:

1. How many books did you take?
2. Did you attend the spring Textbook Giveaway? (Added after the spring event)
3. How useful has the Textbook Giveaway been to you?
4. How did you hear about this event?
5. How likely would you attend another Textbook Giveaway?
6. Would you recommend this event at other colleges?
7. Has this event improved your view of the library?

Event and Findings

The Event

It should come as no surprise that strategic location within a college or university raises popularity and awareness. Therefore, the need for a strategic place to host the textbook giveaway event was crucial to its success. Reaching out to other offices in the college, the Reserves librarian received a recommendation from a colleague who had access to a room directly across from the student cafeteria. Consequently, the room was strategically located in the center of student traffic.

The College Center is where most clubs and activities take place. It is also the student cafeteria, so that the positioning of the giveaway event next to a common space for activities and where students eat was pivotal to its success. The event was scheduled for the first week of class in the spring semester 2019. Again, this timing was the perfect opportunity for students to get to know the library and its Reserves collection and partake in the textbook giveaway.

Once the books were successfully weeded, the Reserves librarian created a detailed spreadsheet that would be used to advertise the event with the members of the faculty. With the help of fellow librarians and their liaison relationships with

several department heads, he was able to circulate this list of books to faculty throughout the campus, broadcasting the variety of available titles, so that faculty could announce the event for students entering class. Lastly, he created a flyer that would be passed around and posted throughout the campus to promote the event to students. As many librarians know, the Reference and Circulation desks are inundated with requests for textbook information. Therefore, the flyer was also kept at both desks for librarians and staff to spread the word. This promotion allowed news of the event to circulate well among students and faculty.

As the event drew closer, a small task force of a few College Assistants and the Reserves librarian organized the books by subject in the space allocated for the event. The books were placed in accessible spaces for students to look through. There was only one rule when coming to the event and that was to take only one copy of a single title. Students could take as many books as they wanted but not multiple copies of the same title. The night before the event, the Reserves librarian labeled the subject areas for these books clearly, hoping that the event would be a success.

The event was scheduled for 10 AM to 2 PM on a Wednesday. The Reserves librarian enlisted some help from other librarians to sort the pending chaos. As the doors opened, students were at first bewildered at the concept of free textbooks. Librarians had to explain several times to students walking past that it was not a gimmick or a charade, that in fact these books were textbooks that could potentially help them for class. Within the first twenty minutes, 130 students came into the room. All of these students walked out with at least one textbook. After an hour, the student tally climbed to 235 students, all of whom took out at least one textbook. The overwhelming popularity of the event reached several other programs that caused more students to attend. By 1 PM, the library had reached 400 Students and essentially ran out of books to give away. The event had to be cancelled on the second day and closed early since we only had 13 books left. The reaction to the event was overwhelmingly positive. Several students discussed with the Reserves librarian the need for more events such as this in order to compete with the increasing prices of textbooks.

The second event was scheduled for the fall of 2019 and was promoted in the same way as the first textbook giveaway. It was held during the first week of classes in the same room next to the cafeteria. Everything was posted on social media and circulated through the same flyer at the Circulation and Reference desks and throughout the campus. The second event yielded about the same number of students.

Post-Event Survey

The survey results came in two different groupings. Based on the attendance sheet of around 400 students for each event, 10% responded to the survey. The following

breakdown of the survey will reveal the overall response to the textbook giveaway and its advantages in future library programming. These graphs reflect both events.

To Question 1, “How many books did you take?”, the majority of fall students responded that they took between five and seven books. Subsequently, the spring grouping of students responded that they had taken either three to five books or seven or more. Both the spring and fall survey results reflect the high volume of textbooks taken at each event and verify the fact that this event was an overwhelming success and helpful for students struggling with textbook costs and access to books.




Table 1: Question 1 from Survey

Based on Question 2, “How useful has the Textbook Giveaway been to you?”, almost 75% of respondents in both the spring and fall survey results reported that it was either “extremely useful” or “very useful,” directly reflecting the positive impact this event and type of programming had on the students of KBCC.




Table 2: Question 2 from Survey

Question 3 dealt with how students found out about the event, and the majority of respondents reported “Other,” leading to the conclusion that publicity of the event was not done well through the conventional means of flyers, social media, or word of mouth. Potentially, the high response of “Other” was due to the strategic placement of the event that led many students to just pass by and walk in without knowing the details of the Textbook Giveaway.




Table 3: Question 3 from Survey

Based on the results of survey Question 4 in the spring, 31 of 44 students responded “Very Likely” to “How likely would you attend another textbook giveaway?” This response shows how popular the event was for the students when it initially kicked off. The fall survey, similarly, had overwhelmingly positive results with 30 out of 45 students responding “Very Likely” to attend another textbook giveaway. This means that nearly 80% of students would attend another textbook giveaway. These results not only illustrate the popularity of the event but also show the necessity of a textbook giveaway.




Table 4: Question 4 from Survey

Based on Questions 5 and 6, it can be inferred that many students appreciated the event, and it raised the opinion of the library overwhelmingly. Over 90% of responses stated that they would recommend this type of event at other colleges. The percentage was the same in the spring and fall survey results. Lastly, 93.3% of students answered “Yes” when asked if their opinion of the library had improved. These two results directly illustrate the ability to use events such as the Textbook Giveaway to promote the image of the library and to encourage students to rally behind libraries who work for them.




Table 5: Question 5 from Survey




Table 6: Question 6 from Survey

Reserves after the Event

After the full year of hosting this type of textbook giveaway, the Reserves collection went from being overpopulated to being a productive and appealing collection. College Assistants working with the Reserves collection have noted the significant ease in finding books now that the collection is not inundated with excess copies. Moreover, students who took part in the textbook giveaway have returned to the library. Reserve materials have been used more readily now that students view the library as an avenue for receiving the books they need rather than only a place to study.

The Reserves collection diminished significantly due to the number of books weeded. However, funding for reserve textbooks remained the same. Therefore, since the space needed for new textbooks is now available, purchasing updated editions and new books for the semester is far easier. These newer editions are vital to the success of KBCC students; therefore, having multiple copies available for students remained a key goal for the library. Due to the continued support of the purchase of new textbooks, this method of weeding and programming has continued at KBCC. Consequently, these new purchases will still go under the same weeding process instilled in this paper. The creation of this weeding criteria allows for the collection to consistently be updated while also

Limitations

The limitation of this study is within its sampling population. It is difficult to get every student in the college to participate in this event. Therefore, the sampling size does not reflect 100% of the student population. Moreover, the sampling size is a

small amount that would leave a margin of error of about 14.1%. The only way to adjust this sample size would have been to make sure that every student who attended the event took the survey. This is an unrealistic goal and could not be done. Continuation of this project is expected as long as the library continues to receive fiscal support for purchase of textbooks. This cycle has become a popular staple in KBCC student life.

Conclusion

This case study, though limited by the number of students and their participation in post-event survey, provides insight into potential solutions in using an overpopulated reserve collection to promote library relationships with its patrons. Weeding a collection is not a new practice, as we have seen through the extensive literature promoting the practice. However, the need for weeding within reserve collections in academic libraries is rarely discussed. Moreover, the practice of using these weeded materials to assist students in acquiring their textbooks is rare. The event hosted at Kingsborough both lifted the overall outlook of the library from the perspectives of its students while also effectively weeding out materials that were in no shape to remain on reserve or sitting in the stacks.

Future studies or events would benefit from understanding the need for cheaper alternatives than purchasing books from the bookstore or Amazon. In a library world where OER initiatives are not as effective as the ideal behind them, this case study illustrates an alternative suited for smaller institutions with vast reserve collections.

References

- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2006, August 30). College tuition and fees increase 63 percent since January 2006. *The Economics Daily*.
<https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2016/college-tuition-and-fees-increase-63-percent-since-january-2006.htm>
- Bureau, U. (2020, August 17). Household income: Hinc-01. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/cps-hinc/hinc-01.html>
- City University of New York. (2020). *About CUNY*. Retrieved December 29, 2020, from <https://www.cuny.edu/about/>
- Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois, Collection Management Committee. (2014, June). *Weeding*.
<https://www.carli.illinois.edu/sites/files/files/2014CollectionManagementCommWeedingWhitePaper.pdf>
- Crouse, C. (2008). Textbooks 101: Textbook collection at the University of Minnesota. *Journal of Access Services*, 5(1-2), 285–293.
<http://doi:10.1080/15367960802199026>
- Cuillier, C. (2018, April 23-24). *Overcoming objections to OER from faculty and administrators* [Concurrent session]. University of San Diego Copley Library Fifth Annual Digital Initiatives Symposium.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/symposium/2018/2018/27>
- Government Accountability Office. 2005. *College textbooks: Enhanced offerings appear to drive recent price increases* (GAO-05-806).
<https://www.gao.gov/assets/250/247332.pdf>
- Gregory, V. L. (2019). *Collection development and management for 21st century library collections: An introduction* (2nd ed.). ALA Editions.
- Johnstone, S. M. (2005). Open Educational Resources serve the world. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, 28(3).
<https://web.archive.org/web/20100901161749/http://www.educause.edu/EDUCAUSE+Quarterly/EDUCAUSEQuarterlyMagazineVolum/OpenEducationalResourcesServet/157357>
- Kingsborough Community College. (2019). *About KCC*.
<https://www.kbcc.cuny.edu/aboutkcc/>
- Kingsborough Community College. (n.d.). *Academic programs: Degrees and certificates*. <http://www.kbcc.cuny.edu/academicdepartments/>
- Kingsborough Community College, Institutional Research. (2016). Library operations: FY 2015 and 2016. In *Institutional profile 2016* (p. 48).

<https://www.kbcc.cuny.edu/irap/Documents/IP2016/Page48.pdf#search=library%20operations%20and%202015>

Kingsborough Community College, Institutional Research. (2019). KCC fall 2018 at a glance. In: *Fall 2018 data book* (pp. 1-2).

<https://www.kbcc.cuny.edu/irap/documents/DataBookArchive/Fall2018DataBook.pdf>

Kingsborough Community College, Institutional Research. (2020, July 30).

Enrollment data profile: College enrollment.

<https://www.kbcc.cuny.edu/irap/documents/EnrollmentData/FTEandheadcountbyModules.pdf>

Koch, J. V. (2006). *An economic analysis of textbook pricing and textbook markets. ACSFA* [Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance] *college textbook cost study plan proposal* (ED497025). ERIC.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED497025>

Larson, J. (2012). *CREW: A weeding manual for modern libraries* (revised and updated). Texas State Library and Archives Commission.

<https://www.tsl.texas.gov/ld/pubs/crew/index.html>

Morris-Babb, M., & Henderson, S. (2012). An experiment in open-access textbook publishing: Changing the world one textbook at a time. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing* 43(2), 148-155. <http://doi.10.3138/jsp.43.2.148>

Pitts-Noggle, S., & Rafferty, R. (2017). Investigating textbook reserves: A case study of two models for reserves collections. *College & Research Libraries*, 78(1), 66-79. <http://doi.10.5860/crl.78.1.66>

Senack, E., & Donoghue, R. (2016). *Covering the cost: Why we can no longer afford to ignore high textbook prices*. Student PIRGs.

<https://studentpirgs.org/2016/02/03/covering-cost/>

Slote, S. J. (1997). *Weeding library collections: Library weeding methods* (4th ed.). Libraries Unlimited.

Sommer, R., & Estabrook, M. (1990). Textbook prices and their implications for social sciences librarians. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian* 9(1), 29-37.

Vnuk, R. (2015). *The weeding handbook: A shelf-by-shelf guide*. ALA Editions.