

## Executive Summary

### Ancient History & Mediterranean Archaeology

During the Fall of 1997, all of the faculty and graduate students in Ancient History & Mediterranean Archaeology (AHMA) were surveyed by the Library to determine their use patterns and their levels of satisfaction with The Library's collections and information services. Forty six percent (46%) of the faculty and 50% of the graduate students participated in the survey.

A few points to keep in mind when reviewing these results: first, the survey was designed to collect faculty and graduate student self-reported use and levels of satisfaction. For a more complete picture, these results should be viewed in conjunction with actual use figures, as reported in the Library's annual use statistics and as will be reported within the quantitative portion of the final CLR 6601 report. Secondly, return rates varied substantially from department to department, from a low of 23% (Business graduate students) to a high of 61% (Classics graduate students). A return rate of 50% or higher is necessary in order to say with confidence that the results reported are likely to apply to the group as a whole.

#### Activities and outcomes

AHMA faculty and graduate students are frequent users of the Library - 57% of graduate students and 46% of faculty report using the Library on a daily basis; an additional 43% of graduate students and 54% of the faculty report weekly use. Mostly, AHMA graduate students report using the Library to browse the stacks, to find, copy or borrow materials from the collections, to read or borrow current journals, to search the online catalogs, and to ask librarians for advice in conducting their research.

Eighty-five percent (85%) of the responding faculty report searching print indexes or bibliographies either "sometimes" or "often"; only 15% report searching electronic indexing and abstracting databases or the World Wide Web with this regularity. Faculty are also far less likely to ask a librarian for advice than are their graduate students: 69% say they rarely or never consult a librarian.

Over 80% of responding AHMA graduate students report they rarely or never browse table of contents services on The Melvyl® System, attend Library Research Workshops, or use the BAKER Document Delivery Service. A full two-thirds of AHMA faculty report they "rarely" or "never" use the BAKER service. Also among the faculty, one third report sending graduate research assistants to the library to find, copy, or borrow materials on their behalf, but only 8% do this often.

On the whole, AHMA graduate students and faculty do not report using the Library much to attend faculty library seminars, have librarians teach research skills to their students, search electronic indexing databases, or search the World Wide Web. Whereas most graduate students do not report using the Library in preparing grant applications, 62% of the faculty do use the Library in this way.

None of the responding graduate students reported sufficient experience with online databases available via The Melvyl® System, the BAKER Document Delivery Service, the Library's networked CD-ROM databases, or the Library's instructional services to evaluate them. Furthermore, a large percentage of responding graduate students reported insufficient experience with the Library Web (83%) and stand alone CD-ROM databases (86%) to evaluate them, and 71% of graduate students were not sufficiently familiar with Library reference services to offer an opinion about them.

### Collections

AHMA users appear to rely primarily on the Library's book and journal collections, which a large majority evaluated as either "good" or "excellent". Among responding graduate students, none reported having sufficient experience with newspapers, special collections, government documents, Center for Research Libraries collections, or sheet music to evaluate them. Large majorities also reported insufficient experience with maps and videos to evaluate the Library's collections and one-half reported "insufficient experience" with conference proceedings to evaluate them. Faculty also reported "insufficient experience" with many of these materials.

Seventy percent (70%) of faculty prefer to use print resources, where available. Among graduate students, 67% expressed no preference, but among those who did, they too, preferred print resources. Although large majorities of graduate students and faculty report having a computer and modem in their home and office, 57% of graduate students and 46% of faculty say they never use the Library remotely. Among those that do, their primary use is to search the Library's online catalogs.

### Use & satisfaction with Library services

Among the services with which they were more familiar, 57% of graduate students and 69% of faculty rated Interlibrary Borrowing Service as good or excellent. Close to 30% of the graduate students, however, ranked the turnaround time on books as "poor". Twenty percent (20%) also ranked turnaround time on journals as "poor". Close to one third of graduate students rated Library circulation services and hours as "poor".

A majority of AHMA respondents (86% of graduate students, 85% of faculty) reported they would never use proposed new commercial document delivery services and 58-60% reported they would never use desktop access to information provided by outside vendors or publishers. Greatest interest was expressed in faster delivery of library books - 57% of graduate students and 46% of faculty reported they would use such as service "sometimes".

## Summary | Free-text Questions

### FACULTY

No. of surveys returned: 12

(46% return rate)

Note: Numbers following specific comments indicate the number of times the comment was made.

**1.B. Please describe any recent trends or changes in scholarly communication ... describe how the Library could help you integrate these changes into your teaching or research.**

- Authors and publishers reach web sites in my field or email me advertising new publications. If I knew which titles the university would purchase, I would reach greater complementarity (*sic*) between university library and personal library.
- Some colleagues communicate by email. I do not.

**3.E. Any specific suggestions for prioritizing quantity or quality of services?**

- Most important services are:
  1. Hours open
  2. Circulation, and especially RESHELVING
  3. NRLF -- which could be quicker
  4. Interlibrary loan -- very poor service
  5. Reference services (which seem fine)
- Most important services:
  1. Interlibrary services (especially with UCB falling behind in acquisitions)
  2. Circulation services
  3. NRLF retrieval
  4. Hours
- Longer hours between semesters
- Make every effort to keep the branch libraries. They are invaluable.
- More staff is needed for Moffitt.
- We must enhance Interlibrary Services, the B/S program and retrieval from NRLF. Reference has already been virtually destroyed, that is why I have stopped using it.
- The collection has been and continues to be decimated in the humanities. The primary need is to stop this. No where (so far) has this questionnaire directly admitted this problem -- evidence of the problem itself!!
- Please cease spending money on digitization and related programs and concentrate on 1) maintaining and rebuilding the collection and 2) enhancing Interlibrary Cooperation programs. Also 3) stop exploiting the librarians -- they are grossly overworked and jerked around!

**5.B. Which electronic resources have you used the most?**

- GLADIS (6)
- MELVYL (4)
- Online catalogs
- WWW
- ANTH
- CC
- W-CAT
- MAGS
- Prefer print.

- Books and other printed materials are more convenient and easier to read. (3)
- Prefer print -- our print resources are older and, were therefore, produced by trained personnel, and are, as a consequence, more accurate. There are numerous errors in the electronic records.
- Prefer print -- no danger of pressing a wrong key and losing it.
- I understand print in five languages. I cannot understand electronic resources.
- Electronic resources are uncomfortable to use (staring for long periods at the screen) and are more difficult to take notes from.
  
- Prefer electronic -- more accessible & may be updated more frequently.
  
- Prefer electronic for bibliographic type research; far prefer print for doing actual research.

**9. Qualities most important in a library or information service supporting scholarly research?**

- Comprehensive collections (9)
- Accessibility (4)
- Accuracy (in library records) (2)
- Books, journals, card catalogs (yes)
- Clear indexing
- Ease of finding materials
- Energetic and knowledgeable selector in Acquisitions
- Has special lines for faculty in circulation to avoid delays
- Hours of service (2)
- Old books (e.g., 19<sup>th</sup> century)
- Promptness (2)
- Reference librarians
- Scholarly periodicals
- Timely/up-to-date /
- Unified index of publications (i.e. GLADIS, MELVYL, & Socrates)
- User friendly (2)

**10.A. Unmet library needs?**

- Collections
  - Acquisition of books and journals in the archaeology, art and history of central and inner Asia.
  - If the cuts in periodicals continue for even one more year, my needs for periodicals very quickly will not be met by this library .... Similarly, why is the library planning to spend millions digitizing collections for undergrads when it cannot maintain its research collections? The rush towards things electronic has been a considerable waste of money, and in the near future promises to wreck a proud research library. Furthermore, why are (science) research grants coming into the university not attached at a percentage in order to support the cost of maintaining the obscenely expensive subscriptions to scientific periodicals?
  - All of the needs you have explored pale in significance to the number of publications purchased by the library.

- The holdings are declining in quality and quantity.
- You have hardly spent any attention on the ordering mechanisms for publications, faculty input (currently, very little) and need for more funding for collection development.
- I think there is a serious problem of the library not owning standard books and journals in my field.
- Gaps in print collections.
- The greatest problem I have encountered recently ... is the increasing number of volumes in my field that the library does not have -- often they are not anywhere in the UC system at all. Being able to identify a source is no help if you then can't get your hands on it.
- Would that finances had not compelled the library to discontinue some periodicals!
- They are cruelly under-funded and, in my field, risk being unable to support advanced research if this situation continues. Cutting periodicals cuts the throat of advanced research.
- Availability of books/journals
  - Reshelving is slow and often sloppy.
  - Books are often missing from the stacks or lost.
  - Far too much printed material is stored in distant storage (NRLF).
  - Too many things get lost, stolen, misplaced, or sold off as duplicates at Doe.
- NRLF could be quicker
- Interlibrary Borrowing ... in my experience either never gets what I request, or fails to notify me in time to retrieve it from them. Very poor service, as far as I can compare to other university libraries.
- GLADIS ... is pretty poorly indexed and misleading about holdings; series need to be accessible by author/title.
- Circulation staff (students) poorly trained and unmotivated.
- Totally inadequate funding.
- Cataloging problems, delays; cataloger unavailable for certain languages, fields.
- Library hours are too restricted. (2)

## Summary | Free-text Questions

### GRADUATE STUDENTS

No. of surveys returned: 7

(50% return rate)

**Note:** Numbers following specific comments indicate the number of times the comment was made.

**1.B. Please describe any recent trends or changes in scholarly communication ... describe how the Library could help you integrate these changes into your teaching or research.**

**3.E. Any specific suggestions for prioritizing quantity or quality of services?**

- Availabililty of books (4)
  - Circulation can be much more efficient in reshelving returned books. (2)
  - The shelves tend to be a mess and most people I know feel that you only find what is supposed to be on the shelf maybe 60% of the time.
  - Replacement or searching for lost books need some priority.
- NRLF
  - It would be helpful if NRLF books were available the next morning, instead of the next afternoon.
  - Is there any way to permit NRLF requests to be submitted electronically, to eliminate the need to stand in line?
  - There is no clear reason why some books are in NRLF. Often new but foreign books in my field are there, but outdated, end of the 19th, early 20th C. material is in the Main stacks. This is incredibly frustrating.
- GLADIS
  - Is there any way to recall books electronically as can be done at Princeton?
  - GLADIS needs to be made more accurate. Often the screen does not say a vol. is in NRLF & after a fruitless search of the stacks, the Circ desk will tell me it's in NRLF.
  - The GLADIS database is full of typos.
- Better staffing of circulation desk and exit from stacks to alleviate congestion.
- Release names of patrons who are holding recalled books after the initial recall period.
- I am more concerned that we maintain and increase our collection of foreign journals, monographs, etc. than any of the more "technological advances". Frankly, some of the folios in AHC are more invaluable and enduring than any snazzy CD ROM database; although I am supportive of expanding & integrating technology into research, I think it's vital that books aren't sacrificed. (We've all seen the controversy about the SFPL.)

- Libraries are only useful when students and faculty can get to them. The research seminar rooms for my field have been cut down 16 hours per week in access time since I arrived. This is a worrying trend.

**5.B. Which electronic resources have you used the most?**

- GLADIS (4)
- MELVYL (2)
- Catalogs
- Prefer print; computers harder on the eyes.
- Prefer print; no waiting for terminals or for downloading.
- Prefer print; visual quality of pictures is better.

**10. Qualities most important in a library or information service supporting scholarly research?**

- Availability (3)
- Abundant (2)
- Accuracy (2)
- Efficient (2)
- Extensive (2)
- Quiet (2)
- Catalogue-care
- Complete
- Friendliness
- Helpful
- Knowledge
- Orderly
- Prompt
- Reshelve-care
- Reshelve-time
- Respectful
- Speed
- Thorough
- Timely

**10.A. Unmet library needs?**

- It would be nice if a situation could be reached where books on the same topics would be concentrated in a narrow space, rather than all over the libraries. (2)
- I do not think that the electronic databases (GLADIS and MELVYL) are good enough, considering especially, that the paper catalogue has been suppressed.
- How do the moveable shelves meet standards for Americans with Disabilities Act? I myself have problems moving them and often get very frustrated at moving 8 or 9 shelves -- cranking can be difficult -- even when it's done one shelf at a time. Anyone with any arm, back problems must have difficulties with this.
- Why do library employees, esp. shelvers, talk to each other in loud voices in the middle of the stacks? It's really annoying.
- There are a few books I would like to see on the shelves, in my own field of specialization, Greek numismatics.

- Many critical resources in my field are listed as "missing" in GLADIS. Some were due years ago, but still have not been replaced.