

Executive Summary Classics

During the Fall of 1997, all of the faculty and graduate students in Classics (CLAS) were surveyed by the Library to determine their use patterns and their levels of satisfaction with The Library's collections and information services. Fifty-five percent (55%) of the faculty and 61% 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

Of the departments surveyed, faculty and graduate students in Classics are among the Library's most frequent users. Eighty-three percent (83%) of CLAS graduate students and 40% of CLAS faculty report they are daily users of the library. An additional 17% report that they use the library weekly, while 60% of responding faculty report using the library on a weekly basis. A large majority of both faculty (91%) and graduate students (also 91%) say they browse in the stacks sometimes or often. Large numbers of the faculty (91%) and all of the graduate students (100%) report they come to the library to find, borrow, or copy materials. Ninety-one percent (91%) of the faculty report reading and borrowing journals, as do 82% of the graduate students.

A greater number of faculty report sometimes or often searching print indexes or bibliographies than do graduate students (100% of faculty, 78% of graduate students). On the issue of seeking the advice of a librarian, 27% of the faculty report they do so sometimes or often while 73% report they rarely or never do. Even fewer graduate students (17%) report seeking librarian advice and recommendations on a regular basis.

Faculty and graduate students alike are heavy searchers of the Library's online catalogs. Fewer numbers report searching electronic abstracting and indexing (A and I) databases and the World Wide Web (WWW) "sometimes" or "often" than is the case in other departments surveyed, though graduate students report doing so in larger numbers (48% report searching electronic A and I databases sometimes or often, 48% report searching the WWW sometimes or often). Only 9% of the faculty delegate searching functions to a research assistant either sometimes or often. Fifty-five percent (55%) of faculty say they make assignments requiring undergraduates to use the library. A far greater number – 91% – report sending their graduate students to the library to get help in formulating or carrying out their research projects.

Few faculty (18%) or graduate students (9%) report attending Library Research Workshops. Among the departments surveyed, CLAS graduate students report they search the library's electronic services far less often than do other groups of graduate students: 41% report browsing the Melvyl® Table of Contents databases, 48% access journal article databases on Melvyl®, 5% download articles from Melvyl®, and 18% access the library's CD ROM databases either sometimes or often. In most cases, as low or lower numbers of faculty report accessing these electronic resources. Almost half (48%) of CLAS graduate students report they do not access library resources remotely, even though 74% of them report having a computer with modem at home. Fifty-two percent (52%) report having a computer with modem in their office.

About half of the faculty (46%) report using the library in preparing grant applications, though few – 18% – report attending faculty seminars. Only 9% of the faculty say they sometimes or often rely on librarians to help teach research skills to their students.

Collections

Eighty-two percent (82%) of the faculty rate the library's collections of books as good or excellent. Far fewer graduate students – 39% – rate the circulating collections as good or excellent. This was among the lowest approval ratings for the Library's book collections revealed by the survey results. None of the faculty, but 13% of the graduate students rated the circulating books collection as poor. Majorities of both faculty (82%) and graduate students (65%) rated the journal collection as good or excellent.

CLAS faculty appear to use a wider range of materials, including special collections, conference proceedings and videos, than do their counterparts in other departments. Still, CLAS faculty and graduate students reported insufficient experience with newspapers, documents, sheet music, slides, maps, music, or the Center for Research Libraries collections to evaluate them. Graduate students reported this same level of inexperience with special collections, conference proceedings, and videos as well. The same held true for faculty and graduate students with respect to the library's stand alone and networked CD ROMs, – only 20% of faculty and 18% of graduate students report searching CD ROMs sometimes or often. Seventy percent (70%) of faculty and 65% percent of graduate students reported insufficient experience with the library's stand alone CD ROM databases to evaluate them, while 80% of the faculty and 96% of the graduate students said the same about the Library's networked CD ROMs.

Use & satisfaction with Library services

None of the graduate students reported enough experience with the BAKER service to evaluate it, whereas only 31% of them were likewise unfamiliar with Interlibrary Borrowing Services (IBS). Fifty-seven percent (57%) of graduate students were inexperienced with the Berkeley/Stanford Cooperative Program though CLAS faculty were more familiar with it than their counterparts in other surveyed departments, and 91% of them rated the service as good or excellent. About 64% of the

responding faculty rate Interlibrary Borrowing Service as good or excellent, whereas 82% of faculty reported insufficient experience with the BAKER service to evaluate it.

Faculty are somewhat more satisfied with Circulation and Reference Services than are graduate students (55% v. 48% for Circulation Services, 46% v. 43% for Reference Services) rating them as either good or excellent, but these "approval ratings" are among the lowest – if not the lowest – of the departments surveyed. A full one-third of graduate students reported "insufficient experience" with Reference Services to evaluate them. A large majority of both faculty (73%) and graduate students (91%) also reported "insufficient experience" with Instructional Services to evaluate them.

Like their counterparts in several other departments, CLAS faculty expressed little interest in most of the proposed new fee based library services. Large majorities of faculty responded they would rarely or never utilize expedited library-provided document delivery services, commercial fee-for-service document delivery, or desk top access to information from outside vendors or publishers. Twenty-seven percent (27%) of CLAS faculty said they would sometimes or often use a service which provided faster delivery of books they needed. Graduate students were similarly disinterested in the first three services, but 65% reported they would sometimes or often pay for faster delivery of needed books.

The majority of those who are remote users of library resources report searching the library's online catalogs (100% of faculty, 92% of graduate students). Browsing Melvyl® Table of Contents databases (either sometimes or often) was reported far less frequently (36% of faculty, 42% of graduate students do so), as was accessing journal article databases on Melvyl® (40% of faculty, 33% of graduate students report doing so sometimes or often). Larger numbers of both faculty and graduate students report searching the WWW (78% of faculty, 92% of graduate students). Half of the responding graduate students report they search the Library web remotely either sometimes or often.

Only 30% of CLAS graduate students rated the library's hours as good or excellent while another 30% rated them as poor. Thirty-six percent of faculty also rated library hours as poor, the highest disapproval rating of any department surveyed.

Summary – Free-text Questions

FACULTY – Classics

No. of surveys returned: 11 (55% return rate)

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.

- Want more online book reviews
- Want complete Greek & Latin texts on CD-ROM
- Increased use of email (2)

- Electronic reviews (e.g. Byrn Mawr Classical Review)
- Images of art work on WWW (2)
- WWW

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

- Collections
 - Maintenance, organization & augmentation of books and journals should be the Library's top priority; "electronic resources" should be its lowest. (2)
 - Students need ready access to networked information but there's no reason ...[it] should be considered the primary responsibility of the library. It is more important that the Library purchase books and maintain print collections.
- NRLF
 - Faster NRLF retrievals.
 - NRLF retrieval - disgraceful that books cannot be requested electronically.
 - NRLF next day delivery by 10:00 am not 4:30.
- Hours
 - Longer hours
 - Do not reduce library hours during intersessions -- that's when faculty do research (2)
- Expand CC database to more than just last 10-15 years
- Put ILB Services online
- Restore Gutenberg Express
- Holds and recalls take too long & are too faint to read easily
- Bring back Humanities collections w/ Rowell numbers to the stacks
- It's no secret that GLADIS was never intended as a search program; between MELVYL and GLADIS I can find things. When they are not in UCB, GTU or NRLF, I turn to Stanford/Fastbook which usually solves things ... I probably should take the courses, but if there could be online tutorials in better use of, say, MELVYL and other databases, I'd probably take the time. It would seem less problematic than signing up for a class held in the library.

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

- GLADIS (5)
- MELVYL (5)
- CC (2)
- The mere fact that you ask this question (as though the choice were someday to become necessary) is disturbing
- Prefer electronic for bibliographic searching, print for actually reading the materials themselves
- Prefer print -- the way I work and think, the kinds of links and cross references I get in print are more valuable, and often faster. I find searching many electronic resources frustrating and slow, though of course, when I find something it's easy to capture.

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

- Collection size, comprehensiveness (6)
- Accessible (3)
- Available materials (2)
- Up-to-date/current (2)
- Promptness (2)
- Ease in locating
- Efficient
- Electronic or print documentation of this collection
- Good journal collection
- Helpful staff
- International
- Long hours
- Organization & stability (system shouldn't change unless absolutely necessary)
- Properly filed
- Quiet, conducive ambience
- Reliable
- Specialized
- Warm, non-institutional setting
- Well cataloged
- Well funded, well funded, well funded

10.A. Unmet library needs?

- Circulation
 - More library staff -- poor turnaround time & mistakes in reshelving (3)
 - More library staff -- bottlenecks at Circ.
 - Patron generated recalls via GLADIS (now, two visits are required to do this)
 - Inadequacy of Service Desk personnel
 - Circulation Services -- sluggish, inefficient & often mistaken; Circulation staff appallingly ignorant of the library
 - Faculty [should be] treated with respect and courtesy in the matter of books lost track of while in our charge. Heavy fines & impersonal notices are demoralizing
 - Poor shelving
- Collections
 - Replace missing books or provide multiple copies (2)
 - Cuts in purchasing; failing to order essential books
 - Strongly deplore the fad of digitizing
 - Many gaps in journals and circulating books
- Make it possible for faculty to set up their reserves directly in GLADIS
- Inadequacy of GLADIS records
- Rolling stacks ... make browsing a slow and painful task
- GLADIS is still not complete ... MELVYL has not incorporated all the information that is in GLADIS
- Didn't ask about the reserve system, esp. the issue(s) involved in putting books on reserve for graduate students. Classics, with its own dept. library, eases the task; but for courses in other depts. (I teach in more than one dept.) ...

- I've avoided using ILL because I haven't really needed it (I've found other ways). But it would be nice if ordering books from any UC Library were as easy as ordering books from NRLF. Also, in terms of renewals, why should books in NRLF that "come" from (say) UC Davis be treated differently for me than books originally in UCB's collection?
-

GRADUATE STUDENTS

No. of surveyed returned: 23

(61% 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.

- There are many new electronic corpora of ancient and medieval texts, as well as online manuscript image databases and dictionaries. By providing high-speed web access as well as subscribing to certain pay services, the library could greatly aid scholars in my field.
- [Illegible] and Classical Antiquity are now published online. Updates of new journals coming online would be useful. The internet addresses we were given for the above two were wrong. Need more computers linked to the university system in the Classics Library. Currently, we have one, which is less than we used to. Linking the 3 art history computers to web and email would be helpful.
- Email is increasing. AH/C has begun regularly informing us of acquisitions. More of this, and maybe consultation on future acquisitions should be encouraged.
- The best thing would be if somehow the Tables of Contents of journals were made electronically searchable by author and subject.
- The most pronounced change is increasing use of computers for teaching, research, communication. Email is increasingly important for communication between TAs and student.

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

- Availability of books. Tracking/replacing missing books. (19)
 - A better tracking system as well as the serious attempt at fulfilling search requests for "missing" books is the top priority.
 - Books are too often lost or missing.
 - In eight years here, this semester has been the first time I have gone into the stacks with a list of books we are supposed to have and have found them all.
 - Circulation services are by far the most troublesome in the library system. Books are constantly listed on GLADIS as being in the library, but they are often not in the stacks.
 - Circulation is often slow in returning books to shelves.
 - I think the absolute priority should be given to maintaining the collection of printed books. Too often the Library has only one copy of a very important book -- very often in Moffitt alone where it is very likely to have been subject

to highlighting and underlining or simply such intensive use as to be in need of replacement. (2)

- Multiple copies of important books that are in very high demand would be good. (2)
- The three services I regard as most crucial are: keeping a full and up-to-date collection of books, journals, etc. (including replacing lost/stolen copies before bill is paid), keeping the information about such books up-to-date, so that the items on the shelves correspond with the items on the catalogues, and keeping the library open for as long hours as possible (a particularly striking problem between semesters).
- More important than any special services or electronic resources are: 1) buying books (thoroughly) relating to scholarly work at UCB and maintaining subscriptions, 2) replacing lost or missing materials and filling gaps in series/collections.
- Hours (5)
 - As I use such a wide array of materials, depend on them, every single day for research and study, the very limited hours at the library are its most disappointing feature.
 - Expansion of hours would be a great benefit to my career here.
 - More hours for the Classics Library (esp. Sunday evenings).
 - Library hours, especially those for my department, Classics, are abysmal to the point of being a disgrace.
- GLADIS (3)
 - GLADIS could be more efficient.
 - GLADIS is often frustratingly idiosyncratic.
 - GLADIS's sorry state does not make research impossible, but often difficult.
- The new stacks limit browse time. I used to browse more often when I could walk through the stacks. (2)
- Instructional services are crucial for self-teaching ... A library tour for Classics PhD students including internet development, etc. would be helpful. (2)
- The ability to check out a book quickly is the most important service. (2)
- Interlibrary Services -- a very important supplement to Berkeley's collection.
- Most important -- being able to find all the information I need on my own, through the online catalogs.
- NRLF should have shorter turnaround time.
- On numerous occasions I have returned books but that information does not get entered into the computer. Though I cannot afford the extravagant replacement fees that are charged, I also do not have the time or patience to get receipts. Perhaps a more efficient system could be developed?
- Concerning reference services, it would be helpful if there was a reference desk in the main stacks. I would find that helpful when I have trouble finding books.
- I find my ability to do research is affected by exactly what books are located in the AH/C grad. Library. I'd love to be able to request that certain books be located in AH/C.
- NRLF cards are outdated and time-consuming.
- Try to turn journals around from the bindery quicker.
- I must say that I found some of the cuts on newspapers quite outrageous.

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

- GLADIS (15)

- MELVYL (13)
- Current Contents (2)
- Dissertation Abstracts
- Other catalogs

- Prefer print
 - Prefer print; I find it easier to read and to refer to in my research. (2)
 - I find that I consult print resources far more than any other medium. Part of this may be due to the variety of alphabets with which my work is involved -- it may be more difficult to put documents of this nature online than an all-English document.
 - Prefer print; not vulnerable to power failures, software problems, or the deterioration of storage media ... a well made book, moreover, is aesthetically superior to the great majority of electronically produced images.
 - Prefer print; the format of a computer screen is too limited (you cannot go back and forth and get a sense of the whole) and cannot be transported.
 - Prefer print; the sorts of books I/we use have not been made available in a useful electronic format, nor are there any plans for them to be. When they are, quality is inferior.
 - Catalogs are easiest to use online. Most of my research, however, is based in print journals and books (many of this were published several decades ago, or are Classics reference works not yet online).

- Prefer electronic
 - Prefer electronic; faster (4)
 - Prefer electronic; easier to search by subject on the computer systems. Also, I am just more comfortable with them.
 - Prefer electronic; more efficient.
 - Electronic catalogues are more efficient than index cards, but I am most uneasy about the permanence of all electronic media and hope that backup records (hard copy) exist in some form.
 - Prefer electronic; more convenient for printing articles and using info.

- Variable preference
 - I prefer easily searchable indices, but can't imagine ever reading articles or books online.
 - The movement toward online resources is good and important but it cannot replace the usefulness of books. These services should be acquired only in consultation with faculty and students of the departments these devices are supposed to serve, said faculty and students being fully aware of the cost of these newer services and the degree to which traditional means (books & journals) will be compromised by the acquisition. I myself am online at least 1 1/2 hours a day, but so far, I have found online scholarly instruments sorely wanting in comparison to standard print alternatives (major exception: Chadwyck-Healey).

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

- Complete/comprehensive collections (16)
- Accessibility (8)
- Orderly/organized (5)
- Convenient/Easy to use (4)

- Up-to-date information (3)
- Availability (3)
- Efficiency (3)
- Accuracy (2)
- In stock (2)
- Reliability (2)
- Bookshelves that one can stand in without fear of being crushed at any moment
- Comfort
- Electronic accessibility
- Hard copies
- Help in obtaining material not in collection
- Hours
- Knowledge
- Multiple copies
- Practicable
- Professional
- Promptitude (sic)
- Quiet
- Quick
- Responsiveness
- Successful searches for missing items
- User friendly
- Willingness to try different methods to maximize accuracy of finding

10.A. Unmet library needs?

- CD ROM databases important to my field -- the one for Greek, and the one for Latin texts which allow complex lexical searches and accumulation of statistical lexical data. Having these on the 3rd floor in Doe, at the PC station, would be enormous benefit to me and all of my colleagues ... this would be much more useful than the bibliographic database currently on the PC up there. We already have a print version which suffices.
- It would be nice to have less expensive photocopying.
- Analytics. These are always a problem ... it would be best if the books could be catalogued, and put on the computer system. If not, it would be helpful to put the series record, with call numbers, volume holdings, on GLADIS.
- Put signs on the moveable stacks, reminding people to be courteous of others, and not to browse when people are waiting.
- I was also charged for a book I had returned and after it was found it took almost a year for my money to be refunded in spite of inquiries made by our student advocate. The money was only returned after I turned the problem over to Channel 7's consumer advocate.
- I understand the need to use space efficiently, but it is regrettable that so many books are in movable stacks, where browsing is limited by the need of other readers to move them, or in storage, where browsing is impossible ... fortuitous discoveries are often among the most valuable sources for the reader's work. The loss of uninterrupted browsing is a serious impediment to scholarship and a defect in the UCB library with which all serious users must contend. (2)
- In a perfect world, I'd like to see the AH/C Library gain a separate classics periodical room, which would free up ever precious shelf-space for the importation of many more monographs on classical topics.

- The environment in our departmental library: the stacks are much easier to work in because of temperature control, etc., but many reserves I need are on 2-hour loan in AH/C, and heat, cold, and noise often make it hard to work productively there.
- The questionnaire does not address as an issue what is still, in my field, the one need a library cannot dispense with to remain a respected research tool, even in the 21st Century: collection development of scholarly monographs and journals.
- I've noticed that sometimes recent volumes in series are slow to arrive. I know this may have more to do with a series than with UCB Library, but often these volumes are critical for up-to-research (sic).