



1. Summary

In the Spring of 1996 the University Library surveyed teaching faculty to ascertain their attitudes towards Library services and resources. This survey followed up on a survey conducted in the Spring of 1993. Many questions on the two surveys were basically identical, although the 1996 survey expanded on some questions and added others.

As with the 1993 survey the target population of the 1996 survey was the teaching faculty in the schools primarily served by the University Library: Arts & Sciences, Architecture, Commerce, Continuing Education, Education, and Engineering. Five hundred surveys were sent out and 339 were returned. This random sample of 339 ensures that its characteristics match those of the full population of 913 to within approximately plus or minus 4%.

The largest proportion of respondents was from the School of Arts & Sciences with 64%. Engineering comprised 18% of respondents and the remaining 18% represent the other schools.. The majority of respondents were professors (45%), with 27% being associate professors, 23% assistant professors and the remainder from other ranks. This closely matches the actual distribution of ranks in the total population -- 42% are professors, 29% are associate professors, 20% are assistant professors, and 8% are lecturers. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents have been at UVA from 1 to 5 years and 26% have been affiliated with UVA for over 20 years.

As in the 1993 survey Alderman is the most often visited library with 85% of the respondents having used it in the current (1995/1996) academic year. Sixty-seven percent of the sample had visited Clemons in the same period and 50% visited the Science & Engineering Library. Alderman Library is also the library most teaching faculty list as their "home" or primary library (42%). When combined, the science libraries are listed by 37% of teaching faculty as their home libraries. 91% of the respondents answering the question visit one of the libraries in person at least once a month and 78% search VIRGO from their offices at least once per month.

When asked to rate their "overall satisfaction" with the Library and its services the respondents rated it 4.26 on a scale of 1 (Not Satisfied) to 5 (Very Satisfied). In 1993 the equivalent overall rating was 4.09. As in 1993 the humanities and social sciences rated the library higher (4.35 & 4.36) than did the sciences faculty (3.99). However, the ratings by academic discipline all increased over the survey done three years ago just as did the overall rating.

In 1993 faculty were asked to rate 46 different library services, collections and facilities. This number increased to 64 primarily by expanding the list of electronic services. Once again a 1 to 5 rating scale was used. As in 1993 services tended to be rated more highly than collections and facilities. On average reference, instruction and communication and circulation services were rated most highly while physical facilities and ordering new materials were rated the lowest. The median for the average ratings for all 64 items was 4.02. The highest rated items were LEO document delivery, class related library instruction, in-person reference and library liaisons/departmental contacts. The lowest rated items were parking, study & research space, online help screens, and Cavalier Advantage card machines.

Faculty were asked to rate 11 formats of information delivery for importance to their research in the next two years. Not too surprisingly they rated paper books and journals as the most important tools for their research. Electronic indexes were rated third in importance. Likewise when asked their priorities in allocating staff time and funds paper books and journals were ranked as top priorities, garnering 68% and 67% of the responses respectively. Electronic databases (47%) and preserving library materials (16%) were the third and fourth choices for allocation of scarce funds.

2. Background of Survey and Expected Use of Results

In the Spring of 1993 the Management Information Committee of the University Library together with the Evaluation Subcommittee of the University Libraries Committee, conducted a survey of teaching faculty in the Schools primarily served by the University Library system: Arts & Sciences, Engineering, Education, Continuing Education, Commerce and Architecture. The 1993 survey revealed that while faculty thought that overall the Library was doing a good job, there were certainly areas that needed improvement. Additionally, it revealed that for whatever reasons -- lack of publicity, disinclination to use, little need to use -- certain library resources and services were used by very few faculty.

Much has changed since 1993. Karin Wittenborg became University Librarian in October of 1993. She began making changes, many of which, were based on the findings of the 1993 survey. The Library has increased hours of operation during holiday breaks and intersession periods. The Science & Engineering Library has been air-conditioned and further renovations are planned. Alderman Library has undergone a reorganization, partially in response to the 1993 survey which revealed that for a significant majority of faculty (62%) Alderman was not their primary library. To better reflect a more subject oriented approach to library service Alderman selectors and departments were realigned. Monographic funds for psychology have been increased.

The Library Management Information Committee began planning a follow up survey in the Fall of 1995. While for the most part the original 1993 survey would be replicated to allow for comparisons, new questions were added, old ones expanded and the format was changed somewhat. Eight faculty agreed to pilot test the new instrument and did so, making only minor suggestions. Members of the Library staff also examined the new instrument, again making

suggestions for minor changes. The Center for Survey Research also offered technical guidance in constructing the survey and on some questions.

George Stovall, of the University Office of Institutional Planning, generated a random sample of 500 teaching faculty from the 913 full time faculty of the Schools primarily served by the University Library: Arts & Sciences, Engineering, Education, Continuing Education, Architecture, and Commerce. Faculty from the Schools of Medicine, Law, and the Darden School were excluded from the sample. In early March the questionnaire, together with a cover letter from Karin Wittenborg, was sent to the sample. After three (two written, one phone or E-mail) reminders, a total of 339 questionnaires were returned by June 1 for a response rate of 68%.

A random sample of 339 from a population of 913 ensures that the measurements from the sample reflect those in the whole population with a high degree of accuracy. For the data shown below, the percentages in the sample differ from those in the whole population by no more than $\pm 4.2\%$ and in some cases by only $\pm 2-3\%$. Ratings of satisfaction in the sample can be expected to differ very little from those in the population. For example, on a scale of 1 to 5, respondents in the sample showed an overall satisfaction with library resources and services of 4.26. The rating by the entire population can be expected to be somewhere in the range between 4.19 and 4.33. The questionnaire (reproduced in Appendix 1) consisted of 24 questions addressing general demographics, use of the Library & collections, and satisfaction with the Library. Two questions were open ended -- "greatest strength", area needing improvement -- and there was a section at the end for additional comments. The "greatest strength" and "needs improvement" responses have been categorized and are reported here.

The goal of this survey, as in 1993, is to provide objective, quantifiable information on the Library's services and resources from one of our primary clientele groups. The retention of many questions from the earlier survey will facilitate comparisons over time. Results of this survey will be used to evaluate Library services and resources for developing funding and service priorities.

3. Faculty Users and the Libraries They Use

The 339 faculty respondents to the survey were distributed among the faculty ranks in similar proportions to the whole population of 913. The distribution between male and female also mirrored the overall population.

Rank & Gender in Faculty Sample and Population		
<i>Rank</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>Population</i>
Professor	45%	42%
Associate Professor	29%	29%

Rank & Gender in Faculty Sample and Population		
<i>Rank</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>Population</i>
Assistant Professor	23%	20%
Lecturer	11%	8%
Male	76%	78%
Female	24%	22%

The majority of the respondents were from the College of Arts and Sciences, but all schools served by the Library were represented in the survey:

Distribution of Faculty Among Schools		
<i>School</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>Population</i>
Arts & Sciences	64%	60%
Engineering	18%	18%
Education	8%	12%
Commerce	5%	5%
Architecture	4%	4%
Other	1%	1%

These distributions are very similar to those of 1993.

Faculty were asked what type of computer operating system they used both in their home and office. PCS and Macintoshes were the most often checked. 35% of the faculty use PCs and 27% use Macintoshes. Another 21% use UNIX operating systems.

Use of Computers by Faculty, 1996		
<i>Computer Operating System</i>	<i>Times Checked</i>	<i>% of faculty who checked</i>
PC	119	35%
Macintosh	90	27%
UNIX	71	21%

Use of Computers by Faculty, 1996		
<i>Computer Operating System</i>	<i>Times Checked</i>	<i>% of faculty who checked</i>
PC DOS Only	63	19%
PC Windows 95	40	12%
Don't Use & Other	43	13%

The survey also asked about which libraries respondents had visited in the past academic year and which library they used most often. These data produced similar results to the 1993 survey.

Comparison of Library Use and Primary Library - 1993 & 1996				
<i>Library</i>	<i>% who used in 1996</i>	<i>% who used in 1993</i>	<i>Primary Library % in 1996</i>	<i>Primary Library % in 1993</i>
Alderman	85%	81%	42%	38%
Clemons	67%	59%	4%	1%
Science/Eng.	50%	56%	18%	20%
Fine Arts	29%	26%	7%	5%
Education	24%	23%	7%	7%
Bio/Psych	18%	17%	7%	8%
Physics	13%	18%	5%	5%
Math/Astro	12%	18%	5%	6%
Music	12%	9%	2%	1%
Chemistry	10%	10%	4%	4%
Commerce	--	8%	--	3%

As in 1993 the most used library is Alderman, followed by Clemons and Science & Engineering. The increase in the number who used Clemons in the past year as well as in the number who consider Clemons to be their primary library is probably a result of the Commerce Library collection being moved to Clemons. There are apparent decreases in the use of Science & Engineering, Physics, and the Math/Astronomy Libraries.

While a plurality of the respondents consider Alderman their primary library (41%) the majority

(59%) consider another library to be their primary library. In 1993 the percentage considering Alderman to be their primary library was 38%. If the science libraries (Science & Engineering, Biology/Psychology, Physics, Chemistry, and Math/Astronomy) are combined, we find that 37% of the faculty primarily use one of these libraries. Thus, the primary library for 41% of the faculty is Alderman; for 37%, is one of the science libraries; and for 16%, is one of the FAME libraries (Fine Arts, Music, and Education). While these percentages are similar to those found in 1993, the percentage of faculty considering either Alderman or the science libraries to be their primary library have approximately switched.

4. Patterns of Library Use

To obtain a clearer picture of how the faculty actually use the University Library question 7 on the survey asked respondents to answer “how often” they used several library services.

Methods of Accessing the Library	
<i>Type of Library Use</i>	<i>% who have used this service at least once a month *</i>
Visit a library in person	91%
Search VIRGO from office	78%
Search VIRGO from home	44%
Use Library WWW pages	39%
Phone transaction with the Library	34%

*percentage based on faculty who answered question 7

While faculty certainly do access the Libraries remotely, in-person visits still account for the largest percentage of use. Of those answering the question, 91% visit a library in person at least one time each month. 78% of faculty answering the question search VIRGO from their offices at least monthly, and 44% search from home that often. About a third (34%) of the faculty answering the question telephone the Library at least once per month, and 39% use the Library WWW pages at least once per month.

50% of the faculty who responded to the question say they visit a library in person at least once per week. The same percentage responded that they visit the library virtually from their offices at least once per week. A quarter of the faculty who responded visit the library via their home computers at least once per week. 17% say that they use the Library WWW pages at least that often. It appears that on a weekly basis the Library’s virtual clientele may actually surpass its in-person faculty clientele.

The 1993 survey asked faculty to estimate all uses of the Library (dialing into VIRGO, telephone

queries, in-person visits, LEO transactions, etc.) in one number. 92% of the faculty responded that they used the Library in some way least once a month. No exact comparison can be made between 1996 use and 1993 use because no overall figure was solicited from the faculty in 1996.

5. Problems and Getting Help

Questions 8 and 9 addressed any reasons faculty might not use the Library more often and any problems which they encounter in using the Library. Two-thirds of the faculty responded that there was no reason they did not use the Library more often. 27% responded that there were reasons they did not use the Library more often, primarily poor parking. This percentage has declined since 1993 when 38% said there were reasons they did not use the libraries more often. Poor parking surpassed “the library doesn’t own what I need” as the primary deterrent to more frequent use.

Reasons for Not Using the Library	
<i>Reasons for not using the Library</i>	<i>% of Faculty who checked</i>
Parking	12%
Library doesn’t own what I need	6%
Libraries are unpleasant to work in	6%
Not enough time	5%
Limited hours	4%
Remote computer access is inadequate	4%
VIRGO is difficult to use	3%
Other	9%

When asked if they generally find what they need, 75% of the faculty responded that they do usually find what they want. 19% said that they do not generally find what they need. Strategies for getting help included consulting LEO, placing a recall, and consulting staff.

Getting Help in the Library	
<i>Strategy for finding material</i>	<i>% of Faculty who checked</i>
Place a hold, recall or search request	15%
Go to Interlibrary Loan/LEO	11%

Getting Help in the Library	
<i>Strategy for finding material</i>	<i>% of Faculty who checked</i>
Ask at Reference desk	9%
Ask Circulation staff to help	7%
Browse stacks	6%
Use the Internet	4%
Other	10%

6. Overall Satisfaction

Faculty were asked, as they were in the 1993 survey, to rate, on a scale of 1 (Not Satisfied) to 5 (Very Satisfied), how satisfied they are with the Library “overall”. The 328 faculty who responded to this question gave the Library an overall approval rating of 4.26. This compares favorably with the 1993 overall rating of 4.09. Though the change is not statistically significant, nevertheless it suggests a modest increase in the faculty’s satisfaction with the Library, and indicates that on the whole the faculty remain pleased with the Library and its services.

As in 1993 faculty from the humanities and social sciences appear to be more satisfied with their library service than those from the sciences. All of the overall ratings by academic area increased over those from the 1993 survey though again the changes are not statistically significant.

Overall Satisfaction with University Libraries		
<i>Faculty Discipline</i>	<i>1996 Rating</i>	<i>1993 Rating</i>
Social Sciences	4.36	4.26
Humanities	4.35	4.27
Other	4.00 (only 3 individuals)	4.20
Sciences	3.99	3.87
All Faculty	4.26	4.09

Overall satisfaction with library services does not seem to be dependent on faculty rank, though associate professors appear to be less satisfied with the Library than other ranks. There is also little difference in ratings by gender; women gave an overall rating of 4.20, and men 4.28.

Satisfaction with the Library by Faculty Rank		
<i>Rank</i>	<i>Satisfaction</i>	<i>% of Sample</i>
Professor	4.28	45%
Associate Professor	4.16	27%
Assistant Professor	4.29	23%
Lecturer	4.70	3%
Instructor	4.50	1%
Other	3.70	1

It is also interesting to look at the overall rating based on which library a faculty member indicated as his/her “home” library. [Note: Percentages of faculty designating a library as their “home” library differ from those reported on page 6 because some respondents did not answer question 24 about overall satisfaction. The percentage of Alderman “home” library users who also answered question 24 was 40%.]

Overall Satisfaction by “Home” Library			
<i>“Home” Library</i>	<i>Satisfaction rating</i>	<i>% Who designate as “home” library</i>	<i>Number of Respondents Total - 328</i>
Alderman	4.41	40%	132
Science & Engineering	3.77	17%	57
Fine Arts	4.39	7%	23
Biology/Psychology	4.26	7%	23
Education	4.48	6%	21
Physics	4.13	5%	15
Math/Astronomy	4.14	4%	14
Chemistry	3.92	4%	13
Clemons	4.45	3%	11

Overall Satisfaction by “Home” Library			
<i>“Home” Library</i>	<i>Satisfaction rating</i>	<i>% Who designate as “home” library</i>	<i>Number of Respondents Total - 328</i>
Music	4.83	2%	6
Most often visited - not answered	4.46	4%	13

7. Satisfaction with Services and Resources

The survey contained nine questions with a total of 64 services & resources to be rated on a satisfaction scale of 1 (Not Satisfied) to 5 (Very Satisfied). There was also a category of “don’t use” which could cover both “don’t know about” and “know about but don’t use”. Of course, a respondent could also simply leave a question blank.

When the results were tallied, each item received two scores. One score was the number of people who rated the item on the 1 to 5 scale; this figure, the number of respondents who had opinions about the item, indicates the *visibility* or impact of the particular resource or service. The other score is a mean rating. In calculating this value, only the responses in the 1 to 5 scale were used. This figure, of course, indicates the level of *satisfaction* for the particular service or resource among the faculty who rated the item.

For the 64 services, collections, and resources rated by faculty, about half were given an average rating of 4.00 or higher, and half below 4.00. We will consider those items which were rated 4.00 or higher to be services and resources with which the faculty are more satisfied, and those with ratings of less than 4.00 to be services and resources with which the faculty are less satisfied. This is also a convenient breaking point because it is the one used in the 1993 survey report.

The 1993 survey rated 46 different services and resources. The 1996 survey asks for ratings on 64 services and resources. The expanded list of services and resources includes some newer more innovative services and resources. In 1993 “a little less than half of the 46 items were rated by 50% or more of the faculty, while a little more than half were rated by less than half of the respondents”. This was not the case in the 1996 survey. In the 1996 survey 50% or more of the faculty only rated 20 of the 64 items, while less than 50% of the faculty rated the remaining 44 items. Using the 1993 scale of visibility (>50%=higher visibility; <50%=lower visibility) we would have to conclude that only 20 of the 64 services and resources are highly visible. Of these 20 highly visible services or resources 12 were rated 4.00 or above and 8 were rated below 4.00.

The following tables divide the 64 rated items into four groups:

- (1) those with average ratings of 4.00 or higher, rated by 50% or more of the faculty
higher satisfaction/higher visibility
- (2) those with average ratings of 4.00 or higher, rated by less than 50% of the faculty
higher satisfaction/lower visibility
- (3) those with average ratings below 4.00, rated by 50% or more of the faculty
lower satisfaction/higher visibility
- (4) those with average ratings below 4.00, rated by less than 50% of the faculty
lower satisfaction/lower visibility

Higher Satisfaction, Higher Visibility - 4.00 or above & 50% or more of Faculty		
<i>Service or Resource</i>	<i>Average rating</i>	<i>Percent of Faculty rating</i>
LEO - Document Delivery	4.59	75%
In person reference	4.46	80%
Put books on reserve	4.38	79%
Telephone reference	4.34	57%
Interlibrary loan	4.26	81%
Reference Books	4.16	80%
Help with electronic databases	4.14	50%
Put photocopies on reserve	4.12	69%
Hold/recall a book	4.04	79%
Library GWIS pages	4.03	53%
VCAT - Library online catalog	4.03	88%
Books	4.01	96%

The 12 items which were rated 4.00 or above by 50% or more of the faculty were primarily services. However, both the reference collections and general book collections fell into the highly visible and highly satisfactory categories. As we'll see below, VCAT, the Library's online catalog, and the book collections moved from below 4.00 ratings in 1993 to above 4.00 ratings in 1996. "Help with electronic databases" became *much* more visible, moving from 18% visibility to 50% from 1993 to 1996.

The most used services or resources are:

Books	96%
VCAT	88%
ILL	81%
Reference	80%
Reference Books	80%
Hold/recall a book	79%
Put books on reserve	79%
LEO/Document Delivery	75%
Put photocopies on reserve	69%

Higher Satisfaction, Lower Visibility - 4.00 or above & less than 50% of Faculty		
<i>Service or Resource</i>	<i>Average rating</i>	<i>Percent of Faculty rating</i>
Library Dept. Contacts	4.41	37%
E-Text Center	4.33	16%
ABI/INFORM	4.30	8%
Help searching Virgo	4.28	39%
Electronic Reference Serv.	4.28	32%
Video Classrooms - Clem.	4.27	22%
Help with Govt. Docs	4.23	28%
OCLC First Search	4.23	12%
Sound Recordings	4.20	10%
NABS	4.19	11%
Alderman Electronic Classrm	4.19	11%
Dig. Media & Music Ctr.	4.15	6%
Printed Library Guides	4.14	33%
Video Recordings	4.11	39%
Retrieve Ivy Stacks material	4.10	30%
Help with Internet	4.09	32%
Library Short Courses	4.06	30%

Higher Satisfaction, Lower Visibility - 4.00 or above & less than 50% of Faculty		
<i>Service or Resource</i>	<i>Average rating</i>	<i>Percent of Faculty rating</i>
Rare Books	4.05	28%
Newspapers	4.03	33%
Microforms	4.02	35%
Government Documents	4.01	41%
Libra - Newsletter	4.00	27%
Lexis/Nexis	4.00	13%
Proquest	4.00	6%

While the items above are in the low visibility category, it is important to note that 1/3 or more of the faculty rated the following items: Library departmental contacts, help searching VIRGO, electronic reference service, printed Library guides, retrieval from Ivy Stacks, Library short courses, newspapers, microforms, and government documents. 10% or less of the faculty rated ABI/INFORM, sound recordings, the Digital Media & Music Center, and Proquest. Highly rated but less visible services and resources include: Library departmental contacts, the Electronic Text Center, ABI/INFORM, and help searching VIRGO.

A third of the respondents rated retrieval from Ivy Stacks. The rating was fairly high, at 4.10.

Lower Satisfaction, Higher Visibility - Below 4.00 & 50% or more Faculty		
<i>Service or Resource</i>	<i>Average rating</i>	<i>Percent of Faculty rating</i>
WILS	3.95	63%
Journals	3.89	92%
Order New Books	3.89	63%
Dial-in VIRGO Access	3.57	55%
Find Missing Books	3.57	62%
Conference Proceedings	3.48	53%
Order New Journals	3.36	55%
Self-Service Photocopiers	3.30	71%

Eight items were rated “lower satisfaction/higher visibility”. The journal collection appears in this group as it did in 1993.

Visibility for this “lower satisfaction/higher visibility” group tended to be lower than visibility for the “higher satisfaction/higher visibility” group. Only one item in the “low sat/high vis” group rated above 75% while of the 12 items in the high sat/high vis group 8 items received visibility scores between 75 and 96%. The journal collection (92%) and the self-service photocopiers (71%) are the most visible of the lower satisfaction items.

Lower Satisfaction, Lower Visibility - Below 4.00 & less than 50% Faculty		
<i>Service or Resource</i>	<i>Average rating</i>	<i>Percent of Faculty rating</i>
Rush Catalog New Material	3.98	31%
Library WWW Pages	3.94	35%
Digital Image Ctr.	3.92	7%
Maps	3.89	18%
Databases on CD Server	3.88	42%
Social Sciences Data Ctr.	3.88	7%
Britannica Online	3.86	10%
Virtual Access to GMU/VCU	3.75	5%
SEL Electronic Classroom	3.74	8%
Library Computer Worksta.	3.73	39%
Slides	3.71	12%
Order Other New Material	3.65	28%
Fiche/Film Readers	3.62	37%
Geographic Info. Ctr	3.61	5%
Cavalier Advantage Cards	3.25	30%
Online Help Screens	3.12	41%
Study & Research Space	2.97	48%
Parking	1.91	42%

Eighteen items appear on the “lower satisfaction/lower visibility” table. The three most visible are parking, study & research space, and databases on CD server. Online help, library computer workstations, fiche/film readers and the Library WWW pages are also more visible low satisfaction items.

Comparing 1996 Satisfaction and Visibility with 1993 Results

In order to compare visibility and satisfaction from 1993 to 1996, we should look only at the items on both surveys. There are 39 such items. Of the 39 items on the 1996 survey which were also on the 1993 survey we find that as in 1993 one-half of the items were rated by 50% or more of the faculty and one-half were rated by less than 50% of the faculty. Based on only those items on both surveys we can compare their relative visibility and their satisfaction rating from 1993 to 1996.

Of the 39 items rated on both surveys 11 were rated as less satisfactory in 1996 than in 1993, and 22 were rated as more satisfactory in 1996. As rough indicators of statistical significance, a rating must have changed by at least $\pm .20$ between 1993 and 1996. Similarly, a visibility percentage must have changed by approximately 8% or more. Any items in the following tables for which either visibility or rating changed significantly from 1993 to 1996 is in *italics*. The tables are grouped by the 1996 satisfaction/visibility scores.

1996 Higher Satisfaction, Lower Visibility						
Item	1996 rating	1993 rating	Change	1996 %	1993 %	Change
<i>LEO</i>	<i>4.59</i>	<i>4.50</i>	<i>+.09</i>	<i>75%</i>	<i>62%</i>	<i>+13</i>
In-person Ref.	4.46	4.46	0	80%	78%	-2
Put Books on Reserve	4.38	4.38	0	79%	74%	+5
Telephone Ref.	4.34	4.46	-.12	57%	63%	-6
ILL	4.26	4.26	0	81%	76%	+5
Ref. Books	4.16	4.02	+.14	80%	85%	-5
<i>Help with electronic data.</i>	<i>4.14</i>	<i>4.27</i>	<i>-.13</i>	<i>50%</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>+32</i>
Put Photocopies on Reserve	4.12	4.22	-.01	69%	64%	+5
<i>Hold/recall book</i>	<i>4.04</i>	<i>4.37</i>	<i>-.33</i>	<i>79%</i>	<i>80%</i>	<i>-1</i>
VCAT	4.03	3.99	+.04	88%	84%	+4

1996 Higher Satisfaction, Lower Visibility						
Item	1996 rating	1993 rating	Change	1996 %	1993 %	Change
<i>Books</i>	4.01	3.78	+ .23	96%	95%	+1

In the high satisfaction/high visibility items on the 1996 survey which were also on the 1993 survey most of the ratings and percentage of faculty ratings did not change much. However, the percentage for “help with electronic databases” increased from 18% to 50% - a 32% increase - taking it from a less visible service to a more visible one. Ratings for both VCAT, the Library’s online catalog, and the book collections crossed the 4.00 line. Approval for VCAT rose from 3.99 to 4.03. More significantly, approval for the book collections rose from 3.78 to 4.01. The 95% of the faculty rating the book collections indicate that this is the Library’s most visible resource. Satisfaction with putting a hold or recall on a book decreased by from 4.37 to 4.04.

1996 Higher Satisfaction, Lower Visibility						
Item	1996 rating	1993 rating	Change	1996 %	1993 %	Change
<i>E-Text Ctr.</i>	4.33	4.18	+ .15	16%	8%	+8
<i>ABI/INFORM</i>	4.30	4.03	+ .27	8%	9%	-1
<i>Video Classrm</i>	4.27	4.23	+ .16	22%	20%	+2
<i>Help with Docs</i>		4.45	- .22	28%	31%	-3
<i>Sound Record</i>	4.20	3.62	+ .58	10%	11%	-1
<i>NABS</i>	4.19	4.04	+ .15	11%	13%	-2
<i>Ald. Elec. Class</i>	4.19	4.14	+ .05	11%	4%	+7
<i>Printed Library Guides</i>	4.14	3.82	+ .32	33%	49%	-16
<i>Videos</i>	4.11	3.92	+ .19	39%	28%	+11
<i>Rare Books</i>	4.05	3.84	+ .21	28%	21%	+7
<i>Newspapers</i>	4.03	4.01	+ .02	33%	43%	-10
<i>Microforms</i>	4.02	3.97	+ .05	35%	34%	+1
<i>Govt. Docs.</i>	4.01	4.06	- .05	41%	41%	0

The 13 items in the 1996 high satisfaction/low visibility category show greater movement than the items which faculty already use and like. Seven of the 13 items increased markedly in either

visibility or satisfaction, with 2 increasing in both. Faculty rating the Electronic Text Center doubled from 1993 to 1996 from 8% to 16%. Videos increased in visibility from 28% to 39%. Satisfaction with sound recordings, rare books, and microforms also increased. Satisfaction with sound recordings increased more than any other satisfaction rating, from 3.62 to 4.20. Microforms moved from the lower satisfaction to higher satisfaction by crossing the 4.00 satisfaction level. Faculty are less satisfied with both the documents collections and service.

1996 Lower Satisfaction, Higher Visibility						
Item	1996 rating	1993 rating	Change	1996 %	1993 %	Change
WILS	3.95	3.81	+.14	63%	64%	-1
<i>Journals</i>	3.89	3.63	+.26	92%	96%	-4
Order books	3.89	4.00	-.11	63%	59%	+4
<i>Dial-in VIRGO</i>	3.57	4.09	-.52	55%	80%	-25
<i>Find Missing bks</i>	3.57	3.79	-.22	62%	65%	-3
<i>Order Journals</i>	3.36	3.03	+.33	55%	48%	+7
Photocopiers	3.30	3.26	+.04	71%	71%	0

In the sensitive area of low satisfaction/high visibility 4 satisfaction scores improved and 3 dropped. Dial-in access to VIRGO was rated by 25% fewer faculty in 1996 that it was in 1993. The lower satisfaction score (.52 less in 1996) suggests increasing dissatisfaction with VIRGO. Scores for both the journal collection and ordering journals improved but are still below the 4.00 level. The satisfaction score for the journal collection increased significantly from 3.63 in 1993 to 3.89 in 1996.

1996 Lower Satisfaction, Lower Visibility						
Item	1996 rating	1993 rating	Change	1996 %	1993 %	Change
<i>Rush Catalog</i>	3.98	4.28	-.30	31%	36%	-5
<i>Maps</i>	3.89	3.69	+.20	18%	17%	+1
<i>CD Databases</i>	3.88	3.58	+.30	42%	24%	+18
<i>Slides</i>	3.71	3.50	+.21	12%	11%	+1
<i>Online Help</i>	3.12	3.67	-.55	41%	74%	-33

Online help moved from a high visibility (74%) item in 1993 to a low visibility (41%) in 1996.

The faculty who still use online help like it less than they did in 1993. The satisfaction rating dropped from 3.67 to 3.12. However, almost twice as many faculty use the CDROM databases in 1996 as did in 1993 (visibility jumped from 24% to 42%). Satisfaction with the CDROM databases increased from 3.58 to 3.88.

Greatest Strength of the University Library

270 faculty responded to question 22 - "In your opinion what is the greatest strength of the University Library?" 1996 responses to this question are quite similar in their distribution to those in 1993. The Library's collections were listed by 37% of the faculty as being the Library's greatest asset. 20% of the respondents said that the staff was the Library's greatest strength. Many faculty listed more than one "greatest strength." Typical of this type of response is: "its holdings and cordial staff." When all such answers were tallied as separate answers there were a total of 347 answers to the "greatest strength" questions. The proportions remained similar to those when only the first response was counted.

Greatest Strength of the University Library			
<i>Service or resource</i>	<i>1996 rating*</i>	<i>1996 # of Faculty responding</i>	<i>1993 rating*</i>
Collections	37%	125	31%
Staff	20%	69	26%
LEO	12%	40	13%
Online services	7% (includes VIRGO)	23	9%
Multiple locations (Branches)	3%	9	5%
VIRGO	--		4%

*Based on total number of surveys returned

Area Most in Need of Improvement

244 faculty out of 339 responded to question 23 "What is the ONE thing the University Library could do that would most improve its services to you?" Improving or expanding collections was the most frequent reply, but the responses showed great variety.

Area Most in Need of Improvement			
<i>Service or resource</i>	<i>1996 rating*</i>	<i>1996 # of Faculty responding</i>	<i>1993 rating*</i>
Collections	19%	66	19%
Online services & CDs in office	16%	55	10%
More centralization & changes in organization of materials	7%	24	7%
Facilities, research space & parking	6%	19	10%
Increase hours	5%	18	4%
VIRGO	4%	15	3%
Circulation - book drops, LEO & reserve	4%	14	2%
Satisfied (no improvements needed)	4%	12	2%
Other	5%	16	--

*Based on total number of surveys returned

8. Priorities for the Future

In an effort to ascertain what types of material faculty think they are likely to need question 20 asked: "Please rate the following resources for their importance to your research and teaching activities during the **next two years**. If you don't expect to use a resource in the next two years you should rate it as "NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT." Printed books and journals were given the highest scores - 4.55 and 4.56, respectively, on the scale of 1 to 5.

Anticipated Research & Teaching Needs for Next 2 Years		
<i>Resource</i>	<i>Mean Score</i>	<i># of Faculty responding</i>
Journals (Print)	4.56	324
Books (Print)	4.55	307
Computerized indexes	3.89	314

Anticipated Research & Teaching Needs for Next 2 Years		
<i>Resource</i>	<i>Mean Score</i>	<i># of Faculty responding</i>
Internet, including WWW	3.49	319
Journals (Electronic)	3.05	315
Electronic texts	2.69	316
Video recordings	2.41	317
Microforms	2.28	312
Foreign language materials	2.22	314
Rare books & manuscripts	2.02	317
Sound recordings	1.65	316

When asked to check 3 resources or services to which they would like to see funding allocated the results were similar to those above. Faculty want to see funding concentrated on printed books and journals, and on electronic databases to help them find information in books and journals. Two-thirds of the faculty rated printed books and journals as their highest priority for future funding.

Funding Priorities		
<i>Service or Resource</i>	<i>1996 % of Faculty responding</i>	<i>1993 % of Faculty responding</i>
Printed books	68%	59%
Printed journals	67%	66%
Electronic databases	47%	32%
Preserve library material	16%	--
Reshelve material quickly	10%	--
Increase library hours	9%	--
Electronic centers	9%	27%*
Improve library WWW pages	8%	--
Video recordings	7%	9%**

Funding Priorities		
<i>Service or Resource</i>	<i>1996 % of Faculty responding</i>	<i>1993 % of Faculty responding</i>
Library computer workstations	6%	--
Electronic reserve	5%	--
New Special Collections bldg	5%	7%***
Microforms	2%	4%
Consultation w/ librarians	2%	7%****
More library instruction	2%	--
Sound recordings	2%	--
Other	8%	15%

*Asked as separate types of media, e.g., social science data, electronic texts, etc.

**Audio Visual Materials

***Rare Books & Manuscripts

****In-person Instruction in electronic services