

## **2004 Faculty Survey on the University Library Highlights**

1. The University Library asked 886 full-time academic and research faculty (in the schools of Arts and Sciences, Architecture, Commerce, Education, and Engineering) to participate in a library survey. A total of 520 faculty completed the survey—a response rate of 59%.
2. Faculty gave the library high ratings in overall satisfaction (4.35 out of 5) and customer service (4.50 to 4.73).
3. Overall satisfaction ratings have risen significantly since 1993, but are down slightly since 2000. The gap between humanities and sciences has diminished; the overall rating by science faculty rose to 4.25, while the humanities/social sciences rating fell to 4.41.
4. When asked to select their three highest priorities for the libraries, faculty named books (selected by 61%), electronic journals (49%), Interlibrary loan/LEO (35%), electronic reference sources (31%), and print journals (27%).
5. When asked to state a preference for journal format, 58% chose electronic journals, 29% chose print journals, and 13% had no preference.
6. The highest ratings for specific resources and services went to Interlibrary loan/LEO (4.60), renewing (4.57) and checking out (4.56) materials, and answering reference questions (4.55).
7. The lowest ratings went to study and research space (3.10), photocopiers (3.44), and conference proceedings (3.53).
8. When faculty were asked open-ended questions, a plurality (~30%) indicated the library staff was the ‘greatest strength of the University Library.’ Next on the list were collections, electronic resources, and LEO.
9. When asked “...what could the University Library do to improve its services,” faculty opinion was very scattered. The most frequent responses (each less than 15% of the total) called for expanding and enhancing collections, and expanding and developing electronic resources.
10. The responses were not consistent among the various academic units. Satisfaction ratings, use patterns, priorities, and journal format preferences varied greatly, indicating the need to examine the results on a department by department basis.