University of Chicago Library Faculty Survey 2013
Final Report

Assessment Planning Team and Faculty Survey Project Team
3 July 2013

Introduction

The University of Chicago Library creates and maintains a culture of assessment of its collections, services, and spaces to fulfill its commitment to provide comprehensive resources and services in support of the research, teaching, and learning needs of the University community.[1] In order to provide these resources and services, the Library seeks to understand the research, teaching, and learning needs of its users[2] through periodic surveys.

The 2013 Faculty Survey is the third of these surveys. The Library surveyed graduate and professional school students in 2010 and undergraduate students in 2011. On January 31, 2013, the Library emailed invitations to complete the Faculty Survey to 3,701 current faculty, emeritus faculty, other academic appointees, and postdoctoral fellows. A total of 645 surveys were completed. Overall, faculty users are greatly appreciative of the Library and its support for their teaching and research. Survey results support a conclusion that the Library's historical focus on collections continues to serve the needs and interests of the faculty. Responses indicate that the faculty are engaged with the issues surrounding the Library's increasing reliance on resources in electronic rather than print formats, as well as the challenges inherent in the use of tools to discover and access those resources.

The survey was divided into 4 sections: Collections, Services and Spaces, General Feedback and Demographics. For purposes of this report, we have placed the Demographics question at the beginning, to provide context for the rest of the discussion.

Demographics

The overall response rate for the survey was 17%, with 645 surveys completed. This response rate is comparable to the responses to the 2010 Survey of Graduate and Professional School Students (18%)[3],

---

[1] University of Chicago Library Mission Statement: http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/about/mvv.html
[2] Ibid.
[3] 2010 University of Chicago Library Survey of Graduate and Professional School Students: http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/surveys/2010/index.html

and lower than the response rate to the 2011 Survey of Undergraduate Students (26%)[4]. It is, however, comparable to the faculty's rate of response to the 2007 LibQUAL+ survey (15.3%)[5].

As the tables show, response rates varied by academic status, age, and discipline. The highest response rates by population came from those in the Oriental Institute, the Divinity School, the Humanities Division, and the Social Sciences Division.

Response rate by Division/School

Division/School	Population	Responses	Response Rate
Oriental Institute	32	12	38%
Divinity School	41	14	34%
Humanities Division	352	115	33%
Social Sciences Division	299	79	26%
Institute for Molecular Engineering	17	4	24%
Physical Sciences Division	534	99	19%
Harris School of Public Policy Studies	33	6	18%
Social Service Administration	65	11	17%
Law School	101	17	17%
Biological Sciences Division / Pritzker	1736	238	14%
Chicago Booth School of Business	180	17	9%
The College	240	22	9%
Other	51	4	8%
Graham School of General Studies	20	1	5%
Did not respond		6	--
Total	**3,701**	**645**	**17%**

Response rate by Academic Status

Academic Status	Population	Responses	Response Rate
Faculty	1,318	313	24%
Emeritus Faculty	345	49	14%
Other Academic Appointees	1,473	197	13%
Postdoctoral Fellows	565	86	15%
Total	**3,701**	**645**	**17%**

---

[4] 2011 University of Chicago Library Survey of Undergraduates
http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/surveys/2011/index.html
[5] 2007 University of Chicago Library LibQUAL+ Survey http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/surveys/2007/index.html

Response rate by Age

Age Group	Population	Responses	Response Rate
Under 40	1,403	218	16%
40-49	787	145	18%
50-59	656	122	19%
60-69	429	89	21%
70 or over	426	66	15%
Did not respond		5	--
Total	**3,701**	**645**	17%

Library Collections

Collection Adequacy
1. The Library's print and electronic collections are effective in meeting my research and teaching needs.

Academic Status	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Faculty	41% (128)	49% (152)	7% (21)	1% (4)	3% (8)
Emeritus Faculty	31% (15)	55% (27)	2% (1)	2% (1)	10% (5)
Other Academic Appointees	40% (79)	50% (98)	3% (6)	5% (10)	2% (4)
Postdoctoral Fellows	33% (28)	53% (46)	6% (5)	1% (1)	7% (6)
Total:	**39% (250)**	**50% (323)**	**5% (33)**	**2% (16)**	**4% (23)**

Faculty are generally very satisfied with the Library's effectiveness in facilitating research and instruction. 89% of respondents agreed with the statement, "The Library's print and electronic collections are effective in meeting my research and teaching needs," while only 6% disagreed. Emeritus faculty and those aged 70 or older were slightly more likely to disagree, but a large majority of faculty across all schools and divisions agree that the Library effectively meets their research and teaching needs. The high levels of satisfaction with the Library were reflected in many positive comments received in the survey.

Preferences for Print or Electronic Format
2. The Library continues to buy print resources even as resources are increasingly available in electronic formats. The budget does not allow the Library to buy resources in multiple formats, necessitating a choice between electronic or print. Please list the most important criteria that should influence the Library when deciding whether to purchase a book in print or electronic form.

Faculty have nuanced views about e-books and print books. We expected that preferences for print vs. e-books would vary depending on the age of the respondent and the discipline; however survey responses were more consistent across those two variables, though disciplinary and generational differences are sometimes present. While some respondents prefer print and others prefer electronic, there was a general acknowledgement of the value of both formats, and a willingness to conduct research using both print and electronic texts in all disciplines and age groups. Faculty distinguished frequently between their own preferences for reading and research and what they thought the Library

should collect, recognizing that preservation, access by multiple users and budget constraints could make a different format choice appropriate for the Library. Even among Humanities faculty, preferences for electronic formats in monographs are growing, led, we suspect, by faculty's increasing desire for and dependence on electronic formats for journals. Surprisingly, many emeritus and older faculty expressed a preference for e-books. Distance from campus and the frequency/utility of working from home were given as reasons for preferring the electronic format.

While faculty rely on and value the Library's electronic discovery tools, whole-hearted adoption of e-books for research is hindered by three factors. First, some respondents almost reluctantly confide a preference for reading scholarly books of any length in print. These respondents often differentiate among types of books. Edited collections of chapters, articles or shorter works are much more readily accepted in e-book format. Even while preferring to read more substantial works (more "in depth", "difficult", "challenging") in print, faculty acknowledge the usefulness of being able to discover and search a text in full text. A second and more significant factor is the multiplicity of e-book platforms and their lack of adaptation to scholarly research. Survey responses support an inference that if the platforms were more intuitive, more accessible, more standardized and more supportive of the ways faculty use research materials, resistance to e-books generally would decline significantly. The third factor is preservation: faculty express concern for the long-term viability of e-books. As migration to new tools/formats is required, faculty need to be assured of the availability of materials for the long-term.

These latter concerns are shared by other large research libraries. The Yale University Library recently published a Report of Findings and Recommendations of its eBook Strategic Plan Task Force[6]. That Report observes that: "on one hand print books help the Library best fulfill its mission to collect, organize and preserve knowledge, but on the other, eBooks help the Library fulfill its mission to support the (current) teaching and research missions of Yale University." Yale concludes that it should "encourage eBook models that align with its mission as an academic library and that best support its constituents in their teaching, learning and research." (pg. 20) Our faculty's survey responses indicate agreement with this position, but, of course, the devil is in the details and, as our faculty note, the details have not yet been dealt with to their satisfaction. We are moving toward an electronic world, and our faculty generally support that movement, but their support is contingent upon solutions to the access and preservation issues.

Users from the science disciplines generally favored e-books. Representative comments include:
- "I believe the electronic format is the way forward, though in instances where significant utility is lost in the e-version (maps, older texts, color overlay plates), I think the library should go ahead and purchase the print version." -- Faculty, Biological Sciences Division.
- "digital prints are environmental friendly, easier accessible (even off site), and cost effective (I think)." – PostDoc, Biological Sciences Division.
- "The library should maintain print books that are not readily available online" – Academic, Biological Sciences Division.
- "Always pick electronic, it can always be printed." – Academic, Pritzker School of Medicine.
- "I have nothing against completely electronic collections." – PostDoc, Biological Sciences Division.

---

[6] The eBook Strategic Plan Task Force: Report of Findings and Recommendations
http://www.library.yale.edu/departments/collection-development/Yale-ebook-task-force-rpt.pdf

- "Ease of access: Can I download the electronic version as a PDF? Good! Cumbersome online interface that doesn't work on mobile devices? Bad!" – PostDoc, Biological Sciences Division.

Responses from users in the Social Sciences Division, Booth School of Business, the Law School, and The College could be generally characterized as "It depends." Approximately 30% expressed clear support for e-books:

- "I seldom go to the library these days, especially since most things are available digitally (and thus from my office or home). So this is a priority." – Faculty, Booth School of Business.
- "If in doubt: buy the electronic version. For better or worse, we might be facing an enormous generational shift in reading habits. And I say this also as a professor whose students are ever more reluctant to go over to the library for anything. Electronic accessibility is in the long run the criterion for existence of any text." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.

About 20% expressed clear support for print:

- "I still prefer books in print form but may get used to electronic" – Emeritus, Social Sciences Division.
- "That is, the more important a book, and the longer, the stronger would be my preference for a print copy." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "Moving to a completely digital acquisitions policy would be hugely short-sighted, because print books are likely to survive much further into the future than digital materials, given the potential for electronic mishaps and worse in the unforeseeable future. Therefore, it seems prudent to continue to buy print versions of most reputable scholarly works." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.

But about half of the respondents saw value in both formats:

- "Periodicals only in electronic form; books in print form. I find it very hard to read books on the computer. However, I like reading books on Kindle and citation issues are being corrected, so if Kindle-compatible electronic books become available, life would be beautiful." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "Anything that will in the longer run be read and reread might rather be print material. Anything really artsy, poetry, literature; anything conceptually dense: philosophy, social and political theory But I must also admit that this tends to be material that I buy, if I can, and do not check out of the library if I am really interested in it and really want to work with it. Real classics you might have in both versions also because you might not have to buy multiple copies and because these materials circulate a lot." –Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "I would think first about preservation. Books that are published on acid paper or in formats that won't last long are preservation problems. Items that are purchased in electronic form may also be ephemeral in that they require periodic copying, often in new formats. A hardbound book on acid-free paper can last without copying. I would choose on the basis of what is most likely to endure for the next--I don't know the right time period, but say 200 years." – Emeritus, Social Sciences Division.
- "The smaller and more specialized the publisher, the more should paper be the norm for purchase." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.

- "Any e-reading software that doesn't allow for a complete download of the book is otherwise not very useful for me, and I would always be inclined to request an inter-library loan for the item so I could have a print book." – Faculty, The College.

The Humanities faculty responses were similar. 27% would prefer e-books, 34% print, and the other roughly 40% are in the "It depends." group. Format preferences depend on content (the quality of the edition, the type of work, print is better for deeper engagement with the text) and access (searching, downloading, high demand, simultaneous users, use for teaching and course reserves). Electronic is preferred for access, although difficult interfaces elicit frustration. Representative comments:

- "Personally, I think books by single authors should be in print form but journals and 'chapter books' could be in electronic form since the articles are not so long. But I am sure others disagree with this." – Faculty, Oriental Institute.
- "This is a tough question. I like the ease of being able to access journal articles from home through the library website. For books that I need to read cover to cover, a hard copy is nice. But this varies on a case by case basis, and I'm not sure if I can articulate clearer guidelines!" – Academic, Humanities Division.
- "From an art-historical perspective, electronic is probably better except in those cases in which the illustrations, fold-outs and the like really require print." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "Durability and accessibilty. Electronic volumes still lag behind print where things like skimming and portability are concerned. I often prefer to read away from the computer and away from the office." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "as much as i prefer the physical book myself, i am finding that young undergraduates are a lot less likely to make the trip to the library to read anything that is on reserve in print rather than in digital format. Electronic form allows instant and simultaneous access to multiple users." – Academic, Humanities Division.
- "First, the quality of the digital interface. Many electronic formats are totally unusable as far as I'm concerned: slow to load, impossible to scroll through, hard to see at a legible text size, and equally importantly, likely to be obsolete within 5 years, while the book might stay on the shelf for a hundred. Having to master 6-7 different e-reader interfaces is maddening. I really appreciate being able to download a .pdf, ideally a searchable one--this is how I manage Hathi Trust, for example, since that's an example of a disastrous interface in my view." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "In most cases, electronic form would be fine; it avoids the need for recalls, saves shelf space, and is easier to use in courses." – Faculty, Divinity School.

Recommendations for Collections and Digitization

3. The Library is committed to developing collections that anticipate and enable new modes and areas of scholarship while continuing to address current research and teaching needs. Which specific scholarly resources would you recommend that the Library purchase?
4. Through its Digital Library Program, the Library creates a variety of digital collections by digitizing existing Library materials. Which specific materials would you recommend that the Library digitize?
5. Please provide any further comments you may have on the Library's collections.

These three questions asked faculty for specific recommendations for purchase and digitization, followed by an opportunity to comment generally on the Library's collections. The specific recommendations have been forwarded to the applicable bibliographers and to the Digital Services Steering Committee for consideration.

Comments on collections covered a wide range of issues, some specific to certain collections and others directed to formats and access. Comments regarding strengths of the collection far outnumbered criticisms, with some collections receiving exclusively positive comments:

- "The University of Chicago Library has one of the world's greatest collections in South Asian materials, and I very much hope that will continue to be the case." – Faculty, Divinity School.
- "The Middle East collection is excellent. It should be preserved and expanded as that is a big strength of the library. The Ottoman collection in particular." – Academic, Social Sciences Division.
- "Cinema and Media Studies is a growing field that we have only just begun to pay proper attention to. Happily, we have an excellent bibliographer there who stands ready to help." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "Many students in my departments are writing on gaming and other interactive computer formats. The library is doing a good job, and I'd encourage them to continue purchasing games, etc.." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "I find that most new books that I desire have been either ordered by library or I am able to request them and they arrive in good time" – Academic, Social Sciences Division.

Multiple comments expressed concerns in the fields of:

- Music: "Unfortunately, we still do not have the good enough collection in that field. Lots of scores are not available to our students and they usually go to Northwestern University to pick up the music we need for analysis." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- Engineering: "Library has a fairly lackluster collection on engineering and technology." – Faculty, Physical Sciences Division.
- History: "More generally, sub areas such as slavery in the US and Southern and general US history" – Faculty, Divinity School.
- Newspapers: "The archived material for Newspapers is not great." – Academic, Pritzker School of Medicine.

The ability to browse the collections remains a strong positive. Faculty commented on the ease of access to the collections, especially remote access, noting that for many uses they no longer need to be in the Library to use the collections. However, browsing remains important along with on-campus access to materials.

- "I think everything the library has done in the last few years to provide access to the collection without having to physically visit it has been terrific, and whatever else can be done along those lines, is to be welcomed enthusiastically." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "Great great great. What a pleasure to work at this library--and how nice that browsing is still really supported." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "Thank you for your efforts to make books available on campus and resist the temptation to move lesser used books to storage. This is very much appreciated." – Faculty, Physical Sciences Division.

Electronic access is greatly appreciated, but is not without its difficulties. Faculty complain of dead links, subscription problems, lack of seamlessness in accessing articles, and e-book usability. Frustration is especially acute where expectations of access are raised, but then thwarted.

- "I routinely send between 10-20 error reports via the catalog of links that don't work, vendors that don't recognize U of C subscriptions to e-pubs, etc. I think the library needs more staffing hours and better ways of maintaining and auditing these links." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "Many university presses and the like have online archives to which we do not have full access. We should have everything!" – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "As a scientist I would like to have easier seamless access to articles from journals to which the library subscribes. For example, I get journal table of contents in my email often on my phone but I can't link to articles of interest without exiting email, logging onto the library website and researching for the article." – Academic, Pritzker School of Medicine.
- "However, sometimes, the full text of some journals are not available from FIND IT. It is not very easy to follow the FIND IT to find the full text." – Academic, Pritzker School of Medicine.
- "there's nothing more frustrating than those online books." – Academic, Pritzker School of Medicine.
- "There are some records that are marked 'e-resource', but in fact only the TOC etc are online. Someone should go through the records marked 'e-resource' and check/qualify them." – Faculty, Humanities Division.

Several faculty members commented on staff in connection with collections. The faculty sees the bibliographers and reference librarians as particularly valuable resources.

- "The efforts of the subject bibliographers are great." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "It seems to this faculty member that staffing levels are too low, esp at the subject bibliographer levels. The specialist bibliographers have been asked to cover too many subject areas for too long now- they are heroic, but there's a limit to what can be done under these circumstances. We need to get back to pre 2008 staffing levels among the bibliographers - otherwise the collections will suffer in the long-term." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "The availability of reference librarians has proved extraordinarily important to me. Please no cut backs there." – Academic, Pritzker School of Medicine.

Overall, members of the faculty want *more* materials in their subject areas, particularly more journals and more electronic access to journals. This theme recurred throughout the survey:

- "My main need is to retrieve journal articles and make them available to myself and students in an electronic form." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "All I need is access to ejournals" – Faculty, Biological Sciences Division.
- "Electronic Journal access is the most important." – PostDoc, Social Sciences Division.
- "Making as much stuff possible digitally so that I can do research from anywhere." – Academic, Humanities Division.

Library Services and Spaces

Adequacy, Use, and Recommendations for Improvements

6. The following Library services or spaces met my research and teaching needs in the last year.
7. Please provide any specific comments you may have on the Library's website and online search tools.
8. Please provide any specific comments you may have on the Library's services or spaces.

The next section of the survey asked respondents to indicate whether specific Library services and spaces met their needs in the last year. While many did not use the services and spaces, most who did agreed that it met their needs. While feedback was provided on the majority of the services and spaces listed, the following is intended to highlight those services and spaces that received significant mention.

	Used Service	Used Service and Agree	Used Service and Disagree
Library website	93%	84%	4%
Library catalog	87%	86%	3%
E-Journals list	79%	83%	2%
Lens	61%	68%	10%
Database finder	59%	76%	5%
Assistance from a librarian at a reference desk	53%	89%	1%
Scan & Deliver document scanning service	52%	86%	2%
UBorrow service providing loans from affiliated research libraries	52%	84%	2%
Course reserves	51%	81%	3%
Assistance from a Library subject specialist	47%	86%	0%
Online assistance via Ask a Librarian	37%	72%	3%
Special Collections Research Center	32%	67%	2%
Research guides for specific topics or courses	29%	57%	2%
Presentations from a librarian in a class or workshop	27%	63%	1%
Library teaching spaces	26%	57%	3%
Library faculty studies	26%	62%	4%
Journal alert services provided by the Library	25%	53%	3%

Website and Search Tools
The Library website and catalog were both the most used and the most satisfactory. This is consistent with findings from the 2012 ITHAKA S+R US Faculty Survey, which indicated a growing reliance on library catalogs, particularly in the humanities.[7] In addition, 19% of responses to question 7 provided generally positive feedback to the Library's website and search tools. The many negative responses to Lens, as well as numerous comments regarding interface challenges in the current catalogs, provide support for the implementation of VuFind, currently scheduled for Winter 2014. Respondents indicated specific issues with compatibility, use of the back button, and exporting citations. One noteworthy and repeated request expressed a desire for Lens to include page numbers within the table of contents, specifically to aid in submitting requests for course reserves and Scan & Deliver.

Negative feedback expressed desires for the Library's website to be easier to navigate and more intuitive. In general, respondents wanted fewer obstacles between them and their research. This included calls to simplify the authentication process and have quick links to popular databases, either on the Library main page or on user customizable pages.

---

[7] ITHAKA S+R US Faculty Survey 2012 http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/us-faculty-survey-2012

Many faculty expressed frustration about the complexity of our research environment. They yearn for a simplicity that is not currently available with the multiplicity of tools and databases the Library has to maintain in order to provide access to the wealth of materials available:

- "why are there so many different search tools - Lens, UBorrow etc. Can we please combine them?" – PostDoc, Physical Sciences Division.
- "Make it simpler. Google provides access to an enormous range of content with a very simple user interface. This would be ideal for the Library." – Faculty, Biological Sciences Division.
- "I find the process of searching for an electronic journal and then being sent to a database (JSTor, etc.) and then opening the pdf cumbersome. I also [find] the search engines in JSTOR and other databases very hard to use. Googlescholar works so much better, at least in my opinion." – Faculty, School of Social Service Administration.
- "I'm always challenged figuring out whether the library has an electronic version of a journal article I want, and then where to go to download it. I usually figure it out in the end but it takes some time." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "I found the search engine sometimes kind of clunky - for instance, in search results I often want to open each record in a new tab so that I don't need to click on each record, look at it, then go back to search results. But often the records wouldn't open in a new tab (seemed to have something to do with Javascript I believe is what the empty new pages would say). I'd sometimes end up accidentally having to redo searches because the process of going back and forth between results and specific entries broke down." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.

This data points to the need for the Library to consider making the resource discovery process more straightforward. This is consonant with the recommendations made in recent report on resource sharing and library discovery systems to the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) Library Directors[8]. Even experienced researchers like our faculty may prioritize convenience and speed over navigation of a complex environment, and accustom themselves to sampling from a wealth of sources only the information that is readily accessible to them. Providing ready access to the richness of our resources has to be a priority.

Scan and Deliver and UBorrow
Scan and Deliver and UBorrow, both launched in 2012, received high praise throughout the survey. 86% of Scan and Deliver users and 84% of UBorrow users indicated satisfaction with the services; dissatisfaction with both was a very low 2% among users. Representative quotes from the survey include:
- "Scan & Deliver is extremely useful, one of the most useful library services I've seen so far. UBorrow works well, too, so kudos for these innovations!" – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "The scan & deliver service is excellent and is essential for my work." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "Thank you for the Scan and Deliver service -- it's indispensable, particularly on the go." – Faculty, Physical Sciences Division.
- "Scan and Deliver has changed my life; I see it as the single most important service the library offers." – Academic, School of Social Service Administration.

---

[8] Framework for Discovery-to-Fulfillment Systems Planning in the Context of CIC Resource Sharing: A Report to the CIC Library Directors.

In response to a later question, however, one faculty member indicated reservations about the use of the service by students:

- "I really do not like the scan and deliver service for students. I think students need to spend more time doing hands on research, and experience the joy of unexpected discoveries. Getting them into the stacks should be our goal, rather than making it possible for them not to have to." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.

Instruction, Reference, and Course Reserves

89% of faculty who consulted a reference librarian and 86% of those who consulted a subject specialist were pleased with the service they received. However, only 53% and 47% respectively indicated that they had utilized these services. Few faculty use research guides and few have research presentations from a librarian, although a majority of those that did were satisfied.

Few faculty commented on the Library's instruction programs. Comments relating to faculty's teaching responsibilities focused on reserves, recognizing the importance of this function. Reserves staff are appreciated, but many felt that the reserves system is confusing for faculty and students and that turn-around time is slow. Confusion partially arises from a lack of clear understanding of the relationship of course reserves and Chalk websites. Information is provided to faculty on each function separately without clarifying how they relate to one another. New initiatives to more closely integrate course reserves with Chalk course sites may help address these frustrations. Taken together, these data indicate a need for further outreach and better marketing of the Library's instruction and course-related services.

Physical Spaces

Faculty gave high marks to the Mansueto Library space, as well as the first floor remodeling of the Regenstein Library. Others complained about the disruptions caused by renovations and the reorganization of the collections. Several respondents deplored the closing of the Manuscript Search Room. Respondents also indicated some support for the retention of Eckhart Library in its current location.

Responses also indicated areas where the Library could make valuable improvements to physical spaces. Faculty complain about noise, food and lack of cleanliness, attributed to undergraduate use of Regenstein. Respondents also voiced a desire for more faculty study space.

Conclusions and Next Steps

Recommendations for New Services and Suggestions for Improvement

The final set of questions asked for input on services and initiatives that the Library is currently considering, then asked for suggestions for other ways in which the Library could support research and teaching responsibilities. Taken with other survey themes, these questions provide some direction for the Library as it moves into the digital future.

9. Which of the following services would be of value to you if the Library were able to offer them?

Question 9 presented a set of services and initiatives currently under consideration as the Library seeks "to develop research and teaching tools, services, programs, and environments that enable users to take

full advantage of Library resources and to interact with technology in new ways."[9] Responses to this question varied by school or division, reflecting differences in the research habits and environments by discipline. The three most desired services are tools for citation management, archiving of digital research, and paging between libraries, though additional comments elsewhere in the survey indicate a strong interest in support for copyright issues.

Tools for citation management and sharing

This option received the most positive responses of the services listed, with more than 46% of all respondents selecting this as a desirable service (although respondents from The College were least positive, at 33%). We find this somewhat puzzling, as the Library already offers and supports citation management tools. One faculty member's lengthy and representative comment sheds some light by indicating the inadequacies of tools currently supported by the Library:

- "First, a comment on question no. 9. I used EndNotes. Then I used RefWorks. They were both initially a pain to set up, then, for awhile, extremely useful, then became more work than they were worth, and both for the same reason: they keep 'upgrading' them in such a way that whatever the user has done to find work arounds for inevitable kinks ends up making the bibliography that user has developed unusable in its current state. I _would_ like a tool for citation management IF IT IS STABLE. I dream of a STABLE IF IMPERFECT TOOL.... with stability measured over years, not over months. But I don't have time to invest in learning and building a bibliography in a new tool that is just going to change on me (even if supposedly for the better) in just a few years." – Faculty, Humanities Division.

Archiving of your digital research

Archiving of digital research received 38% support, with strongest interest from the sciences. The College, Booth School of Business, and the Divinity School were least interested in this service. Unlike the other services highlighted in this report, this service received few mentions elsewhere in the survey.

Paging and delivery of materials between Library facilities

Third in popularity at 36%, this service was of greatest interest to the Social Sciences Division. The Biological Sciences Division, Physical Sciences Division, and the Booth School of Business reported fewer positive responses, most likely because much of their research environment is online.

While this service was proposed in question 9, it received mentions throughout the survey. Some respondents indicated that this service is available at many other institutions, while others simply expressed strong interest:
- "A paging and delivery service would be great, even if only while classes are in session" – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "Paging and delivery service would be a HUGE help. HUGE." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "The library at my previous university would deliver items from branch to branch for me to pick up. This was a very helpful service." – Faculty, The College.

---

[9] University of Chicago Library Strategic Directions, 2012-2015.
http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/staffweb/depts/diroffice/annrep/Directors%20AR%202012.pdf

Support with copyright issues:
This proposed service received only 27% support clustered in the Oriental Institute (6), Social Sciences Division (35), and the Law School (7), but received additional mention elsewhere in the survey:

- "A better understanding of copyright is always in need" – Academic, The College.
- "The copyright issue has occupied the last year of my life. I find it amazing that the university offers no help to young professors who are struggling to figure out how permissions work in academic publications." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "I would also like to the see the library adopt a more humanities-sensitive approach to fair use. I feel the U of C's fair use policy is unusually restrictive compared to other research universities I've worked at and it's a serious problem - both pragmatically and intellectually for a research university to be contributing toward the monopolization and commodification of knowledge by redrawing fair use in ways that impeded student and faculty access to shared, and limited-distribution modes of reading/etc. As a humanist scholar I am not interested in turning knowledge into intellectual property in ways that are ultimately chilling to the exchange of ideas, to teaching and learning. The fair use policy strikes me as implicitly involving all of U of C faculty in a very limited and limiting definition of fair use." – Faculty, Humanities Division.

Other proposed services
Respondents expressed interest in assistance writing grants for projects with a digital component; however, the popularity of this service diminished with the age and rank of the scholar. 35% of respondents under 40 years of age and 44% of postdocs found this to be a desirable service. Support for text analysis and data mining was less popular overall (28%), with most interest coming from the Harris School of Public Policy Studies and the School of Social Service Administration. Data management planning received the fewest votes of all of the potential service offerings listed, with strongest interest from the School of Social Service Administration, where 45% of respondents found it to be desirable.

Conclusion and Next Steps

10. What could the Library do to better support your research and teaching?

In this final section, the faculty reflected on both the presented question and the themes and topics raised throughout the survey. Responses generally support a conclusion that faculty are frustrated with the learning curves and varied interfaces associated with electronic research. In response to this question, as throughout the survey, the faculty spoke not with one voice, but with a range of opinions and concerns. The humanities and hard sciences represented the ends of a spectrum, but the gap between them was not great. Responses to the question of electronic versus print resources demonstrated a general acceptance of the concept of an increasingly digital future, while expressing concerns about interfaces and persistence of access.

Many of these factors are outside the Library's direct control. Vendors continue to introduce new interfaces; realignments in the publishing industry result in changes to familiar tools; publishers do not have standardized approaches to similar issues. As a result, researchers have access to a huge universe of resources, but experience significant barriers to their use. The complexity of the environment is a deterrent from making full use of the Library's collections. Several comments suggested that faculty rely on a few familiar tools because it is too difficult to discover and learn how to use new ones. Survey data suggests that the Library could enhance our value to the faculty and better serve our core patron group

by making discovery of and access to the resources we provide, both print and electronic, easier and more straightforward and by making training more available at the point of need. Additionally, the Library could stress to our vendors and collaborators the importance of improving platforms and interfaces for electronic resources, as this has the potential to reduce barriers to entry for all Library patrons.

Throughout the survey, respondents indicated their great appreciation for Library staff. Many staff members were praised by name, indicating that respondents greatly value the care and expertise Library staff bring to their work. Some concerns were expressed that staff are or may become overburdened:

- "Do not overwhelm the subject librarians with serving too many fields; they are the bread and butter for every serious researcher at a university, and you need to give them the best support, salaries, and work environment that you can." – Faculty, Humanities Division.

As in our previous surveys, the high overall satisfaction levels were reflected in the general tone of the comments, which included many compliments about the Library:

- "Ours remains the finest working library I know--there are larger collections, but none of [them are as] accessible and pleasant." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "The library is doing a fantastic job, especially given these challenging times. I am very happy to see efforts at the improvement of workspaces, ambience, customer service, etc. The Scan&Deliver service is very, very helpful, so continuation and expansion of the service will be very much appreciated. I am also very fond of Ask a Librarian." – Faculty, Humanities Division.
- "The library is a superb resource" – Faculty, Harris School of Public Policy Studies.
- "I am deeply impressed by the range and depth of the collections and by the readiness of the library to purchase materials that are recommended." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "You are doing a fine job in getting me the material I need. I am quite happy with the Reg! So three cheers to you all." – Faculty, Social Sciences Division.
- "The collections are top rate and 99% of the time fulfill my needs." – Academic, Biological Sciences Division.
- "I am positive there are things to improve, but the library as it is now is already very supportive of research and teaching." – Faculty, Oriental Institute.

In closing, we are grateful to the many faculty who took the time and the opportunity offered by this survey to express the importance of the Library to their work, as well as their appreciation for the efforts of the Library to meet their research needs. Their comments underscore the importance of the collections, both print and electronic, to their research and teaching, while emphasizing the challenges presented by myriad interfaces and paths to resource discovery. The traditional yet evolving roles of the Library, *collections, discovery, access, service, and perpetuity,*[10] are echoed throughout the survey's responses, and speak to the Library's continued responsibility to meet the needs of the faculty as they also evolve.

---

[10] The Transformation of Research Libraries
http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/about/LibraryTransformation_2page.pdf