

July 20, 2006

Pat Steele  
Interim Dean of University Libraries  
Wells Library 299D  
Bloomington, IN 47405

Dear Interim Dean Pat Steele,

The Bloomington Faculty Council Library Committee is pleased to present the final report of our spring 2006 faculty survey on the library. We think you will see, in reading our summary and the full text of faculty responses to the survey, that the Bloomington faculty was eager to express its feeling about the library and its services and has a strong interest in the continued success of our academic library. We appreciate the opportunity to engage our colleagues in thinking about library affairs and the opportunity to contribute to the university's planning activities surrounding the future of the library.

We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have about the report and we look forward to continued productive conversations with you next year.

Sincerely,

Harold Ogren, Physics (chair)

Robert Billingham, HPER  
Angela Courtney, Libraries  
Luis Davila, Spanish & Portuguese  
Ruth Engs, AHS-HPER Emerita  
J. Albert Harrill, Religious Studies  
Cecile Jagodzinski, Libraries  
Joss Marsh, English  
Kevin Rottet, French and Italian  
Richard Rubinger, East Asian Languages and Cultures  
Pnina Shachaf, SLIS  
Jodi Shepherd, Graduate and Professional Student Organization  
Rex Sprouse, Germanic Studies  
John Steinmetz, Geological Survey  
Lynn Struve, History  
Kelly Kish, Ex-Officio, Bloomington Faculty Council

cc: Michael A. McRobbie, Interim Provost  
Adam W. Herbert, President  
Theodore K. Miller, BFC President

## Introduction

During the 2005-2006 academic year, the Bloomington Faculty Council Library Committee and Interim Dean of the Libraries Pat Steele have been working on an internal review of the future role of the library in the university. The rapid pace of digitization of materials and the availability of information via web searches will have profound effects on the role that our library will play in the future. The extent of this digital revolution is most dramatic in the sciences, but is now also beginning to impact the humanities as well.

To provide a broad array of faculty input on these issues the BFC Library Committee developed a short survey (10 library use questions and 6 requests for comments) (Appendix A). The responses to the library use questions are summarized on Pages 4-5 and the comments are summarized on Pages 6-11. Appendix B contains additional comments and remarks sorted by academic department.

The primary goal of the survey was to hear from faculty across academic disciplines. Multiple methods (department meetings, online surveys, and hand distribution and collection) were used by Committee members to administer the survey. Members of our committee made personal visits to eleven departments and schools. For these face-to-face meetings the survey questionnaires were distributed to the faculty and a conversation on the general topics ensued. Additionally, we e-mailed faculty from more than thirty departments inviting them to fill out an identical web-based form of the questionnaire. In total, we collected 501 completed surveys, which is approximately 36 percent of the tenured and tenure-track Bloomington faculty. Table 1 illustrates respondents by department, as a percentage of the survey respondents, and as a percentage of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the respondents' department.

Summary statistics presented on Pages 4-5 were developed by collapsing departments into broad discipline-based categories to ensure more than 10 cases in each data cell. These are the collapsed categories: COAS: Arts & Humanities (English, History...) COAS: Social and Behavioral, COAS: Science, HPER, Education, Business, Music, SLIS, Law, Journalism, Nursing, Optometry, MedSci, SPEA, Informatics, Other.

### Overall Summary

The detailed summaries for each question will be given later but the overall picture that emerged from this survey was clear: the Bloomington faculty is appreciative of the important role that the library plays in their research and teaching and wants to see this role continue and expand over time. Faculty members have become avid users of the digital resources and expect that our library will continue to keep our campus at the forefront of this revolution, while maintaining many of the traditional modes of interaction especially in certain disciplines. They understand the necessity of moving materials to the ALF, but are worried that they may lose contact with primary monographs and journals in their field, many of which are viewed as critical reference material. There are many who still long for the feel and smell of real books. Branch/campus library support is very strong, primarily because of the easy access to relevant research materials but also because the branch librarians are highly valued.

Academic Department	Method	Frequency	Percent of Survey Respondents	Percent of the Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in Respondents' Department
African American and African Diaspora Studies	Web	4	0.8	0.4
Anthropology	Web	14	2.8	0.47
Apparel Merchandising and Interior Design	Web	1	0.2	0.25
Astronomy	Web	2	0.4	0.25
Biology	Web	20	4	0.29
Business, Kelley School of	Web	23	4.6	0.2
Central Eurasian Studies	Dept. Mtg.	14	2.8	0.93
Chemistry	Web	7	1.4	0.16
Classical Studies	Dept. Mtg.	7	1.4	0.78
Communication and Culture	Web	5	1	0.26
Comparative Literature	Web	2	0.4	0.18
Criminal Justice	Web	3	0.6	0.19
East Asian Languages and Cultures	Dept. Mtg.	12	2.4	0.75
Economics	Web	10	2	0.4
Education, School of	Web	23	4.6	0.23
English	Web	14	2.8	0.28
Folklore and Ethnomusicology	Web	3	0.6	0.17
French and Italian	Web	4	0.8	0.21
Gender Studies	Web	1	0.2	0.14
Geography	Web	5	1	0.36
Geological Sciences	Web	6	1.2	0.27
Germanic Studies	Web	4	0.8	0.4
Health Physical Education and Recreation, School of	Web	17	3.4	0.31
History	Dept. Mtg.	27	5.4	0.56
History & Philosophy of Science	Dept. Mtg.	7	1.4	0.78
Hope School of Fine Arts	Web	5	1	0.15
Informatics, School of	Dept. Mtg.	34	6.8	0.58
Journalism, School of	Web	4	0.8	0.18
Law, School of	Web	4	0.8	0.1
Library & Information Science, School of	Web	6	1.2	0.4
Linguistics	Dept. Mtg.	6	1.2	0.46
Mathematics	Web/Paper	27	5.4	0.56
Medical Sciences	Web	5	1	0.39
Music, Jacobs School of	Web	25	5	0.19
Near Eastern Languages and Cultures	Dept. Mtg.	0	0	0
Nursing, School of	Web	2	0.4	0.5
Optometry, School of	Web	6	1.2	0.3
Philosophy	Web	2	0.4	0.13
Physics	Dept. Mtg.	29	5.8	0.57
Political Science	Web	7	1.4	0.25
Psychology	Web	11	2.2	0.23
Public and Environmental Affairs, School of	Web	12	2.4	0.26
Religious Studies	Dept. Mtg.	5	1	0.29
Slavic Languages and Literatures	Web	1	0.2	0.11
Sociology	Web	12	2.4	0.36
Spanish & Portuguese	Dept. Mtg.	17	3.4	0.74
Speech and Hearing Sciences	Web	2	0.4	0.11
Telecommunications	Web	5	1	0.38
Theatre and Drama	Web	8	1.6	0.53
Other (Research Scientists, BFC members)	Web/Paper	29	5.8	NA

## Library Use

Faculty members were asked how frequently they visited the Main/Wells Library, visited a branch or campus library, used the library website, used IUCAT, and checked out books from the ALF. Responses were: 5 = Daily, 4 = Weekly, 3 = Monthly, 2 = Seldom, 1 = Never.

Faculty have enthusiastically embraced the web-based services (IUCAT and Library website) and use them very frequently. Branch library and Wells library visitation is less frequently reported than web use. And the infrequent use of the ALF compared to other library services reflects in part the growing availability of digital information and in part a differential effect across the disciplines on what has been moved to the ALF.

As expected, faculty members in the Arts and Humanities were the main users (3.60) of the Wells library while the Sciences were the smallest users (2.03). However, the branch use of libraries was highest for the Sciences (3.35) and Music (4.17) while lower for Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences (2.61), which probably reflects the departmental distribution of branch libraries. Web use was high for all groups, but highest for Arts and Humanities (4.55) and IUCAT use was highest for Arts and Humanities (4.54) as was ALF use (2.43). One clear conclusion is that overall library use (including web use) is higher for the Arts and Humanities faculty than any other group of faculty. One could speculate that this is the result of more non-print research material being accessible for the other departmental areas and the heavy reliance of the Arts and Humanities disciplines on print media.

Table 2. Library Use by Discipline

	Visit Wells Library		Visit Branch Library		Use library website		Use IUCAT		Check out from ALF	
	Count	Mean (SD)	Count	Mean (SD)	Count	Mean (SD)	Count	Mean (SD)	Count	Mean (SD)
<b>COAS: Arts &amp; Humanities</b>	148	3.60 (.74)	138	2.64 (1.06)	147	4.55 (.65)	147	4.54 (.64)	140	2.42 (.90)
<b>COAS: Social and Behavioral</b>	69	2.97 (.87)	66	2.61 (1.04)	69	4.39 (.79)	69	4.04 (.85)	62	1.82 (.69)
<b>COAS: Science</b>	89	2.03 (.87)	88	3.35 (.97)	87	4.07 (.87)	88	3.58 (.89)	84	1.92 (.72)
<b>HPER</b>	17	2.47 (.62)	16	3.25 (.68)	17	4.12 (.70)	17	3.94 (.75)	17	2.06 (.97)
<b>Education</b>	23	2.35 (.71)	21	3.14 (.96)	23	3.91 (.52)	23	3.70 (.64)	21	1.67 (.66)
<b>Business</b>	23	2.39 (1.08)	22	2.36 (.79)	23	3.65 (1.03)	23	3.26 (1.01)	20	1.55 (.51)
<b>Music</b>	24	2.29 (.86)	23	4.00 (1.31)	24	4.17 (1.24)	25	4.4 (.96)	20	1.75 (.91)
<b>SLIS, Law, Journalism</b>	14	3.57 (1.40)	14	3.57 (1.34)	13	4.31 (1.25)	13	3.85 (1.21)	13	2.15 (.80)
<b>Nursing, Optometry, MedSci</b>	12	1.67 (.78)	12	3.08 (1.08)	12	4.50 (.67)	12	3.83 (1.03)	11	1.91 (.54)
<b>SPEA</b>	12	2.58 (.52)	12	2.83 (.72)	12	4.17 (.58)	12	4.00 (.43)	11	2.00 (.89)
<b>Informatics</b>	34	2.24 (.70)	34	2.38 (1.13)	34	3.71 (1.09)	34	3.41 (1.26)	34	1.50 (.75)
<b>Other</b>	29	2.72 (.88)	29	2.72 (.92)	29	4.21 (.77)	28	3.86 (.97)	28	1.82 (.61)
<b>Total</b>	494	2.8 (1.04)	475	2.89 (1.10)	490	4.24 (.87)	491	4.01 (.95)	461	2.00 (.83)

## Importance of Library Use

Faculty members were asked how important library use is for research, teaching, graduate student work, and undergraduate work. Responses were: 4 = Essential, 3 = Important, 2 = Less Important, 1 = Unimportant.

Overall, the faculty thinks that the library and the library services are very important for teaching and research both for themselves and for their students. This seemed to be consistent across all disciplines with a small increase in importance shown by the Arts and Humanities. The uniform response here is interesting given the quite different patterns of use summarized above.

Table 3. Importance of Library Use by Discipline

	Faculty Research		Grad Research		Faculty Teaching		Grad Teaching		Undergrad	
	Count	Mean (SD)	Count	Mean (SD)	Count	Mean (SD)	Count	Mean (SD)	Count	Mean (SD)
<b>COAS: Arts &amp; Humanities</b>	148	3.86 (.47)	149	3.89 (.44)	147	3.52 (.77)	147	3.33 (.83)	144	3.40 (.73)
<b>COAS: Social and Behavioral</b>	70	3.90 (.35)	67	3.93 (.27)	69	3.52 (.74)	59	3.44 (.77)	64	3.19 (.79)
<b>COAS: Science</b>	88	3.88 (.50)	86	3.87 (.46)	85	3.16 (.81)	78	2.99 (1.00)	79	3.24 (.72)
<b>HPER</b>	17	3.82 (.39)	16	3.94 (.25)	17	3.53 (.62)	14	3.57 (.51)	16	3.38 (.72)
<b>Education</b>	23	3.70 (.56)	22	3.91 (.29)	22	3.23 (.61)	20	3.55 (.51)	17	3.06 (.75)
<b>Business</b>	23	3.30 (.82)	21	3.62 (.50)	23	2.43 (.90)	18	2.39 (.78)	18	2.72 (.90)
<b>Music</b>	24	3.75 (.44)	25	3.92 (.28)	21	3.81 (.51)	23	3.70 (.70)	24	3.63 (.50)
<b>SLIS, Law, Journalism</b>	14	3.93 (.27)	12	3.92 (.29)	14	3.50 (.65)	9	3.67 (.50)	3	3.33 (1.16)
<b>Nursing, Optometry, MedSci</b>	12	4.00 (.00)	10	4.00 (.00)	12	3.50 (.67)	9	3.00 (1.00)	9	3.11 (.93)
<b>SPEA</b>	12	3.83 (.39)	12	3.83 (.39)	12	3.50 (.67)	11	3.55 (.52)	11	3.45 (.69)
<b>Informatics</b>	32	3.34 (.94)	33	3.55 (.75)	32	2.66 (.97)	33	2.82 (1.07)	31	2.97 (.88)
<b>Other</b>	29	3.59 (.68)	26	3.69 (.55)	24	3.25 (.85)	23	3.22 (.90)	26	2.92 (1.02)
<b>Total</b>	492	3.78 (.55)	479	3.85 (.45)	478	3.33 (.83)	444	3.25 (.89)	442	3.25 (.79)

## What are the present strengths of the library and library services on the Bloomington campus?

Described by one member of the History Department as “Bloomington’s trump card,” the library system is a valued and active part of the academic life at Indiana University. Responses to the question of strengths of the library fell out into three main areas: the library collections, the library staff, and the library services.

Library collections, both digital and print, were frequently categorized as “impressive” and “excellent” by the faculty (Afro-American Studies, Anthropology), while both the “depth” and “breadth” and “richness” of the collections were lauded by several respondents in diverse subject areas. The availability of full-text electronic journals is a priority among the faculty, and the continued presence of 19<sup>th</sup> century publications on the library shelves was applauded by faculty in the English Department. Similarly, faculty members from the History Department were overwhelmingly happy with the array of online resources they can access through the library. Faculty from the Jacobs School of Music cited the “fine collection” and the “terrific” Variations project as particular strengths, while both the Sociology faculty and the East Asian department faculty targeted the media collections as warranting special mention for both quality and ease of use. While a few respondents did mention that they were not completely happy with the library’s journal collections—“not enough journals available”—other responses were very happy with the services they received through Inter-Library Loan (Biology).

Library faculty were frequently singled out either by name or by subject area, and the teaching faculty unquestionably values the “expertise of the librarians” (Fine Arts), also frequently described as “outstanding,” “excellent,” and “knowledgeable.” Likewise, the library staff, both in the Wells Library and in the branch libraries, were praised for being helpful and supportive. Both Librarians and staff were applauded for their willingness to help faculty and students, for their enthusiasm to teach classes, for their readiness to acquire new items for the library, and for their ability to facilitate easier access to library materials.

Respondents were generally pleased with library services. Many faculty members use the Inter-Library Loan department, and across departments there was consensus that if we have to go without a journal subscription the ILL services are the next best thing. Faculty members in the Philosophy, Classical Studies, and Math departments were particularly satisfied with the Request Article Delivery project. E-reserves were extremely well received by the faculty and should be expanded (History, Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Folklore).

One important thing to note about the delivery of library services that several department meeting conversations revealed is that the library is not and cannot function with a “one size fits all” mentality. The disciplines require specialized library support; what works well for one discipline may be the exact opposite of what another discipline needs or desires in a library. As one Mathematics faculty member pointed out “There is no general theory which determines how to manage libraries across fields.” Balancing the need for centralized initiatives, like the digitization project, but maintaining the independence and uniqueness that meets individual disciplinary needs in the future will be an ongoing challenge for the library and its new dean.

What is your vision of the library's role in the future in helping you with instruction and research?

The faculty's overall vision of the library in the future is more, bigger, faster, and better! A clear vision for the expansion of the digital resources and the growth of the present print collections emerged from faculty across the campus. An Anthropology faculty member explained clearly that "The library is the heart of the university in both research and teaching. We need to preserve that centrality."

Access to the collections, in print or digital media, is critical to faculty work. "The library is an absolutely indispensable part of producing good research and instructing the next generation of scientists. I would hope that it could continue at the level of excellence it has thus far shown" (Chemistry). Continuing that level of excellence, for many faculty members, means "expanding" and "growing" the print and digital collections.

Suggestions for how to improve the digital future ranged from 100% electronic journal availability (Mathematics), to improvement of the searching tools (Music). Access of information should not be restricted to texts, but multimedia resources including music, DVDs, and videos (Education, Theatre & Drama).

However, the faculty also sees the extensive collections of printed material as a great asset, and one that should not be sacrificed for digital growth. As one faculty member from Comparative Literature articulated "I know that I will continue to consult with non-digital materials in many of the libraries on campus. I will also continue to do research digitally through the library system's website. I will continue to send students to the libraries to do research for their projects, and I will continue to take students to the Lilly Library to show them medieval manuscripts."

Many faculty members echoed this comment, particularly in traditional humanities disciplines. They want access to printed material preserved and improved. One faculty member from the English department summarized this concern well: "The library is my laboratory. Just as scientists on this campus need adequate lab space and work space, and access to the raw materials that constitute their research, so I need the library to be available, open, with books accurately shelved, cared for, and with proper collection development and care taken of the valuable resources still in book form. The book is not an outmoded artifact of the past: I NEED THEM and rely upon them, at the same time that I use electronic delivery systems, too. But those of us who research historically distant periods, need access to the archives of the books themselves--the former editions, etc. are all valuable to us. I would hope the library would continue to value its historic collections even as it develops ever more agile electronic resources."

While the dominant responses to this question addressed digitization and the print collections, there were other recommendations for more "student orientation classes" on the "appropriate use of electronic sources" (Nursing) and continued outreach of the librarians to academic courses (Business). Other improved library services suggested include a citation notification service when new materials become available (Music, Economics) or integration of library resources with Oncourse (Informatics, History, Business).

## How will the increasing shift from primarily print to digital collections in the IU Libraries affect your research and teaching?

The responses to this question varied, not surprisingly, by discipline in rather predictable ways. Faculty from traditional humanities and arts disciplines were concerned that shifting too heavily toward digital collections would hurt some of their research. They were worried that access would be limited to print materials. There were other faculty members that felt that there would not be much change, since they were already using digital collections and had found ways to use the new resources. Still others looked forward to the increased access that digital collections might make possible. All seemed to recognize that this will be the future movement of the library, but there are concerns on several fronts.

Faculty from across the campus raised concerns about the quality of life and instruction in relation to the digitization efforts. “I depend primarily on printed materials but various websites and other internet access make my research much easier at least at the entrance point of each topic. I am concerned about the students dependence on digitalized information. It is hard to get them to go to the library and open real books” (Comparative Literature). Another faculty member from the English department noted, “...I worry that we are fostering students' view that the only materials that are worthy of their attention are already on line.” And, an Anthropology faculty member believes “Digital collections breed lazy research habits. It is becoming increasing difficult to shape students' critical skills and their sense of what constitutes a good source or a complete search.”

For faculty research, the increased digital collections make research more “efficient”, “beneficial” or “more accessible” to certain collections (Communication and Culture, Astronomy). Most faculty members highlighted benefits in research of increased digital collections. However, some particular areas are concerning. A faculty member from Central Eurasian Studies commented that “Digital collections [are] good for teaching, journals, ALF. Bad for use of rare, printed texts, which are crucial to my research.”

One Chemistry professor added, “Digital collections are great as long as there is access to articles you need. Unfortunately, there are several journals that do not have access to older articles online. For those articles it is necessary to have print versions. Digital journal articles are great, and I think they are much easier to use than print. On the other hand, the digital books that I have used in the IU library are quite awkward to use and leave a lot to be desired. I think the current user interface is very awkward and not very helpful. Looking up information or searching using the current digital book interface (or at least the one I have used) is a chore and some things are really not possible to do using that interface. Switching to a total digital book collection would be quite detrimental to my research and teaching unless the interfaces were greatly improved.”

Faculty members at almost every departmental meeting we attended commented on the importance of maintaining the historical print collection and a large collection on hand in the library for browsing. Perhaps surprisingly, the value of browsing for research was universal—it was not just the humanities faculty craving for books on the shelves. Faculty in Mathematics and Education commented on the importance of having historical textbooks on hand for browsing. And across the campus there was uniform agreement that the browsing capability of materials is critical for good research.

How will the continual movement of serials and monographs to the ALF affect your research or teaching?

Movement of materials to the Auxiliary Library Facility has been met with mixed reactions from the faculty in Bloomington. While many faculty members barely know of the existence of the ALF and had no comments or concerns about it, others had either a generally positive or intensely negative view.

Faculty members who have found solace with the existence of the ALF have been pleased with the service and timeliness of retrieving items from the facility. “While I miss having older journals immediately available on the shelves, I find that the system for retrieving material from ALF works surprisingly well” (Anthropology). A French and Italian faculty member agreed and added, “The movement of serials and monographs to the ALF seems like a very good idea. It is easy to get materials quickly (especially if one plans a bit ahead). I would think that these materials will be preserved for a much longer time in the ALF than in the main library, where the collections are in danger, unless the campus decides to devote some resources to shoring up the building.”

One faculty member from English offered a different perspective: “I think the issue for me is less about pragmatics (I understand that it is easy to retrieve materials from off site) than it is about the implications of this move; what does it say that monographs have such a clear expiration date? And what kind of history of criticism can we teach (and ask our students to bear in mind) when that history is continually effaced? I have started thinking about discipline-specific reading rooms and what they might offer to students (a utopian vision, I know).”

The most common comment was about the lack of browsing ability of ALF materials (History, Informatics, History and Philosophy of Science, Linguistics, SPEA, Physics, Theatre and Drama). To most faculty members the ALF means a loss of access to materials. “It will somewhat increase the difficulty of rapid access to material. It will require more advanced planning since immediate access will not be feasible. This is an inconvenience unless the printed series and monographs, especially historical/older issues become available digitally” (Anthropology).

Faculty members from language departments present particular concerns about the movement of materials to the ALF. This comment from an East Asian Languages professor summarizes these concerns: “ALF shift is extremely negative for what I do - searching for teaching materials with non-English texts would be much more manageable if I could browse physically through the shelves. Also, in terms of research for inter-regional/ multidisciplinary projects, not being able to browse is negative (just because books are old or not taken out usually doesn’t mean collections should be in ALF).”

There were a number of suggestions at the department meetings for making the transition to the ALF less painful. First, faculty across the campus would like to be consulted before materials are moved (because it is apparently impossible to bring them back once they are gone!). The movement of materials to ALF is illustrative of decisions made by the library administration without prior faculty consultation. There needs to be a stronger commitment to collaborative decision-making in the library’s administration. Secondly, the criteria used for deciding what to move must take into account disciplinary differences and how journals, serials, monographs, books, and other media are used differently in different fields. What one field might consider a journal another department considers reference material. Finally, a suggestion to develop an innovative virtual browser (with images of adjacent texts, with “click” views of tables of contents, etc.) for the entire IU collection (including ALF holdings) would benefit faculty and students.

Are there improvements that you would suggest for communication between the library, the departments, and faculty?

This was the first question that asked about aspects of the faculty-library interface that could be improved. A majority of the responses indicated satisfaction with the present system or indicated no suggestions for improvements. The suggestions received can be broadly categorized into three categories: face-to-face librarian-faculty interaction, web/online interfaces, and interactions with the Library Administration.

Many faculty members across disciplines reported being “well served” and having “good” and “excellent” interactions with librarians. Many librarians were mentioned by name. “The HPER library is blessed with the best staff over the years” (HPER). “The Swain Hall librarians are terrific” (Mathematics). “As far as the music library is concerned we have excellent communication between the librarians and the faculty” (Music). “It is important to maintain the distributed special libraries near the departments they serve, staffed with a librarian who is knowledgeable about the discipline” (Astronomy). Despite this generally high level of satisfaction with the subject librarians, faculty members would also like to be more involved with hiring subject librarians and the decision-making structure of the library administration.

Some general suggestions for improving communication from Afro-American Studies and Folklore and Ethnomusicology faculty members included involving faculty more in acquisitions and new materials. “We could use periodic e-mails letting us know of the new acquisitions in our areas” (Central Eurasian Studies). Faculty members from Education, Informatics, and Business faculty sometimes agree that notices when new journals, relevant periodicals, and datasets come out would be beneficial.

A Chemistry professor suggested that a critical part of library instruction in the future will be to teach people to search in the most efficient manner. Education faculty also mentioned that librarians could offer new short courses and workshops. Faculty in Informatics would like “to see research librarians reach out to faculty rather than the traditional view. I’d like to see new collaborations that can lead to funding opportunities.” SPEA faculty would like to see librarians visit departments and faculty from SLIS would like to have the librarians participate in the brown bag series in that school. These suggestions seem promising for improving communication at the faculty-librarian level.

Several criticisms about the main library webpage and IUCAT suggest that these media are “horrible”, “non-intuitive”, “awkward”, “not easy to use with multiple search criteria”, “clunky” and “slow loading” (Anthropology, Classical Studies, Education, Business, Physics). Improving the availability of videos and DVDs through online requests and campus delivery was also recommended (Anthropology and Communication and Culture). Lastly, the recommendation from one Telecommunications professor was mentioned by several faculty members: “It will be good when all librarians have things like instant messaging. Some of the reference librarians have gone that direction and it’s been really useful to me and to my students.”

Finally, as previously stated, many faculty members believe that a stronger model of consultation with faculty researchers prior to administrative decision making will ease transitions and new initiatives from being met with dissatisfaction by the faculty. The library administration should utilize the BFC Library Committee and subject librarians should utilize their department faculty members as sounding boards for policy changes or changes in service prior to implementation.

Are there changes in the physical structure and layout of the library (Main/Wells Library and Campus Libraries) that you would welcome for the future?

Responses to this question varied depending on the users' primary library but most suggestions were made about the Wells Library. Some comments surrounded accessibility issues like, "Add more parking! Metered and reserved both. The library feels very inaccessible at peak park times" (Spanish & Portuguese). "It would be SO NICE if there were SOMEPLACE I could return my books by car!!! I wish there were one library on campus that had a drive-up window (even a drive-by box on campus would be OK). I have tons of books that I renew continually because returning them requires carrying such a lot of weight so far across the parking lot and up the stairs to the main library. I don't really trust the "return" box in the basement of Ballantine: one of my colleagues had books he was returning stolen from it" (Sociology). A unique suggestion from the School of Business was to create "an archway for crossing 10<sup>th</sup> St. to the Wells Library." "Handicap access should be improved. When I hurt my left knee and could not climb stairs easily, I realized the shortcomings that face handicapped persons." (Afro-American Studies). And, a History faculty member reported that the "Biomedical library is very difficult to access (for someone with a hip problem)."

Many other comments focused on the physical space and condition of the Wells Library. Lighting in the stacks was one area singled out across disciplines that could be improved (Music, Spanish & Portuguese, Sociology, History and Philosophy of Science, SPEA, Central Eurasian Studies, Classical Studies, East Asian Languages). Several faculty members commented on the new lobby area and information commons, mostly with positive thoughts. While a Business School faculty member commented that, "The new coffee shop in the lobby has improved the environment immeasurably," a Spanish & Portuguese faculty member would like to see, "Less café and more books."

Other responses to this question clearly indicated that the faculty would like to see the physical environment of the library reflect the academic natuponses to this question d" Tw ment inhistess is qumostlaculo5(m