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Executive Summary

During 1993/94 the University Libraries began formal needs assessment. The objective of the program was to collect data that reflect the information needs of UTK students, faculty, and staff. Particular emphasis was placed on needs for the next three to five years.

The program was implemented by a Needs Assessment Coordinating Group, a Needs Assessment Consultant, a graduate research assistant, student assistant support, and contributions from many library staff. The Consultant worked with the Coordinating Group to develop a methodology, conduct an environmental scan, hold several focus groups, and supervise a comprehensive library survey. Data from the survey have been analyzed for awareness/use of services, importance/satisfaction rates among users, barriers to library use, and interest in new services.

Data analysis permits particular attention to the relationship between awareness and use. Highlights of the results include:

- High awareness of most collections and services
- High interest in electronic services such as database searching, CD-ROM access, downloading from electronic files and expressed need for assistance
- Lower use of library instruction services
- Lower awareness, but expressed need for 1) ability to check out bound periodicals; 2) information about latest periodical issues received; 3) telephone reference service for graduate students; 4) library guides for undergraduates; and 5) help with the Internet for graduate students

Importance and satisfaction were also explored by the survey. Overall satisfaction with the quality of library services is high. Data shows that graduate students, however, are more critical than faculty or undergraduates of many services. Among the services that could be improved are:

- Ease of use of documents/microforms
- Interlibrary loan turnaround time
- Access to external databases
- In-library access to and ease of use of OLIS
- Turnaround time for materials ordered for the collection
- Availability and convenience of ordering new journals

A brief barriers section of the survey revealed:

- Graduate students and faculty most frequently encounter barriers to service in Hodges library
- Most undergraduates report that they have never experienced difficulty in using Hodges or its services
- The results provide quantitative support for the anecdotal evidence that physical layout of the stacks is confusing.

When asked about a potential thirty-seven new services, users responded that their greatest interest lies in services related to electronic files. Top priority is for remote access to bibliographic databases, followed by the addition of more databases. Ability to download from electronic files and access to non-bibliographic electronic materials are also important. Self-searching of online databases is considered highly important, especially by graduate students. Users are very interested in obtaining full text of journal articles without coming to the library, but they do not want to pay for...
such services. Users would like expansion and simplification of OLIS; they want more databases available through OLIS, better help screens, and the ability to use journal tables of contents via OLIS. Ability to use electronic forms to place requests for interlibrary services, acquisitions, reserve lists, and reference assistance received high marks.

Files that include background materials, a report of focus group discussions, all versions of the survey instrument, all tables produced to date, and a copy of this report are located in the University Libraries Dean's Office.
Introduction

Implicit in the University Libraries mission and goals is the assumption that faculty, staff, and students have a variety of needs that are met by the Libraries. Needs assessment provides librarians with information about user awareness and satisfaction with existing services, as well as interest in new services. An ongoing, systematic program of needs assessment helps librarians determine priorities among limited resources for library programs of the future. At a time when library budgets have reduced purchasing power, a detailed examination of the entire range of collections and services with respect to client needs is critical for informed decision-making about the most effective ways to meet those needs.

The major objective of the FY 1993/94 needs assessment program was to collect data that reflect the information needs of UTK students, faculty and staff, with particular emphasis on the next three to five years. The program focused on value-related issues, and the nature of the institutional culture with regard to libraries and information systems. Libraries' users as well as non-users were considered in the assessment of Libraries' collections and services. Among the questions to be answered were: 1) what services are most valued by the user and why, and 2) what criteria should be used by the Libraries to determine the value of a service.

Methodologies included examination of library statistics, as well as surveys of the user/non-user population. The framework developed in the first years of the program was structured to provide valid and reliable data, a priority ranking of needs, and mechanics for assessment of client needs on a periodic basis. Data gathered will be used for planning and funding future UTK Libraries services.

Multi-year planning precipitated the Libraries Needs Assessment Program. During academic year 1991/92 a Research Seminar Series co-sponsored by the University Libraries and the Graduate School of Library and Information Science (which became the School of Information Sciences in 1994) featured monthly programs on needs assessment elements, including planning steps, a literature review of current assessment techniques, discussion of research trends in the disciplines, needs assessment leadership issues, determination of a target audience, methodologies, the role of library statistics, and development of an exit poll. In September 1992 the Libraries advertised for a Needs Assessment Coordinator to work with library staff to structure and implement a Needs Assessment Program. In March 1993 the University Libraries retained Donald W. King as Needs Assessment Consultant and formed a Needs Assessment Coordinating Group to work with Mr. King to structure and implement a formal Needs Assessment program for the Libraries. Also, a GSLIS student research assistant, Heather Walton, was hired for 20 hours per week.

Program Methods

Mr. King met with the Needs Assessment Coordinating Group on a weekly basis over several months to discuss the UTK user environment and to determine the scope of the project. A series of focus group interviews beginning in Spring Term 1993 helped the team determine particular areas of emphasis for assessment. A total of nine focus groups included the following user and staff categories: students (1 group undergraduates, 2 groups graduates), teaching faculty (3 groups), administrators (1 group), research faculty and post-doctorates (1 group), and UTK library faculty (1 group). A focus group with non-UTK affiliated users was attempted, but not held after more than twenty calls failed to interest sufficient participants. The focus group interviews achieved their goal. The issues raised by the participants were summarized in a report and incorporated into the next phase of the project, preparation of a survey.

As the study progressed it became apparent that data collection could be used as a benchmark for continued monitoring of information needs and requirements. Therefore, survey data collection needed to be comprehensive in service coverage. To accommodate the extensive amount of data required and minimize the burden on survey respondents, a total of seventeen separate and customized questionnaires were designed for groups of library users. Five questionnaires were designed for faculty (and researchers), administrators, and other UTK-affiliated professionals. Three of these covered a portion of all the services provided by the Libraries. One dealt with barriers to library use, and the usefulness and value of services. The fifth was designed to provide a broader perspective on information use (found in documents) and the role of the UTK Libraries in providing this information. Common to all five versions...
were questions on the extent of use of libraries, use of the library via the campus network, and demographic information.

Three questionnaires were designed for undergraduate and graduate students. All of the library services were spread across the three instruments, taking into account that some services apply only to undergraduates or to graduates. Overall use, demographics and information about information resources, and user information instruction were found in all the versions. Separate and distinct questionnaires were prepared for non-UTK affiliated users and for each of the five branch libraries.

Data was collected through questionnaires that consisted of eight distinct parts as follows:

One part obtains data on the number of visits and additional uses (made by telephone, online catalog, etc) in the last month. This data is obtained for the UTK Libraries and other libraries (such as the public library, UT Hospital library, etc.). Also, data is obtained for the distance (in minutes) to libraries that are used. This part is found in all questionnaires.

The second part addresses specific library services and attributes of the services. Information includes whether or not the service has ever been used, and if so, the number of uses in the last month. Awareness is also established for each service. Ratings of importance and satisfaction with services and specific attributes are determined. This part is found in all student, non-UTK affiliated user, three of the faculty, and the branch library questionnaires.

A third part deals with barriers to using the library and its services. This part is found on all student and one faculty questionnaire.

Another part is addressed to outcomes and value of the library: time spent at the library using library services, purposes and consequences of use, cost to use sources alternative to the library, and degree to which objective of use was achieved. This information is found in one faculty questionnaire.

An open-ended comments part (concerning specific services, facilities and staff) is given on all of the student, non-UTK affiliated, and four faculty questionnaires.

A part is addressed to suggested library services. For a list of potential services, respondents are asked to indicate whether or not they favor the service, indicate the likely extent of use of the service, and rate importance of the service to them. This part is found in all student and three of the faculty questionnaires.

All faculty questionnaires provide data on amount of reading, number of personal subscriptions, extent of writing, use of electronic mail and telecommunications, indicators of achievement, and other demographics. Student questionnaires also obtain information and effects of library and information instruction.

One faculty questionnaire deals with reading, user information-seeking behavior patterns, and consequences of reading (for documents obtained through the library and elsewhere). Aspects of electronic publications are also addressed.

Branch librarians met with Mr. King and Ms. Walton to design versions of the questionnaire that were relevant to the services offered in their libraries. Thus, unique instruments were developed for the Agriculture-Veterinary Medicine (Ag-Vet), the Map Library, Music, Special Collections, and University Archives libraries. These parts provided extensive information and data concerning the UTK Libraries' usage, outcomes, impact, and cost-benefits.

Sampling was achieved in two ways. Faculty, administrators, and other professional staff were randomly sampled and
sent one of five questionnaires.

Figure 1, Core Faculty, Administration, Other Sample Size, shows the total number in each of these groups, the number of each version of the questionnaire returned, and the total sample size. The second way that sampling was done occurred in Hodges and the branch libraries. In Hodges Library students and non-UTK affiliated users were sampled over a one-week period in early November 1993. A sample of students and non-UTK affiliated users were handed a questionnaire as they entered Hodges Library. Individuals were asked to complete the questionnaire while in the library (or if not possible, at a later time). The sample was stratified by time period according to previous gate counts. A very brief questionnaire mailed to students about frequency of visits provided data for weighting in-library survey responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>1 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Graduate Students | 1 110 |
|                  | 2 112 |
|                  | 3 121 |
| Total            | 343   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-UTK Affiliated Users</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2, Undergraduate, Graduate Student, Non-UTK Questionnaires Returned, shows the total number of questionnaires that were completed and returned by these groups.

In the branches, users were sampled at pre-determined times in Spring or Summer of 1994, and surveys were distributed according to methodologies recommended as most appropriate by the branch librarians. In the Ag-Vet Library questionnaires were handed out to library users during April and September, 1994. Surveys were handed to every fourth user, regardless of affiliation. CIC staff distributed questionnaires from April 11-29, 1994 to all walk-in users who were staff, faculty, researchers, or students. Staff also sent survey forms to regular users who may not have come to the library during the week. For the Music Library fifty-one surveys were mailed to music graduate students in early April 1994. An additional 107 surveys were mailed to music faculty, other UTK faculty identified by staff as regular branch users, and alumni teaching in area colleges. Two regular community users were also included in this number. Students using the branch between April 4 and 15 were asked to complete the survey. Repeat users were not solicited once they had received the survey. Special Collections handed questionnaires to everyone who used the library between April 11 and 15, 1994. University Archives mailed questionnaires to regular users of the branch, and to
individuals who had done enough research in the archives to have filled out a user registration form. The staff used names from the previous three months and made no distinction between UTK and other users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires Completed and Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag/Vet.Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CiC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3, Branch Library Survey Responses

Data were entered into a QuattroPro spreadsheet for the purpose of making relational estimates of totals, means, proportions, etc. All data were weighted to population totals in order to provide unbiased estimates. For example, students were grouped into five strata categorized by extent of use. Estimates of total population in these five strata were made from a mailed survey of students. Since frequent users have a higher probability of entering into the in-library sample, all sample responses were grouped and weighted by the estimates of population totals. In some instances weighting was done by gate counts. Tables were produced that incorporated data about the extent of awareness and use of services, importance of the service to users and their satisfaction with it, barriers to library service, and user interest in several potential services.
Summary of Findings

Of the 1,349 core faculty who received questionnaires, 451 returned survey instruments. Although 33 administrators and 223 other individuals returned surveys, there were often few responses from this group to specific survey questions. Some questions depend on library or service use, and when use is low there are few responses. Thus, in the discussion of the results, most references are to faculty response, rather than totals from administrators and other, unless specifically noted. Faculty respondents subscribe to an average of 3.8 journals, and read nearly 15 scholarly articles in the month preceding the survey; they also reported reading an average of 3.3 electronic documents during that period. In the past year the respondents published an average of 2.2 scholarly or professional journal articles. A total of 92.7% of the respondents have access to a terminal or microcomputer, and 83.9% have some type of network access. Location of the workstation is in the office for 74%, and 38% have a workstation at home. A sizeable majority access their computer accounts more than once a day, and use electronic mail more than once daily. Average time in a typical week spent using the network for purposes other than e-mail is 63 minutes.

Demographic data gathered from the branch libraries showed wide differences among categories of users, with teachers the primary users of the CIC, and researchers or undergraduates the main clientele of Special Collections. Of the Music Library clientele, 40% of the respondents were undergraduates and 25% teachers or staff. A majority of University Archives users were teachers, staff or researchers, and 10% were undergraduate students.

A total of 344 graduate students and 276 undergraduate students completed questionnaires in the Hodges Library. Most of the respondents are full-time students (graduate, 78.3%; undergraduate, 93%). Among the graduate students 66.7% are working on the Master's degree, while 33.3% are pursuing the doctorate. Over half of the graduate students (58.2%) have access to a microcomputer capable of computing with the campus network, while only 38.5% of the undergraduates report having this capability. The survey inquired about students' grade point averages, which undergraduates reported being at least 3.00, and graduates estimated as high as 3.83. In both categories 25% of the respondents have received recognition for scholarly accomplishment at UTK. Answers to a series of questions about library instruction revealed that fewer than 20% received various types of instruction offered by librarians. Exceptions are the audiotape tour of Hodges which has been taken by 39.7% of the undergraduates and instruction in courses over 500, which has been received by 61.8% of the graduate students. Regarding preparation to use the library prior to coming to UTK, 23.7% of graduate students answered that they were well or extremely well-prepared, and 37.6% of undergraduate students gave the same response. Students were also asked how well-prepared they currently feel, with 71.5% of graduate students and 75.9% of undergraduates reporting that they are well or extremely well-prepared to use the library.

The survey generated data that could be reported in, literally, hundreds of tables. The Needs Assessment Coordinating Group decided to focus on four particular areas, and has provided in the University Libraries Dean's Office copies of tables generated in the four areas, copies of the survey instrument, and a list of comments received on all questionnaires. The comments were used as confirmation of the data, and as signals for giving special attention to data covering the topic of the comment. Findings summarized in this section include Awareness/Use, Importance/Satisfaction, Barriers to Library Use, and New Services. Tables are grouped according to related library functions.

Selected tables are included in this report to illustrate or emphasize summary findings. Familiarity with the construction of the survey will be helpful for interpreting the tables. Figure 4.1, User Awareness and Satisfaction Survey Format, is a sample page from a questionnaire received by a graduate student. This format accounted for the majority of questions posed to participants.
Table 4.2

Reference: AWARENESS AND USE OF ABILITY TO DOWNLOAD FROM CD-ROMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Non-UTK</th>
<th>Grad. Students</th>
<th>Undergr. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>5,606</td>
<td>15,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (n1)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Aware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have need (%)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need (%)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aware</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never used (%)</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used (%)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (n1)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total uses</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>4,039</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per libr. user</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per serv. user</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2, Reference: Awareness and Use of Downloading from CD-ROMs, is a sample table that reports responses from five user categories, beginning with the total population surveyed, followed by the total sample. The table is divided into category by respondent group (i.e., faculty, administrators, etc.). If only certain categories of respondents were asked a given question, data is provided for only those respondents. The number shown on the Population line refers to the total universe, that is, the total number of individuals represented by the sample. Thus, 1,349 Core Faculty were considered the total universe. The "Sample (n)" refers to the number of people (82) who actually answered the question. Percentages of respondents who marked "not aware" or "aware" of the service are shown, according to whether they have a need for the service, and whether or not they have used it. These percentages should total 100%. Figure 4.2 shows that 17.3% of graduate students marked "not aware," but "have need for" ability to download from CD-ROMs. The Use category refers to the number of respondents to the "Approximate number of uses in last month" category on the survey form, and the total uses they indicated. Averages are then shown for a projected number of uses for all faculty who use the library, for faculty who have used the service, and for all faculty.
Figure 4.3, Reference: Importance and Satisfaction with Ability to Download From CD-ROMs, is the second type of table produced from the Figure 4.1 survey form. After the population and sample sizes, the percentage of respondents is shown according to the marks they gave for importance, ranging from very little to very important. An average important figure concludes that section. Satisfaction ratings are shown in the same manner, with the percentages of those marking the categories ranging from very dissatisfied to very satisfied, concluded by an average satisfaction number. Any difference greater than .50 between the importance and satisfaction ratings should be considered significant.

### Awareness/Use and Importance/Satisfaction

The major part of the survey addressed the extent to which users were aware of the services provided by the Libraries, whether users had a need for given services, and whether the services were used. Those who had used the services were asked to estimate the approximate number of uses in the last month. Further, those who had used a service were asked to give importance and satisfaction ratings that ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Results are discussed by library function. Tables with an asterisk (*) are included in Appendix B, Selected Tables.

#### Table 13.12

**Reference: Importance and Satisfaction with Ability to Download From CD-ROMs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Non-UTK</th>
<th>Grad. Students</th>
<th>Undergr. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>5,606</td>
<td>15,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample (n1)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Importance Ratings (proportions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Non-UTK</th>
<th>Grad. Students</th>
<th>Undergr. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Little 1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important 5</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample (n1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Non-UTK</th>
<th>Grad. Students</th>
<th>Undergr. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Satisfaction Ratings (proportions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Non-UTK</th>
<th>Grad. Students</th>
<th>Undergr. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissat. 1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satis. 5</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collections

There is high awareness and use of the general book, journal, reference, and reserve collections. For the specialized collections more distinction can be seen between awareness, which is typically rather high, and use, which may be somewhat lower. For example, while over 70% of the various categories of respondents are aware of the government documents collection, (Table 14.1) only 15.7% of undergraduates, 35.9% of graduates, and 51.2% of faculty have used these materials. The government documents collection has recently become more accessible through the addition of CD-ROM files and loading of bibliographic information into OLIS; a followup study might reveal a substantial increase in use. Users are very aware of the audiovisual collection, (Table 9.7) and use rates range from 63.7% among undergraduates to 52.9% for graduates and 64.5% for faculty.

Importance of the book and periodical collections is high, although less high for special interest areas of Reference, Reserve, Government Documents, and AV. However, the latter tend to have higher satisfaction rates. Graduate students generally are less-satisfied with the collections than the other groups. Undergraduates have the highest satisfaction rate with books, as opposed to other material types. Because the number of administrators who responded was usually 5 or fewer, it was difficult to draw conclusions about the category. Overall ratings for the collection are well within an acceptable range.

Circulation

There is high awareness and use of the term renewal policy by faculty. There is also high awareness among both student categories regarding their ability to place holds and recalls by telephone, but only about 20% have used this service. Regarding the ability to check out bound periodicals, there is relatively high awareness; faculty use the service most often (74%), and graduate students report moderate use (51.8%). Undergraduates are aware of the service, but fewer than 20% use it. A relatively high percentage (18.5%) of graduate students say that they have a need for the service, but are not aware that it exists. (Table 18.3) There is high awareness and use of Reserve. Surprisingly high numbers of faculty (12.3%), graduate students (20.5%), and undergraduates (15.1%) marked that they are not aware of information about latest periodical issues received, but have need for it. (Table 5.1) This illustrates the need for continued online availability of current information and ongoing publicity about its availability.

Respondents express high importance and high satisfaction with Circulation Services. Undergraduates give a slightly lower rating to service attitude (3.82 in Table 4.11) than graduate students (4.00). The borrowing period is satisfactory to all groups, as is the renewal policy. Undergraduate satisfaction with ability to place holds and recalls by telephone is considerably lower than ratings of the other groups, and should be examined. (Table 4.6) There is lower satisfaction with hours of service, yet the "very dissatisfied" responses are minimal, and all categories are average or above. Graduate students are the least satisfied with circulation hours.

High importance is accorded to Reserve services. While the satisfaction with hours (Table 7.9) is lower than for other aspects of the service, it is not a problem. The student satisfaction ratings with staff service attitudes is slightly lower (Table 7.8), and coupled with the written comments, this is an area for attention. Among graduate students and undergraduates, there is considerable dissatisfaction with the loan period. Current Periodicals is another high importance area, and receives positive satisfaction ratings overall. Dissatisfaction with the hours is the greatest complaint, with 25% of graduate students marking the "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" categories. (Table 5.6)

Reference

Users tend to be aware of Reference materials and use them frequently. Graduate students are unaware, but have need for telephone reference service. (Table 13.5) There is high awareness and use of staff, and high awareness and frequent searching of CD-ROM indexes. With respect to downloading, (Table 13.11) 17.3% of graduate students have a need, but are not aware of the process. Data in the tables confirms the written comments that more help is needed with access to CD-ROM files. In *Table 13.14 the fact that a large percentage of users have never asked staff for help is of concern. Database search services responses show that graduate students have considerable need, but many are unaware of the service. Regarding staff assistance with database searching, however, 86.7% of the respondents are
aware of the service, and 25.1% have used it. There were few respondents to the question about database search services for a fee, but those who answered are satisfied.

Regarding the Internet, many people are aware, but have not used the network. Graduate student awareness of staff assistance (Table 13.22) indicates that 22% have a need for help with the Internet, but are not aware that it is available. The faculty are less satisfied with Internet searching than are graduate students, but all user groups are quite pleased with Reference staff assistance in using the Internet.

The printed Serials Holdings List remains a popular access tool, with respondents reporting high awareness and use. (Table 3.2) The SHL receives very high importance ratings, and users are generally satisfied with it. Librarians have recognized the importance of serials holdings information for users, and have since incorporated holdings statements in the online catalog.

Since the survey was taken in Fall 1993, the microform periodicals have been relocated, so the Current Periodicals staff should also give particular attention to the results relating to microforms reported in the Government Documents/Microforms section. Users are generally less aware of documents and report low to moderate use, as compared with other library services. Over 80% of the respondents are aware of the physical access to microforms. On the documents/microforms section for importance and satisfaction, there were considerably fewer respondents. Importance ratings are generally above 4.0. Student satisfaction with ease of use is low, with nearly 50% of graduate students dissatisfied (*Table 14.5). This may reflect their desire for independent access without library intervention. Of the 11 undergraduates who responded, 53% have considerable difficulty with the documents CD-ROMs. Staff get high marks for service. Hours of service are not a problem. There is relatively high satisfaction with microforms, (Table 14.9) although graduate student satisfaction is evenly divided among the five ranking categories ranging from very dissatisfied to very satisfied.

There is high importance and high satisfaction with Reference services. Satisfaction with reference staff assistance is even slightly higher than satisfaction with the reference collection. Satisfaction ratings for CD-ROM are slightly lower than other rates, although users highly rate the assistance with CD-ROMs.

**Interlibrary Services**

Interlibrary Services (ILS) is a high awareness/high use service for faculty. Among undergraduates 17% report having a need but being unaware of the service. 51.3% of graduate students are aware of ILS, but have never used the service. Faculty and graduate student users rate ILS as having high importance. Staff receive high marks for their knowledge, efficiency, and service attitude. Among graduate students 29% are dissatisfied with the turnaround time (*Table 11.4) and nearly equally not satisfied with the hours of service. 58% of graduate student ILS users are satisfied with the ability of ILS to fill requests.

**OLIS**

There is high awareness and use of OLIS. From home or office there is high use among faculty, but lower use and need for undergraduate students (Table 12.3) Regarding the use of OLIS to access external databases, 20% of graduate students expressed a need, but are unaware of the service. There is general satisfaction with OLIS. Undergraduates are very satisfied with in-library access to OLIS, but graduate students are less enthusiastic. (*Table 12.2) Areas receiving lower marks are currency (among faculty), access to external databases (graduate students), and ease of use (faculty and graduates).

**Collection Development**

There is high awareness and moderate use of the ability and convenience of ordering new books. A small percentage (18.8%) of the faculty have ordered audiovisual materials, although 90% are aware of the possibility. Among graduate students 36.9% are not aware of the availability of the materials ordering suggestion box at the Hodges Circulation desk, but they have a need for one. (Table 8.7) Likewise, 25.3% of faculty were not aware of the box, but have a need.
Overall use of the suggestion box is low. Regarding the availability of a librarians who select materials for departments, most faculty are aware, but the user category, other, recorded 28% who have a need, but are not aware of the process. One third of the six administrators responding to this question reported that they have a need to know the colleague who orders materials for their department, but are unaware of the liaison person. Collection Development and Acquisitions staff receive high marks for availability, although under a third of the respondents make use of their services. Overall, the user category, other, appears to be underserved by the collection development process.

There is a pronounced gap between importance and satisfaction on the convenience and ability to order new books, although there is overall satisfaction with the service. There is considerable dissatisfaction, however, with the availability and convenience of ordering new journals. Only two faculty responded to the use of the suggestion box. Given the high satisfaction with the selectors, they probably prefer the more personal means of submitting order requests. There is dissatisfaction with the turnaround time for an order to arrive, and this area should be explored further. Respondents are very satisfied with the service of Collection Development and Acquisitions staff, and in the acquisitions area, satisfaction with staff is rated even higher than importance.

**Library and Information Instruction**

Regarding use of the library tape tour, over 15% of faculty and other indicate that they have a need, but are not aware that a tour is available. Most users are aware of the availability of classroom instruction, although only 33% have taken advantage of it. Although only 55% of undergraduates are aware of English 102 instruction and only 28.3% say they have used it, 13.4% say they have a need but are not aware of the service. (Table 15.8) This finding bears further study, since English 102 is a required course for all majors. Despite overall high awareness and 46.3% graduate student use of library instruction in courses other than English 102, those graduate students who are not aware of the service do not indicate a need for library instruction. (Table 15.13) Most students are not aware of the undergraduate course on information skills offered by SIS.

Importance and satisfaction ratings for the tape tour are high among the few responses to the question. Faculty note high importance to classroom instruction by a librarian; satisfaction is slightly lower, but still relatively high. Information covered in the courses is considered very important, with satisfaction high, but slightly lower. (Table 15.5) Quality of instruction by a librarian is rated highly, with satisfaction higher than importance. Usefulness of the information presented in library instruction sessions is extremely important, with satisfaction slightly lower. (Table 15.7)

Graduate students rated quality and usefulness of instruction much lower in both importance and satisfaction than undergraduates. Since graduate students rated non-English 102 instruction very high, perhaps graduate students see library instruction as more relevant and necessary at the graduate rather than undergraduate level. All instruction services are viewed as extremely important, and the reality of the experience is slightly less than the importance. The data suggest that presentations could be improved through increased relevancy of the instruction to the course content.

**Audiovisual Services**

There is high awareness about the availability of group viewing rooms, and nearly 40% of the faculty have made use of them. Faculty are highly aware of the option to borrow videotapes for classroom use, although only 20% have done so. Only fourteen faculty responded to the importance/satisfaction tables for Audiovisual (AV) services. Faculty (64%) generally ranked as very important all aspects of audiovisual services, including convenience, borrowing, equipment quality, staff knowledge and service, and hours. Only the ability to arrange group viewing rooms ranked less (52% very important). Faculty satisfaction was almost equally high with 57%-70% ranking all questions as 4 or 5 on the scale, although 29% (4 of 14) ranked satisfaction as only 2. Graduate students, while giving high rankings to importance (60%-70% as highest importance) consistently gave lower ranking on satisfaction, particularly for hours of service and quality of equipment. (Table 10.6) Undergraduate rankings were somewhat higher than those of graduate students, especially for convenience, hours, and service attitudes. Levels of satisfaction were also higher, even for hours of service. Overall this section showed consistency with results for other services, and the average importance ranges from 3.96 to 4.85. Average satisfaction is lower, ranging from 3.60 to 4.39. However, the number of faculty
respondents is too low to draw meaningful conclusions. A future AV user survey might pinpoint where improvements are needed. If graduate student dissatisfaction with hours is discounted, there is little in this area that warrants special attention.

**Library Express**

Over 70% of faculty and graduate students are aware of Library Express, although 10.3% of the faculty have a need but are not aware. Regarding pick up of materials, 17.6% of faculty have a need but are not aware. (Table 6.4) Only seven or fewer faculty responded to the importance/satisfaction section, but those who did are positive. Many written comments were glowing reports about the service. Highest satisfaction marks go to the service attitude of the staff, and highest importance is for knowledge and efficiency of staff. The $2 per citation charge received a 2.33 for importance, but a 3.80 for satisfaction, indicating a willingness to pay for the service. (Table 6.6)

**Duplication Services**

Overall importance of Duplication is rated very high, as is reliability of photocopy machines, quality of photocopies, and staff service. All are rated over 4.00. Satisfaction with staff knowledge is also high, as it is with the price. Lower satisfaction ratings are given by graduate students (Table 2.4) regarding reliability of the machines (16% are very dissatisfied) and by faculty (Table 2.2) with respect to overall satisfaction with duplication services. Conversely, 64% of graduate students have above average satisfaction with reliability of machines. In this high-awareness, high-use area 97.2% of undergraduates have used the coin-operated machines. However, there is dissatisfaction with the coin-operated machines: nearly 25% of the graduate students are unhappy. Satisfaction falls even lower regarding adequacy of machines, with 47% of graduate students dissatisfied. This is in contrast to the importance rating of 4.67. All user categories are somewhat happier about the quality of photocopies, but their satisfaction range (3.40) is still considerably lower than the 4.50 importance ratings.

There is high awareness of the microform reader/printers. Reader/printers in Documents/Microforms get importance ratings above 4.00, and have satisfaction rates above 3.40 (the lowest is for graduate students, where 23% are dissatisfied.) Satisfaction with respect to the number of reader/printers is slightly lower, and very similar to the satisfaction for reliability. (Table 14.12) Response to copy quality dips below 3.00 for students, and 50% of faculty were dissatisfied. Documents/Microforms staff get high marks for satisfaction, with the faculty rating of 3.76 being the lowest in the area of knowledge/efficiency. Satisfaction with the Doc/Mic hours nearly matches the importance ratings for that category.

**Library Publications**

The **UTK Librarian** gets high awareness ratings, although 18.3% of faculty say they have no need for the publication. (Table 16.1) There is high use of specific guides in the Library Guide series. Among undergraduates, 19.1% say they have a need for, but are not aware of the guides. That figure rises to 25.3% of under-graduates who have need for Library News but lack awareness. Satisfaction with The UTK Librarian is even higher than the importance rating. This trend, to a lesser extent, is the same for library guides. The eight faculty who evaluated importance for Library News averaged a 3.00 rating; student ratings were lower, 2.65. Satisfaction with Library News was much higher ranging from 4.00 for faculty to 3.17 for undergraduates.

**General Library Facilities**

Everyone seems to be aware that parking is available, and use ranges from 51.9% for other, 58.6% for faculty, and 68.1% for undergraduates to 80.1% for graduate students. The importance of parking is highest, however, for undergraduates (4.74) and they are the least satisfied. (Table 17.11) The most satisfied of the parking clientele are the user category, **other**. Importance/satisfaction data on general library facilities hovers around the 4.00 mark for importance, with graduate students marking 4.40. Students are quite satisfied (4.22 graduate, 4.59 undergraduate), and only 11% of faculty are dissatisfied. Signage is considered above 4.00 in importance to all groups (4.72 to
undergraduates), and gets slightly lower, but still respectable ratings for satisfaction (faculty, 3.71 and undergraduates, 4.23). The shelving arrangement gets a moderately high importance ranking (4.09-4.31), and while the satisfaction is lower, the only average below 3.00 is for the user category, other (2.78). (*Table 17.3) Graduate students (3.49) are the most satisfied. Of faculty 40% are dissatisfied.

Division of bound periodicals among floors is generally a non-issue. Importance is slightly higher (4.22 for graduate students), but satisfaction for faculty and graduate students is above 3.50. Regarding periodicals on microfilm, graduate students give a slightly higher satisfaction than importance ranking (only nine answered the question, however) and faculty rated them 3.69. Hodges hours are very important, most of all to undergraduates (4.92), but the least satisfied group is faculty (3.57) where 25% marked one of the two "dissatisfied" categories. Undergraduates are the most satisfied (4.10).
BARRIERS TO LIBRARY SERVICES

The barriers portion of the survey was relatively brief, and thus is included in this report as Figure 5, Barriers In Using Library and Its Services.

5. Have you ever experienced difficulty in using the Hodges Library or any of its services?
   No (circle 1 and skip to Question 6 on Page 7) ......................................................... 1
   Yes ................................................................. 2

   If "yes", how many times in the last month have you encountered a difficulty?
   times in the last month

   If "yes," what was/were the difficulty(ies)? (Circle ALL that apply for the LAST TIME you had difficulty.)

   a. I was unable to find a book or other material even though I had the title, author, or other information about the material .............................................. Y N

   If "no", skip to item (b) below. If "yes," what type of material was involved?
   Book ................................................................. 1
   Journal ......................................................................... 2
   AY material ........................................................................ 3
   Government document .......................................................... 4
   Other (specify) ........................................................................... 5

   What did you do? (Circle ALL that apply.)
   I asked circulation desk staff for help .............................................. 1
   I asked reference desk staff for help .............................................. 2
   I asked another staff member for help ............................................ 3
   I browsed through stacks looking for it ............................................. 4
   I searched OLIS ................................................................. 5
   I searched a CD-ROM database .................................................... 6
   I used the serials holding (Orange) book ........................................... 7
   I gave up ............................................................................... 8
   Other (specify) ........................................................................... 9

   What was the outcome of this difficulty? (Circle ALL that apply.)
   Problem was not resolved .......................................................... 1
   Problem was completely resolved ............................................... 2
   Problem was resolved, but not completely satisfactorily ..................... 3

   b. If the problem did not involve a book or other material, please indicate what the other problem(s) was/were:

   I needed help in using OLIS ................................................................ Y N
   I needed help in using a CD-ROM database ........................................... Y N
   I needed help in searching an online database ...................................... Y N
   I didn't know where to go in the library to find needed service ................ Y N

Data is shown in Barriers Tables 19.1 through 19.7. Graduate students (70%) and faculty (62.2%) most frequently encounter barriers to service in Hodges, while most undergraduates (65%) report that they have never experienced difficulty in using Hodges Library or any of its services. The survey results provide quantitative verification to librarians' observations that physical layout of the stacks is confusing, as shown in Barriers Table 19.5 where 73% of graduate and undergraduate students and 92.9% of the faculty report confusion. Responses to the ways that users resolved difficulties indicate that many problems go unresolved. When asked for the reasons that they do not ask library staff (Barriers Table 19.7), a frequent response was that "I could not find staff able to help." Other possibilities were spread over several categories in this table. Further analysis on comparing responses of users who asked for help and those who did not might give insight toward possible solutions.
### POTENTIAL LIBRARY SERVICES

**Figure 6.1**

**SECTION 2**

NEW LIBRARY SERVICES

3. In this section we list a number of potential new UTK Libraries services or changes in old ones that have been suggested by patrons.

A. For each service we ask you to indicate whether you would favor the service (circle Y) or would not favor the service (circle N). Please circle U (unsure) if you are uncertain whether you favor the service.

5. If you are likely to use the service, (i) indicate your likely uses per month by circling the appropriate number and (ii) note the level of importance of the service to you.

**IMPORTANCE RATING: VERY LITTLE IMPORTANCE -1 to VERY IMPORTANT -5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B (i)</th>
<th>B (ii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Library Express to return books, etc., at end of term</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to place hold for materials online</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-charging of materials</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>&lt;1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourage circulation of bound volumes of journals</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate bound volumes of journals more than 10 years old</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>&lt;1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD-ROM Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to download data to your own PC from CD-ROM databases or from</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>&lt;1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>databases available via OLIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote (dial-up) access to CD-ROM databases at UTK Libraries</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>&lt;1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to additional bibliographic databases on CD-ROM (circle the</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>&lt;1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field of study or specify discipline. Humanities, Social Science,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Science Engineering, Business,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to non-bibliographic data (e.g., full text of journal or</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>&lt;1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newspaper articles, statistical/demographic data, industry/corporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial information) on CDI ROM or via OLIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Library Services, Page 1, is the first page of a faculty questionnaire about potential library services.
Figure 6.2, Interest, Perceived Importance, and Likely Use: Circulate Bound Volumes More Than 10 Years Old, is the corresponding table (Table 18.6) that shows the proportion of those who favor, do not favor, or are unsure of the service. The questionnaire asked respondents to rate the service regarding its importance, and to estimate the likely number of uses per month. The table section labeled "Importance Rating" indicates the number of people who responded to this section (33), and then shows the percentage of responses for the possible answers from 1-5. Thus, 36.4% of the 33 respondents believe that it is very important for the library to circulate bound journal volumes more than 10 years old. The average importance figure can range from 1-5; any figure over 3.5 should be considered significant.

Finally, the Likely Uses of the New Service per Month tells how many people (31) answered this part of the question, shows the percentage of responses in each category for number of uses, includes an average number of uses, and provides a total use estimate. In this table 41.4% of the respondents said they would borrow a bound periodical from 2-5 times each month, and the average number of uses each month for all categories is 2.40. Total number of uses is estimated at 354 for the Core Faculty group.

A total of 37 unique questions were asked about new services. Data from the responses is shown in tables beginning, "Interest, Perceived Importance, and Likely Use:" among other tables in the functional categories, such as Circulation, Reference, etc. Five tables address new services in the area of Circulation. They cover user interest in having Library Express pick up materials charged to faculty at the end of the term, ability to place holds for materials online, self-charging of materials, and circulation of bound journals. While each of the topics received a generally positive
reception, the percentage of response in the categories "do not favor" and "unsure" are higher than those for other new services, particularly electronic services. The "average importance" ratios are under 4.00 for all of the questions. The areas of greatest interest to users are 1) using Library Express to return materials at the end of the term; and 2) continuation of the policy to circulate bound journals, regardless of age. These findings suggest that there be no change in current circulation policies for journals.

There is high interest in potential services related to electronic files. Questions cover topics related to ability to download data to an individual microcomputer from CD-ROM or other databases available via OLIS (*Table 12.11); remote access to electronic files through the UTK libraries (*Table 12.10); access to additional electronic bibliographic databases (*Table 12.12); and access to non-bibliographic electronic materials, such as article full text, industry financial reports, and statistical data. (*Table 12.14) Very few "do not favor" responses were received for this category, although the "unsure" ratings comprised around 20% of the total for each question. This suggests that some respondents may not understand what such services would be. Average importance ratings were all over 4.00. Top priority within the category is for remote access to bibliographic databases, followed by the addition of more databases. Ability to download from electronic files is favored by 75% of the faculty respondents, and 72% want access to non-bibliographic electronic materials.

A series of questions about access to document text addressed interest in ability to obtain full-text journal articles online from home or office, articles mailed to the individual at cost, articles mailed to the library for individual pick-up, articles delivered to the personal workstation, and electronic delivery of articles ordered via interlibrary loan. Tables 11.8 through 11.11 show that users are very interested in obtaining full text online journal articles without coming to the library, but they do not want to pay for such services. While 63% of faculty indicated their interest in receiving electronic delivery for articles requested via Interlibrary Services, 33% were unsure, suggesting that the abbreviation ILS used in the survey was not well understood.

Self-searching of online databases is considered highly important, especially by graduate students. Table 13.31 shows that 84.3% of the 102 graduate students who responded favor such access, and that 67.2% rate it very important. In Table 13.32 over 43% of the faculty respondents and 56.6% of graduate students indicate their support for having the library be the required repository for all UTK-prepared research and technical reports; however, 22.5% of faculty and 10% of graduates oppose such a practice. One third in each category marked "unsure."

Several questions focused on access to materials through OLIS. Users are asking for expansion, simplification, and directness of OLIS. Graduate students (79%) want more databases through OLIS. Users favor better help screens; the comments section of the survey confirms the opinion that OLIS is difficult to use. Although 26%-55% of all categories of respondents favor the use of printed guides via OLIS, many (29%-55%) are unsure (Table 16.7). While most respondents favor a single integrated online catalog of all materials held on campus (*Table 12.9), the average importance ratio is only 3.83, lower than the importance ratings for other electronic services. Very high importance (4.21) is given by faculty for interest in using journals tables of contents via OLIS (Table 12.13).

Moderate interest was apparent in new reference services, but the results do not hold compelling mandates for change. Research services to analyze research results (Table 13.28) was apparently not understood by the faculty respondents, as nearly 50% marked "unsure" on this question. Reference service by appointment (Table 13.29) is not of great interest to faculty; unfortunately students were not polled on this question. While few faculty and administrators desired the availability of various services in their offices, many respondents (41%-63%) marked "unsure." Access to electronic forms (*Table 18.8) to place requests for interlibrary services, acquisitions, reserve lists and reference assistance received high marks (56%-68%) with an average importance rating of 3.90.

Tables 15.23-15.29 addressed user needs for various types of instruction, ranging from overall library skills to Internet training. Response to the four questions dealing with a short course and credit courses indicate high interest and high importance. The highest importance ratings came from faculty (4.02) and graduate students (4.29) for a short course for graduate students, as shown in Table 15.24. Undergraduates gave high importance ratings (4.03 in Table 15.25), as did graduate students (4.22 in Table 15.26) for the availability of a credit course on information skills. Instruction on how to download CD-ROM data was favored by 71% of the faculty respondents shown in *Table 12.11; unfortunately, students were not asked this question. Over 60% of faculty respondents were interested in instruction on
the use of personal bibliographic software (Table 15.27). While automated point-of-use instruction received relatively high interest ratings, only 30% of the faculty actually favor it (Table 15.28); and 63% were unsure. Instruction about the Internet is highly favored by all groups and receives high importance ratings.

High interest among faculty exists for an electronic version of the new acquisitions list (Table 8.17). Regarding a monthly report of new articles on predetermined subjects, around 70% of the respondents favor such a service, and it received importance ratings that range from 4.05 to 4.33. This is in sharp contrast to the current low volume of users currently registered for online Selective Dissemination of Information service and bears further investigation.
BRANCH LIBRARY SURVEYS

Surveys conducted in the branch libraries varied in terms of the instrument, as well as the extent of response. Nearly 80 respondents in the Music Library and 107 users in the Ag-Vet Library answered most questions. Users were extremely pleased with the services in these libraries, with most satisfaction ratings well above 4.00. Because of the high ratings, any figure lower than 4.00 should probably receive consideration as a possible area for improvement.

In the University Archives and Special Collections libraries, there were eight and twenty-three responses, respectively. It is difficult to generalize conclusions on the basis of the smaller responses, and methodologies other than survey, such as focus groups, may provide more meaningful assessment for these services. In the CIC there were forty-two responses to most survey questions, but inconsistencies in the data suggested that respondents did not interpret the questions accurately. For example, Tables 21.43 and 21.44, related to access to large format photocopiers and availability of light tables, had low importance ratings (2.65 and 2.47 respectively) yet satisfaction ratings ranging from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied," were given for services that do not presently exist. Highlights from the branch results follow.

Agriculture-Veterinary Medicine Library

Users are aware of and have used most services, including the book and journal collections, reference assistance, reserve, interlibrary loan, Library Express, database searching, Medline current awareness service, and access to OLIS. They are highly satisfied with these services, even with interlibrary loan (Table 20.13-14) where the turnaround time includes extra days for sending the request to Hodges and shipping the materials from Hodges to the branch. Some areas where satisfaction is below stellar include photocopy machines (Table 20.53-54), a differential between importance and satisfaction in the journal collection (Table 20.3-4), and an importance rating of 4.56 followed by a satisfaction rating of 4.07 for satisfaction with in-library access to the UTK catalog (Table 20.31-32). Confirming the findings for Hodges are awareness and satisfaction with ability and convenience of ordering new journals (*Table 20.47-48) where 33% of those aware of the service have used it, and they rate it 4.71 in importance, but 3.96 in satisfaction.

Map Library

Users have high awareness of the U.S. maps collection and rate both importance and satisfaction high (4.17 and 4.16, respectively). The reference collection is needed, but many users (45.7%) are not aware that it is available. (*Table 21.9-10) It received a high importance rating (4.5), although satisfaction is only 3.94. In contrast, the average importance of the atlas collection is rated at 3.88, but the average satisfaction is a 3.5. (Table 21.11-12) With a sample size of only 16 responses, this is characteristic of the potential for other types of assessment methodologies. There is high awareness of the availability of reference service, although 13.9% have need but are unaware. (Table 21.15-16) Importance and satisfaction with reference service are high. Importance for the ability to search CD-ROMs in the library and over the network are generally lower than for Hodges, even though awareness is high.

Music Library

Music Library users are highly aware of the book, journal, and audio collections. The music video collection receives higher satisfaction than importance ratings, as does the music interactive video collection. (Tables 22.7-8 and 22.9-10) The awareness rating for music video is somewhat lower, with 12% having a need for, but being unaware of the collection. Although over 50% of those who are aware of interlibrary loan services in the Music Library have not used them, there is a slight difference between the importance (3.60) and satisfaction (3.33) ratings; 16.2% of music library users are not aware, but have need for ILS (Table 22.15-16). There is higher awareness about campus ILS services (76% are aware), yet 12% are unaware of them and report a need. (Table 22.17-18) Staff generally receive very high marks; one area for attention may be "searching the Internet" where the importance is rated at 4.58 and the satisfaction at 3.92. (Table 22.25-26) As with the Ag-Vet and Hodges responses, these users rate the ability to order new journals high (4.60) but the satisfaction low (2.50). Reliability of audiovisual equipment receives a somewhat lower satisfaction
rating (*Table 22.45-46), as does satisfaction with the circulation period for audiovisual material. Reliability of photocopiers seems to be better in Music than in Ag-Vet, although performance of microform readers does not quite meet the moderate average importance expectation.

**Special Collections**

The Special Collections survey queried users about awareness and importance of specific collections, such as the Tennessee, Knox County, American Literature, Southeastern Indians, etc. materials. Since only a small percentage of the twenty-three respondents used one or more of these collections, there were only two or three in the sample size for importance and satisfaction. In some cases, such as for the History of UTK collection and the early voyages and travels collection, satisfaction rated higher than importance. (Tables 23.11-12 and 23.9-10) Ratings for staff service were consistently very high. Satisfaction with duplication services such as photocopy quality matched responses to Hodges and other branches where there is considerable room for improvement. (*Table 23.33-34)

**University Archives**

The total sample size of eight is a very satisfied group, particularly with respect to the rating of staff service. In fact, staff received a 4.83 satisfaction rating from six respondents over a 4.67 importance rating. Two of the respondents indicated a need for staff to do photocopying, but were not aware that such a service exists. Users are generally satisfied with the collections, although the importance ratings tend to be higher than satisfaction. A possible area for further exploration is the discrepancy between importance of in-library OLIS access to the UTK catalog (4.67) and the satisfaction (4.20) on the basis of five responses. (*Table 24.13-14)
4. This question deals with your awareness and use of the Hodges Library's collections and services. Even though you are a library user, you may not be aware of or use some of these services.

For each collection or service listed below, please:

- Circle 1 if you were not aware of the service and have a need for it;
- Circle 2 if you were not aware of the service and have no need for it;
- Circle 3 if you were aware of the service and have never used it;
- Circle 4 if you were aware of the service and have ever used it.

If you have used the service, please indicate the approximate number of uses in the last month (put zero if you have used the service at some time, but not in the last month). Also, if you have ever used the service, please rate (i) the importance of the service or service attribute to you (Very Little Importance - 1 to Very Important - 5) and (ii) your satisfaction with it (Very Dissatisfied - 1 to Very Satisfied - 5). Please do not write in darkened areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Not Aware Of Service</th>
<th>Aware Of Service</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Uses in Last Month</th>
<th>Answer Only if You Have EVER Used Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a Need for Service</td>
<td>Have No Need for Service</td>
<td>Have Never Used</td>
<td>Have Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of reference material to answer questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference service by telephone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance of reference staff with questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching of CD-ROMs on library network</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to download from CD-ROMs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance of reference staff with CDROM searching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database search services (performed by reference staff for a fee)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance of reference staff with database search services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching of the Internet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>