

Understanding Faculty Needs: A Case Study at the University of Toledo

學科教授對圖書館服務之需求： 多麗都大學實例

Julia A. Martin

Business & Economics Librarian/Assistant Professor of Library Administration,
University of Toledo, U.S.A.

E-mail : julia.martin@utoledo.edu

Keywords (關鍵詞) : Subject Librarians (學科館員); Subject Specialists (主題專家); Liaison Librarians (院系聯絡館員); Collection Development (館藏發展); Surveys (問卷調查); Information Seeking Strategies (資訊搜尋策略); Information Process Behavior (資訊處理行為)

【Abstract】

The paper explores how faculty need and use the library. It reviewed literature on the roles of subject librarians and the advantages for faculty and libraries. It summarized key strategies for subject liaison librarians to develop relationships with faculty and the use of surveys to explore faculty needs. The paper also included a survey administered to the business, engineering, and education faculty at The University of Toledo in 2006-07 to help subject librarians better understand their clients. The University of Toledo survey focused on faculty perception of library collection development and library services, and examined faculty's research needs and their patterns of using library resources and services.

本文探討學科教授對圖書館的需求和使用。它對學科館員對提供專業學科服務的優勢和對圖書館服務所起的作用作了文獻探討，並概括了建立和院系教授聯繫的主要策略和使用問卷調查來瞭解他們的需求。本文包括2006-07年度對多麗都大學商學院、工程學院和教育學院教授的問卷調查，發現教授對資訊檢索和資訊處理的行為理念和使用圖書館的模式。問卷注重教授研究興趣和資訊搜尋策略與圖書館服務的關係，從而使學科館員更充分瞭解他們學術研究的需求。

Introduction

The faculty survey began with a desire to better understand faculty needs so that subject librarians could better serve them. Subject librarians are tasked with helping the faculty and students of specific colleges or departments. Many librarians focus their efforts on serving students rather than faculty and The University

of Toledo (UT) is no exception. However, a recent merger, a new university mission statement, and a new strategic plan demonstrated a significant increase in the university's research endeavors. In light of these changes, several subject librarians at UT felt a need to reassess services to faculty.

First, the literature was searched to better understand the roles of subject librarians in serving faculty. The literature revealed not only the roles of subject librarians, but strategies for developing closer relationships and many advantages for both the library and faculty members.

Second, the literature was searched to discover the needs of faculty. While some information was found on reading habits and faculty's desire for more comprehensive library collections, an incomplete picture was formed. At UT, a LibQUAL+ survey had previously been conducted. However, its response rate was low with very few faculty members responding. UT's business librarian, with the encouragement of the College of Business Administration's Library Committee, decided it might be helpful to conduct a survey directly aimed at faculty. Survey questions were generated from other surveys and from a desire to understand usage of specific titles and services offered at UT. Survey results provided insight into how UT faculty view and use research materials.

This paper is based on a presentation given at the Chinese American Librarians Association's 21st Century Librarian Seminar in Wuhan, China in October 2008.

Literature Review

The Roles of Subject Librarians

The roles of subject specialists vary, but typically encompass six responsibilities: specialist knowledge, reference services, library instruction, liaison activities, collection development, and research assistance.

To provide a foundation for specialist knowledge, a degree, particularly a graduate degree, in a relevant discipline is often preferred by libraries. However, many specialists have other relevant experience or fall into the specialty because of the unfulfilled needs of their institutions. Subject librarians often provide in-person, email, chat, IM, and phone reference services at a reference desk in a specialty library or a main library. Subject librarians are responsible for working closely with a subset of the university population, usually a college or a department. Library instruction, particularly in the subject specialty, is another common responsibility. Subject librarians may incorporate information literacy guidelines into instruction and reference by emphasizing the need for information, how to find it, how to evaluate it, and how to use it. In many cases, subject librarians put great emphasis on developing and maintaining relationships with faculty in their assigned colleges and departments. Another important responsibility for subject librarians is collection development. The American Library Association's (ALA) Reference and User Services Association has published "Guidelines for Liaison Work in Managing Collections and Services" (2001). Collection development includes not only the selection and de-selection of books, but important choices regarding dropping serials or moving them to electronic formats and the acquisition of databases to support the curriculum and research. In-depth research assistance for faculty and graduate students, and even undergraduates and community members, is another valuable service provided by subject librarians. Though not all subject librarians will serve all these roles, they will serve many of them (Cotta-Schonberg, 2007; Dyson, 2007; Gaston, 2001; Hardy & Corral, 2007; Wood, 2005; Yang, 2000). The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) published a Liaison Services SPEC Kit (Logue, Ballestro, Imre, & Arendt, 2007) which offers examples of roles and responsibilities, position descriptions, training materials, and service descriptions for liaisons, who are often subject specialists.

The advantages for faculty, students, and librarians are many. Advantages for faculty include a forum for communicating their needs and one identifiable and responsible person. Both faculty and students benefit from targeted collections and subject specific library instruction. The librarian's deep subject knowledge and access to other subject specialists assist faculty and graduate students in advanced research requests.

A subject specialist organization of the reference department has the potential to create many advantages for librarians, particularly a better knowledge of their customers. Close faculty-librarian relationships often lead to a natural forum for communicating both faculty needs and library policies, services, and resources. The library and the librarian increase their visibility and cultivate opportunities for creating customer participation and buy-in and, possibly, advocacy. Other possibilities such as team teaching and collaboration in research and writing may develop. Advantages for the library go far beyond the development of focused paper and electronic collections.

Many strategies may help a subject librarian create and maintain relationships with faculty. Subject specialists in various disciplines have shared their strategies and experiences, including a Rutgers task force (Glynn & Wu, 2003); Frada Mozenter, Bridgette Sanders, and Jeanie M. Welch (2000); Carla Hendrix (1999); Scott Stebelman, Jack Siggins, David Nutty, and Caroline Long (1999); Jessica Albano (2005); Stephan Macaluso and Brabara Whitney Petruzzelli (2005); a group of new subject liaisons (Stoddart, Bryant, Baker, Lee, & Spencer, 2006); an ALA Business Reference and Services Section meeting (2001); Michele R. Tennant, Tara Tobin Cataldo, Pamela Sherwill-Navarro, and Rae Jesano (1994); Sandra Beehler (2006); and Matthew Wright (2007). Perhaps the most effective is to focus on key classes, including library instruction classes and research classes. Instructors of library instruction classes are often able to find the time to fit in a trip to the library. Targeting library instruction classes has the

advantage of reaching students at the beginning of their academic careers. One disadvantage to this approach is that the students usually do not have an assignment on which to focus their attention during the session. However, an emphasis on the library as a place to study, use computers, and ask questions is a good first step. Research classes are a natural environment for library instruction and developing ongoing relationships with faculty. Students focus on the content of the session because they have a defined outcome that requires library research. One disadvantage is that research classes are often scheduled at the end of students' university careers instead of towards the beginning. If the librarian can reach all sections of a required class in the college or department, maximum coverage for amount of effort can be achieved.

Other strategies for developing relationships with faculty include targeting new faculty, who tend to be more open to new strategies, attending department and college meetings, sometimes to present, but always to listen, attending the college's public lectures, and distributing a newsletter, email update, or blog. A library pathfinder or workshop on a new or changed product might be welcomed. Browsing faculty websites for research interests and browsing offered classes and their textbooks and syllabi offers information regarding the interests of faculty. A survey of library users, whether LibQUAL+ or a homegrown survey, may prove fruitful. Another way to experience the college and create serendipitous meetings is to conduct office hours in a computer lab or busy corridor, which the University of Alberta's Cameron Science & Technology Library (Reichardt & Kowalyk, 2004) and the University of Mississippi's library (Stephan, 2007) successfully implemented. Though students may be the primary target, faculty often stop by to chat. Some universities (Bartnik, 2007; Freiburger & Kramer, 2009; Johnson & Alexander, 2007) are experimenting with embedded librarians or field librarians, where the librarian's office is moved from the library to the college or department. The collection re-

mains in the library and the basic job duties do not change. However, the librarian is more accessible and becomes a member of the college or department community.

Much of the literature on liaison librarians and subject specialists focus on serving students. Even the development of better relationships with faculty often seems to have the end goal of reaching students, with faculty members as intermediaries. In the survey conducted at UT, faculty research needs rather than teaching needs are addressed.

Surveys of Faculty to Better Understand Their Needs

Today's academic libraries suffer from a lack of measures of success. The traditional measures of collections, expenditures, and staffing no longer adequately describe or measure most libraries. Many have proposed new areas of measurement and these measurements have some models, but data can be difficult to obtain and are certainly not standard across libraries. Sharon Weiner (2005) showed that new measures of service, including number of reference transactions, number of instructional presentations, and number of attendees at group presentations positively correlated with The Association of Research Libraries traditional measures of number of volumes owned, number of journal subscriptions, number of employees, and budget. Kathryn Deiss (1999) proposed measuring organizational capacity by measuring human resources, individual and group performance, creativity and innovation, and organizational capacity. Even something as basic as measuring the use of electronic resources, on which libraries increasingly spend a larger proportion of their collections budgets, is not yet consistently feasible, though many groups are working on the technical aspects of this measurement (Bernon, 2008; Pesch, 2008; Tijerina & King, 2008).

Libraries have turned to business practices for measures of quality and satisfaction. Shi and Levy (2005) discuss the evolution of library surveys. Many

libraries use LibQUAL+, a survey designed to measure affect of service, library as place, and collections and access. LibQUAL+ is a modified form of SERVQUAL, a tool businesses use to measure service quality. However, libraries suffer from low response rates to LibQUAL+ surveys as well as debate over some of the survey items and the difficulty of separating tangibles and intangibles. Some researchers have concentrated on specific populations. Kayongo and Jones (2008) found that faculty at ARL libraries were consistently dissatisfied with collections and access to them. They found strong correlations between faculty scores on the LibQUAL+ survey and ARL statistics for total materials expenditures.

Librarians and their professional organizations have also developed surveys to better understand their customers. In 2002 The Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) published a report that explored the changing usage patterns caused by the growing web environment (Friedlander). Faculty reported spending an average of 15.79 hours a week obtaining, reviewing, and analyzing information. At that time 67.8% of faculty still relied exclusively on print resources. However, 25.6% said they needed more online journals. More recently, King, Tenopir, Choemprayong, and Wu (2009) found that faculty spend about 132 hours per year (2.5 hours per week) reading scholarly articles. In addition, they found that libraries provide 52% of the articles read. Faculty have also been surveyed regarding their awareness of library databases (Larabee & Lorber, 1994; Renwick, 2005; Weingart & Anderson, 2000). The majority of researchers found that many faculty lack awareness of library resources and recommended the need to promote library databases and other resources.

University of Toledo Faculty Survey

The UT faculty survey was designed to capture information regarding research activities rather than

teaching activities. Ideas were generated from LibQUAL+ questionnaires and other published surveys (Friedlander, 2002; Larabee & Lorber, 1994; Renwick, 2005; Thomson-Roos, 2005; Weingart & Anderson, 2000). The subject librarians hoped to gain insight into how the library fit into faculty research practices. During the 2006-2007 academic year, full-time faculty in the Colleges of Business Administration, Engineering, and Education at The University of Toledo were surveyed. College of Business Administration faculty were surveyed first in Fall 2006. In Spring 2007 the survey instrument was modified slightly to survey faculty in the Colleges of Engineering and Education. All faculty members were mailed a survey with a brief note of thanks and a mint. Two follow-up emails were sent. Fifty-eight faculty members out of a population of 225 participated, with a 26% response rate. Though a 26% response rate was less than hoped for, the response was sufficient to form an impression of faculty characteristics. Faculty members

were asked a series of demographic questions and questions about their satisfaction level with library resources and services, their information search behaviors, and library usage patterns, some of which are summarized below.

Results

Demographics

Of the participating faculty, 25 were from the College of Business Administration, 15 from the College of Education, and 18 from the College of Engineering (Table 1). The average length of employment at UT was 12 years and the average length of time conducting scholarly research was 16 years. More participants were male (42) than female (16). The majority of respondents were tenured faculty (35), followed by tenure track faculty (14), and visiting faculty or lecturers (9). The average number of peer reviewed journal articles published per person was 18 (Table 2).

Table 1 *Respondents by College*

College	Respondents	Population	Response Rate
Business	25	78	32%
Education	15	59	25%
Engineering	18	88	20%
Total	58	225	26%

Table 2 *Respondents' Demographic Profile*

Gender		Tenure Status			Years Researching		Peer Reviewed Articles
Male	Female	Tenured	Tenure Track	Visiting/ Lecturer	at UT	Total	
42	16	35	14	9	12	16	18

Faculty Satisfaction Level with Library Resources and Services

Faculty were asked a series of questions about their beliefs regarding research material availability and whom they believed held the responsibility for acquiring them. A seven point Likert scale was used with 1

being strongly disagree, 4 being neither agree nor disagree, and 7 being strongly agree. Faculty were asked to rate their beliefs regarding library resource availability and effect on research (Table 3). Ratings for each question were averaged and displayed here from highest (agree) to lowest (disagree). Responses

indicate that library resources do positively support research, but that faculty desire further support. Fur-

thermore, responses indicate that library resources do not play a strong role in determining research pursuits.

Table 3 *Resource Availability's Effect on Research*

Survey Question	Ave. Rating
The availability of research materials and resources at UT libraries positively impact my research productivity.	5.34
My ability to meet my department's research goals is facilitated by the availability of library resources at UT.	4.65
I am happy with the research materials and resources available to me through UT Libraries.	4.62
UT Libraries current resources do not adequately support faculty research activity.	4.31
I feel a sense of frustration with the availability of research materials available through UT Libraries.	3.52
Completing research projects is difficult given the library resources available at UT.	3.35
My department's research expectations are difficult to achieve with the current level of research materials and resources available through UT Libraries.	3.35
The type of research activities I undertake is partly determined by the library resources available at UT.	3.15

Faculty were also asked who bears the responsibility of providing research materials (Table 4). Ratings for each question were averaged and displayed here from highest (agree) to lowest (disagree). Responses indi-

cate that faculty believe the university bears the highest level of responsibility for providing research materials and that individual researchers bear the lowest level of responsibility.

Table 4 *Responsibility for Access to Research Materials*

Survey Question	Ave. Rating
My influence over what happens at UT regarding the allocation of library resources is limited.	5.58
UT bears responsibility for making research materials and resources available.	5.28
I want to find alternative ways to access resources to support my research.	4.75
UT controls the availability of research materials and library resources.	4.73
My department bears some responsibility for making research materials and resources available.	4.41
The State of Ohio controls the availability of research materials and library resources.	4.38
I want to build my own funds to access or purchase reading materials or other resources for my personal research library.	4.14
I want to become actively involved in efforts to increase state and federal support for research resources at UT libraries.	3.76
I want to spend time encouraging others to play an active role in identifying new ways to fund or sponsor library resources for research.	3.75

Faculty Information Search Behaviors

Faculty members were asked about their behavior when conducting research. Table 5 shows the re-

sources faculty used when not using the library. A seven point Likert scale was used with 1 being never happens and 7 being frequently happens. Ratings for each question were averaged and displayed here from

highest (frequently happens) to lowest (never happens). It was no surprise that Internet usage dominated research behavior. Faculty were more likely to pur-

chase their own materials than to visit another library, once a very common and necessary activity.

Table 5 *Behavior When Conducting Research*

Survey Question	Ave. Rating
Search for free resources on the Internet.	5.80
Utilize public resources and databases to access research materials (excluding UT libraries and OhioLINK).	5.68
Purchase journals or other materials from my personal funds.	4.59
Borrow research materials or books from research colleagues.	3.89
Visit other universities to utilize their research resources and facilities.	3.36
Seek outside funding to pay for research materials otherwise unavailable through UT libraries.	2.91
Actively participate in a repository or online working papers community offered by other academic institutions (e.g. SSRN).	2.89
Share the cost of purchasing research materials with research colleagues.	2.64

Faculty Information Usage Patterns

Faculty were given a list of 17 library material types and services and asked which were used in their university work (Table 6). A five point Likert scale was used with 1 being never use, 2 rarely use, 3 not sure, 4 occasionally use, and 5 being frequently use. Ratings for each question were averaged and displayed here

from highest (frequently use) to lowest (never use). Results indicate that faculty use journals and journal databases much more than any other type of library material or service. A lack of the use of librarians, library guides, library instruction, and individual instruction demonstrate their independent research behavior.

Table 6 *Use of Library Resources & Services*

Resource or Service	Ave. Rating
Journal articles	4.54
Remote access of library databases from campus	4.48
Electronic indexes or abstracting tools	4.26
Remote access of library databases from home	4.09
Library books	3.88
Magazine articles	3.49
Statistical data	3.40
Company information	3.31
Industry information	3.28
Reference and information desk	3.28
Access of library databases at the library	3.15
Print indexes or abstracting tools	3.10
International data	3.06
Librarian	3.04
Library guides	2.75
Library instruction	2.39
Individual instruction	2.24

Discussion

This study attempted to confirm which library resources and services were being used and to delve deeper into the relationship between faculty research and the library. Surveys administered to the business, engineering, and education faculty at The University of Toledo in 2006-07 have shown that faculty value library collections and desire greater support of research materials. They believe the university should bear primary responsibility for allocating money for research materials and feel that they have little influence over allocation decisions and have little desire to advocate for increased materials allocations. Faculty frequently use the Internet for research and rarely go to library buildings. Of the many resources the library provides, they most value journal literature and the electronic indexes to access it. Several studies support these conclusions, including a collaborative collection building agreement for the selection and funding of electronic databases between business faculty and the business library at Pennsylvania State University, which emphasized the importance of electronic databases to faculty (White, 2004). Tucker, Bullian, and Torrence (2003) presented a model for faculty/library liaison collaborative collection development. Michael Stoller (2005), a New York University collections librarian, theorized that the subject specialist librarian offers the best method for communicating with faculty and developing collections. Additionally, Thomson-Roos (2005) found that collections were extremely important to business and economics faculty.

Though it would be a very broad assumption to think that The University of Toledo's business, education, and engineering faculty represent all UT faculty or all professional faculty, a glimpse of their beliefs, behavior, and library usage may help subject librarians understand the nature of faculty and their library needs. The role of the library that faculty seem to value most is collection development, implying that, from their viewpoint, it is

the most important role for the subject librarian. Whether purchasing new journals and databases, canceling subscriptions, or answering research questions, knowing the needs and characteristics of the faculty assists subject librarians with their duties. While subject librarians most highly value the provision of reference and library instruction (McAbee & Graham, 2005), faculty most value the library collection. Subject librarians should be aware of faculty research needs even though, generally, much more time is spent assisting students and most faculty do not step foot in the library building. Faculty beliefs, behavior, and usage patterns should drive collection development much more than any other library service for faculty.

Though change is slow, The UT Libraries have responded to the needs of faculty. First, the desire for online journal access has resulted in far fewer print publications and more online only journal subscriptions. Second, The UT Libraries have formed a marketing committee to help with communication. Though the first initiatives of the committee focused on undergraduate students, the committee has also begun to consider faculty relations. A flashy email template has been designed for subject librarians and the library to use for communication. A series of "Connection Sessions" has also been planned to highlight services that faculty use for research such as EndNote and interlibrary loan.

Conclusion

This study's goal was to discover how the library fits into faculty member's research practices. It found that faculty do value library resources, but feel they have little influence over their selection. When choosing research projects, faculty members do not consider the availability of library materials to support their projects' success. Of the many library resources and services, faculty primarily use online journals and indexes. Other information resources like books and statistics were also important. Services offered by

librarians such as reference, library guides, and instruction are used much less than materials. The survey results emphasized the importance faculty place on comprehensive collections and access to materials. When serving their patrons, subject librarians need to be aware faculty rely on librarians most for collection building, rather than any other service.

References

- Albano, J. (2005). The must list. *College & Research Libraries News*, 66(3), 203-228.
- American Library Association, Reference and User Services Association, Business References and Services Section, Business Reference in Academic Libraries Committee. (2001). *Brainstorming ideas for faculty liaison*. Program conducted at the meeting of the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/rusa/sections/brass/brassprotocols/brasspres/miscellaneous/liaison.cfm>
- American Library Association, Reference and User Services Association, Collection Development and Evaluation Section, Liaison with Users Committee. (2001). *Guidelines for liaison work in managing collections and services*. Retrieved from <http://www.lita.org/ala/mgrps/divs/rusa/resources/guidelines/guidelinesliaison.cfm>
- Bartnik, L. (2007). The Embedded academic librarian: The Subject specialist moves into the discipline college. *Kentucky Libraries*, 71(3), 4-9.
- Beehler, S. A. (2006). Customizing faculty's needs: Development of a liaison program (A subject librarian's priority). *Against the Grain*, 18(1), 60-61.
- Bernon, J. (2008, December). Why and how to measure the use of electronic resources. *Liber Quarterly: The Journal of European Research Libraries*, 18(3/4), 459-463.
- Cotta-Schonberg, M. (2007). The Changing role of the subject specialist. *Liber Quarterly: The Journal of European Research Libraries*, 17(1-4), 180-185.
- Deiss, K. (1999). *ARL new measures: Organizational capacity white paper*. Available from Association of Research Libraries
- Dyson, P. (2007). Subject liaison at Lincoln. *SCONUL Focus*, 41, 12-15.
- Freiburger, G., & Kramer, S. (2009). Embedded librarians: One library's model for decentralized service. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 97(2), 139-142.
- Friedlander, A. (2002). *Dimensions and use of the scholarly information environment: Introduction to a data set assembled by the Digital Library Federation and Outsell, Inc.* (CLIR pub110). Retrieved from Council on Library and Information Resources website: <http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub110/contents.html>
- Gaston, R. (2001). The Changing role of the subject librarian, with a particular focus on UK developments, examined through a review of the literature. *The New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 7(1), 19-36.
- Glynn, T., & Wu, C. (2003). New roles and opportunities for academic library liaisons: A Survey and recommendations. *Reference Services Review*, 31(2), 122-128.
- Hardy, G., & Corral, S. (2007). Revisiting the subject librarian: A Study of English, law and chemistry. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 39(2), 79-91.
- Hendrix, C. A. (1999). Developing a liaison program in a new organizational structure - A work in progress. *The Reference Librarian*, 32(67), 203-224.
- Johnson, B. L., & Alexander, L. A. (2007). In the field. *Library Journal*, 132(2), 38-40.
- Kayongo, J., & Jones, S. (2008). Faculty perception of information control using LibQUAL+ indicators. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 34(2), 130-138.
- King, D., Tenopir, C., Choemprayong, S., & Wu, L. (2009). Scholarly journal information-seeking and reading patterns of faculty at five US universities. *Learned Publishing*, 22(2), 126-144.
- Larabee, J., & Lorber, C. (1994). Electronic resources: Level of awareness and usage in a university library. *CD-ROM Professional*, 7(6), 137-138.

- Logue, S., Ballestro, J., Imre, A., & Arendt, J. (2007). *Spec kit 301: Liaison services*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.
- Macaluso, S. J., & Petruzzelli, B. W. (2005). The library liaison toolkit: Learning to bridge the communication gap. *The Reference Librarian*, 43(89), 163-177.
- McAbee, S. L., & Graham, J. B. (2005). Expectations, realities, and perceptions of subject specialist librarians' duties in medium-sized academic libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 31(1), 19-28.
- Mozenter, F. L., Sanders, B. T., & Welch, J. M. (2000). Restructuring a liaison program in an academic library. *College and Research Libraries*, 61(5), 432-440.
- Pesch, O. (2008, February). ONIX, Z and JWP: Library standards in a digital world. *Serials Librarian*, 53(4), 63-78.
- Reichardt, R., & Kowalyk, J. (2004). Librarian on-site service at the University of Alberta: How the science and technology library took its information and reference from the library to the faculty. *Sci-Tech News*, 58(3), 7-11.
- Renwick, S. (2005). Knowledge and use of electronic information resources by medical sciences faculty at The University of the West Indies. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 93(1), 21-31.
- Shi, X., & Levy, S. (2005). A Theory-guided approach to library services assessment. *College & Research Libraries*, 66(3), 266-277.
- Stebelman, S., Siggins, J., Nutty, D., & Long, C. (1999). Improving library relations with the faculty and university administrators: The Role of the faculty outreach librarian. *College & Research Libraries*, 60(2), 121-130.
- Stephan, E. (2007). Taking the library to the users: Satellite reference at the University of Mississippi. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 14(4), 59-72.
- Stoddart, R., Bryant, T., Baker, A., Lee, A., & Spencer, B. (2006). Perspectives on... Going boldly beyond the reference desk: Practical advice and learning plans for new reference librarians performing liaison work. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(4), 419-427.
- Stoller, M. (2005). Building library collections: It's still about the user. *Collection Building*, 24(1), 4-8.
- Tennant, M. R., Cataldo, T. T., Sherwill-Navarro, P., & Jesano, R. (2006). Evaluation of a liaison librarian program: Client and liaison perspectives. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 94(4), 402-409.
- Thomson-Roos, E. (2005). Paper number 1: User satisfaction, the main purpose of a library? *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 10(3), 22-31.
- Tijerina, B., & King, D. (2008, November). What is the future of electronic resource management systems? *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 20(3), 147-155.
- Tucker, J. C., Bullian, J., & Torrence, M. C. (2003). Collaborate or Die! Collection development in today's academic library. *The Reference Librarian*, 40(83), 219-236.
- Weiner, S. (2005). Library quality and impact: Is there a relationship between new measures and traditional measures? *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 31(5), 432-437.
- Weingart, S., & Anderson, J. (2000). When questions are answers: Using a survey to achieve faculty awareness of the library's electronic resources. *College & Research Libraries*, 61(2), 127-34.
- White, G. W. (2004). Collaborative collection building of electronic resources: A Business faculty/librarian partnership. *Collection Building*, 23(4), 177-181.
- Wood, H. K. (2005). A Conversation with Anthony Raymond. *BF Bulletin*, 129, 27-31.
- Wright, M. J. (2007). *Survey on law library liaison services* (R. Studwell (Ed.), Briefs in law librarianship series vol. 14, AALL publication series no. 56, a publication of the Research Instruction and Reader Services SIS of the American Association of Law Libraries). Buffalo, NY: William S. Hein.
- Yang, Z. (2000). University faculty's perception of a library liaison program: A Case study. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 26(2), 124-128.

Appendix 1 *FACULTY SURVEY*

Please note that this version of the survey was given to business faculty. Education and engineering faculty received a version that reflected resources used in those disciplines.

DATE: November 21, 2006

TO: COBA Faculty

FROM: Sylvia Long-Tolbert, MIB
Julia Martin, Carlson Library

RE: Library Resources

We are conducting a user survey to better understand your preference and use of research resources funded through the University of Toledo Libraries. In light of budget cuts to library resources on campus, we hope to learn more about what impact library resources have on your research productivity. You also can take this opportunity to share your opinions about your service experience with the library as well as suggest those resources that would be useful to you in your job that are not currently available through the library.

Your participation in this survey involves completing the attached questionnaire. It takes approximately 15-20 minutes of your time to do this. To ensure anonymity, you should return your completed survey via inter-office mail. **Please take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it to Julia Martin, MS#509 by December 8, 2006.**

Questions may be directed to Julia Martin (julia.martin@utoledo.edu) or Sylvia Long-Tolbert (sylvia.long-tolbert@utoledo.edu), the co-researchers of this project.

We greatly appreciate your feedback on this important research and resource issue.

Thank you!

NOTE: By completing this questionnaire you are giving your consent to participate in the project. Whether you participate or not will have no detrimental effect on your relationship with your department, Carlson Library or the University.

Your complete privacy is ensured as the information you supply will be evaluated in aggregate form rather than individually.

PLEASE TELL US A LITTLE ABOUT YOURSELF BEFORE YOU START THE SURVEY.

Gender: M F

Your tenure status: Tenure-track Tenured Visiting / Lecturer

UT length of employment: _____ (years)

Length of time conducting scholarly research: _____ (years)

Research Activity

Number of published peer reviewed journal articles: _____

Number of published peer reviewed conference papers: _____

Date that you last submitted a manuscript to a peer-reviewed journal: (check only one option)
 (year submitted) None

Number of research projects currently underway: _____

Instructional Activity

Number of courses in which you require students to conduct research: _____

Number of courses which are being updated by you: _____

SECTION 1

For each statement below, please circle the rating that most closely reflects your response.

QUESTION 1a: Please rate your experiences with Carlson Library as reflected in the following statements.

	<i>Very Dissatisfied</i>	<i>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</i>	<i>Very Satisfied</i>				
My overall satisfaction with UT libraries	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The relationship library employees have established with faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Resources available to faculty to support research activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Resources available to faculty for teaching activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Employee assistance with research requests	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Employee assistance with teaching requests	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Employee knowledge of research resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Employee knowledge of teaching resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

QUESTION 1b: Please rate your personal satisfaction regarding different facets of your performance. (Continue using the satisfaction scale from the previous question.)

<i>My overall satisfaction with my:</i> research productivity in the past 3 years.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ability to get things done with the research resources available through UT libraries.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
professional progress as a researcher or scholar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

QUESTION 2: Complete the questions in this section IF you are or have been involved in conducting scholarly research during your employment at UT.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>				
The availability of research materials and resources at UT libraries positively impacts my research productivity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completing research projects is difficult given the library resources available at UT.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The type of research activities I undertake is partly determined by the library resources available at UT.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My ability to meet my department’s research goals is facilitated by the availability of library resources at UT.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

QUESTION 3: Rate the following statements in terms of how they relate to your beliefs about the current level of library resources at the UT Libraries.

	<i>Not at all related to my beliefs</i>	<i>Highly related to my beliefs</i>
The state of Ohio controls the availability of research materials and library resources.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
UT controls the availability of research materials and library resources.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
UT Libraries' current resource levels do not adequately support faculty research activity.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
My department's research expectations are difficult to achieve with the current level of research materials and resources available through UT Libraries.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
UT bears the responsibility for making research materials and resources available.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
My department bears some responsibility for making research materials and resources available.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	

QUESTION 4: To what extent have you engaged in the following behaviors related to conducting research?

	<i>Never happens</i>	<i>Frequently Happens</i>
Purchase journals or other materials from my personal funds.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
Utilize public resources and databases to access research materials (excluding UT libraries and OhioLINK).	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
Borrow research materials or books from research colleagues.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
Visit other universities to utilize their research resources and facilities.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
Seek outside funding to pay for research materials otherwise unavailable through UT libraries.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
Share the cost of purchasing research materials with research colleagues.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
Actively participate in a repository or online working papers community offered by other academic institutions (e.g., SSRN).	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
Search for free resources on the Internet.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	

QUESTION 5: State your level of agreement with the following statements

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>
I have a great deal of control over how I get my research done.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
My influence over what happens at UT regarding the allocation of library resources is limited.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
I am happy with the research materials and resources available to me through the UT libraries.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
I feel a sense of frustration with the availability of research materials available through the UT libraries.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	

QUESTION 6: Rate how you think about your role as a member of the academic research community.

	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>
I want to find alternative ways to access resources to support my research.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
I want to build my own funds to access or purchase reading materials or other resources for my personal research library.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
I want to become actively involved in efforts to increase state and federal support for research resources at UT libraries.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	
I want to spend time encouraging others to play an active role in identifying new ways to fund or sponsor library resources for research.	1...2...3...4...5...6...7	

SECTION 2: USE OF LIBRARY RESOURCES AND SERVICES

Which of the following resources or services do you use in your work at the University of Toledo?

Indicate how frequently you use each resource by placing an "X" in the appropriate column. Check only one column.

* An example has been provided in the first row of the table below.

Type of Resource	Never Use 1	Rarely Use 2	Not Sure 3	Occasionally Use 4	Frequently Use 5
<i>Disney Information Network</i>					
Journal articles					
Trade/Magazine articles					
Industry/Institutional information					
Government/Industry standards					
Statistical data					
International data					
Library books					
Electronic indexes or abstracting tools					
Print indexes or abstracting tools					
Group library instruction					
Individual instruction					
Library guides for subject resources					
Librarian					
Reference and information desks					
Remote access of library databases from campus					
Remote access of library databases from home					
Access of library databases at the library					
Other: _____					
Other: _____					

In this section, please indicate your current use of the following electronic resources that are available at the University of Toledo.

Indicate how frequently you use each resource by placing an "X" in the appropriate column. Check only one column.

* An example has been provided in the first row of the table below.

Database Title / Name	Never Use 1	Rarely Use 2	Not Sure 3	Occasionally Use 4	Frequently Use 5
<i>Disney Information Network</i>	X				
Business and Company Resource Center					
Business and Industry					
Business Source Premier/Complete					
EconLit					
Lexis/Nexis Academic					
NetLibrary (e-books)					
PAIS International					
PsycInfo					
Research Insight					
Science Citation Index					
Social Sciences Citation Index					
STAT-USA					
Thomson Research					
Other: _____					
Other: _____					
Other: _____					
Other: _____					

In this section, please indicate the likelihood of using the following electronic resources that are currently unavailable at the University of Toledo.

Indicate how frequently you would use each database by placing an "X" in the appropriate column. Check only one column.

Database Title / Name	Highly Unlikely 1	Somewhat Unlikely 2	Not Sure 3	Somewhat Likely 4	Highly Likely 5
ABI/Inform - provides abstracts of articles from international professional publications, academic journals, and trade magazines.					
Choices - measures product and brand usage and media exposure and gives demographic characteristics and media usage for users of specific products.					
Factiva – indexes more than 8000 journals, newspapers, newswires, etc.					
IBISWorld Industry Market Research – provides 680 industry market research reports at the 5-digit NAICS code level.					
Lexis/Nexis Company Dossier – provides basic and in-depth business information on more than 35 million global companies.					
Lexis/Nexis Country Analysis – provides information on 190 countries and 157 industries.					
Lexis/Nexis Statistical - provides access to statistics on a global basis.					
Intel Reports – covers US and international consumer markets with reports that analyze trends and market forecasts on major players in an industry.					
Value Line Investment Survey Online – one page reports on 1700 stocks.					
World Bank e-Library - provides access to the World Bank's full-text collection of books, reports, and other documents.					
Other: _____					

In this section, please indicate your current use of the listed paper resources that are available at the University of Toledo.

Indicate how frequently you use each resource by placing an "X" in the appropriate column. Check only one column.

Database Title / Name	Never Use 1	Rarely Use 2	Don't Know 3	Occasional Use 4	Frequently Use 5
Best's Insurance Reports Life and Health					
D&B Consultants Directory					
D&B Million Dollar Directory					
Industrial Commodity Statistics Yearbook (U.N.)					
JAI Press series (Advances in International Management, Advances in Strategic Management, etc.)					
Mergent Manuals					
National Accounts of OECD Countries					
Nelson Information's Directory of Investment Research					
Quality Control and Applied Statistics: the International Literature Digest					
Standard and Poor's Industry Surveys					
Ward's Business Directory of U.S. Private and Public Companies					
Other: _____					
Other: _____					

Please discuss how you feel about the availability of library resources and how technology affects your job.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

Please return the survey to

Julia Martin, Carlson Library, MS#509.