To be received and placed on file:

Meetings
The Committee met on 4 occasions. There was also one meeting of the university-wide library committee (UCOL), attended by E. N. Anderson in his capacity as Chair of UCR’s Library Committee.

Program Proposals Evaluated
Several proposals for new programs were evaluated from the point of view of library resources. Library staff attended these meetings to present their knowledge, and were extremely helpful and cooperative. We are very grateful. UCR is extremely fortunate to have such a competent, highly professional library staff.

Master’s Degree in Creative Writing and Writing for the Performing Arts: We reported that library resources are minimal for this program—minimally adequate in creative writing, inadequate in writing for performing arts. Serious need exists for acquisitions of films and videos as well as materials on how to write for such media. Since then, strong comments on the questionnaire (see below) stressed inadequacies in the areas.

Graduate program in Mechanical Engineering: We reported that the library has the basic materials needed, but will have to add more, especially journals in automotive, aerospace, and related areas. This will cost money, and we recommended that the money not be taken from other programs at the university. We thus approved the program with qualifications.

Undergraduate Degree in Environmental Sciences between UCR and California State University, Fresno: Originally virtually nothing about library resources was in the plan. A paragraph was added at our urging. Resources seem adequate for undergraduate teaching.

Master’s Degree in Education: Again, library resources were considered adequate at a minimal level. Approved with urging to purchase more resources.

Library Problems
A large number of serious problems beset modern university libraries. UCR is facing most of them, and is coping with varying degrees of success.

The UCOL meeting discussed these in some detail. They are perhaps best introduced in order of their consideration by UCOL, before we move to problems more specific to UCR. (Considerations about the Merced campus and UC Press were raised at UCOL, but are irrelevant here.)

1. Space. Many UC campuses have far worse space problems than we do. The new Science Library and the remodeling of Rivera give us space that is the envy of several campuses. It is also necessary to note, however, that those campuses are buying books and journals more actively than we are, so they have more to store. Our space needs will surely increase with time. A strong statement by UCOL Chair Geerat Vermeij on the general UC-wide problem is attached.

2. Soaring prices of both hard-copy and electronic journals. This is a problem that is rapidly verging on catastrophe, especially for small schools that have significant programs or specialties in areas where journals are both numerous and notoriously expensive—especially the biomedical area, but also chemistry and engineering. UCR fits this profile (as do some other UC campuses), and we are suffering accordingly. A number of alleviative proposals have been made and some were presented at UCOL; none is presently very far along. Most discussed was a plan to start counter-journals run from academic loci (many journals are in fact published by university presses).

Some publishing firms hold libraries to buying both hard-copy and electronic editions of journals, and/or demand that a given university subscribe to a large package of journals, some of which it may not want or need. At present, there seems no easy way to deal with this issue.

3. Archivability of electronic forms. All agreed—at the UCOL meetings and in our independent consultations with CDL personnel and other qualified persons—that there is, currently, no safe or reliable way to archive electronic publications. Magnetic disks and other formats deteriorate rapidly (magnetic diskettes in as little as two years). Hardware and software becomes obsolete in about five years, and forms cannot be retrieved. Remastering publications onto new hardware or in new software would require thousands of hours and incalculable amounts of money, and, in practice, it does not get done except for extremely frequently used items. One need think only of the problems we now have in working with reel-to-reel tape, Hollerith cards, computer tape, and the like.

The most knowledgeable people we have consulted generally agree that this problem will be solved in about ten years. Current development in CD technology is moving rapidly ahead in this area. CD’s with high levels of long-term security (from redundancy, superior materials, etc.) are being developed. At present, though, it is absolutely
IMPERATIVE THAT PRINT COPIES BE ACQUIRED AND STORED FOR ANYTHING THAT WILL BE NEEDED MORE THAN A FEW YEARS IN THE FUTURE.

The archiving problem is less a concern to many scientists, since their publications are often outdated in a year or two. This is, however, by no means true of all scientists. Life scientists, for instance, frequently have to refer to publications for centuries after they were published. Original publications of species descriptions, major theoretical statements, and descriptions of now-extinct species (we still rely on 17th-century descriptions of the dodo!) are only the most obvious examples. Biomedical scientists also need archival capability (consider original descriptions of pathologies, progress reports on prospective studies, etc.). For the humanities and social sciences, the needs for archival resources are obvious.

In general, electronic/digital forms are expensive—much more so than many hoped when the information revolution was beginning. This is a major concern for library budgeters at Systemwide.

4. Melvyl and other online matters: A new firm, Ex Libris, has taken over the work of supplying software for accessing catalogues, databases, etc. We are promised much better service. A problem is that Telnet with its efficient capacity for complex searches will be gone. The new system does not yet make it easy to search across several databases. This will, hopefully, be corrected in a fairly short time.

5. A proposal was made for programs or courses on using the library. California State University campuses do this, and so do a few UC campuses. UCOL Chair Geerat Vermeij strongly recommended such programs for all campuses. UCR has excellent workshops and programs, but no compulsory course. A compulsory course would require much more staff, and might not add much to the excellent existing programs.

The UCR Library Committee considered the use of graduate students as mentors or trainers, and concluded this would be an excellent idea, well worth exploring.

6. The overall acquisitions problem.

By far the worst problem facing academic libraries, in general, is the current explosion in both number and prices of books and periodicals. Some fields, notably hi-tech, are particularly affected, but the phenomenon cuts across all fields. This leads to hard choices for every university.

This is the problem that affects UCR most directly and most seriously. It is now appropriate to turn to UCR specifically.

UCR’s Library Budget and the Acquisitions Problem

Relative to other UC campuses, UCR has had less money than most, and has devoted to the library a lower percentage of what money is available. Several successive chancellors have seen the library as a low priority.

The total University of California system library budget is $231,093,000. Proportionately, we should expect from our share of UC enrollment a budget of around $15,000,000 (less some costs at the systemwide level). In fact, our budget is somewhat over $9,000,000. See the UCR library budget, attached. (For comparison: UCSB’s is about $15,000,000—also shy, given their enrollment—and Irvine’s is about $17,500,000. Berkeley’s is around $35,000,000.)

Money is given to the library as a lump sum. The library then budgets it between salaries, acquisitions, etc. The University (systemwide) also gives a sum over and above this and separate from it, for acquisitions. From this pool, UCR received $600,000 this academic year. (All campuses get similar amounts—even Berkeley got only $600,000.) The money is specifically intended to be a permanent budget item, but it has been treated at UCR as a yearly windfall and given to the library on a one-time basis.

UCR has a Research Library, that is, a library recognized as such by the Association of Research Libraries. This is mainly a recognition of size; criteria are size of collections; serials holdings; annual additions to collections; total staff; total expenditures. There are 111 such libraries in the US and Canada. We rank near the bottom (fluctuating around 107 in recent years), and in fact would not be eligible if we were not already accredited. We may very well lose this status in the near future. This would probably damage our abilities to get grants and other funding, and would certainly damage our ability to hire and retain top-quality academic faculty.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>8,946,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>7,401,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>3,101,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>2,616,776 (it has grown very rapidly since)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>2,571,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>2,080,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>1,954,019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(UCSC does not have a research library). It will be noted that UCR is not far behind UCSB and UCI, but we are growing rapidly in enrollment while falling behind them in absolute numbers and in acquisition rate. (For the record, we were also well behind such schools as Southern Illinois University, the University of Alabama, and Colorado State University.)

There is a large and increasing backlog of books needed; we need to do considerable retrospective buying. This is especially a problem when we hire new faculty, who naturally come with their research agendas, and who seriously need books and periodicals in their areas. Note the new programs above; all require major investment, and Writing for
Performing Arts involves starting acquisitions virtually from scratch. The budgetary needs for retrospective buying are, of course, growing in exponential fashion, as book prices, journal prices, and above all the prices of electronic forms expand. Weeding out unused journals, cutting back on highly specialized books, sending materials to the storage facilities, and planning with other campuses have all helped the situation in past years, but these have been driven about as far as they can go. Ultimately, continued research by faculty and graduate students (in particular) depends on books and journals being available for examination and immediate use. Interlibrary loan continues to be valuable, and is continually being improved; online materials are coming in, and Special Collections books will now be loaned under special circumstances. However, again, ILL is a supplement—not a substitute for having resources available on campus.

Alone among UC campuses, we have been unable to subscribe fully to the California Digital Library, which makes a very large range of periodicals, databases, etc. available in electronic forms. More generally, databases—inevitably expensive—are among the forms most often found lacking at UCR.

In spite of all this, the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 acquisitions budgets are actually lower than that for 1998-1999. UCR's relatively weak library resources make research more difficult for faculty and students. They will also create a problem for recruiting new faculty and good graduate students, and for retaining faculty, unless something is done.

There appears to be no way to tell how much effect library resources have on extramural funding. It seems likely that weak library resources have a negative effect on a school's ability to compete for grants and fellowships, but no one seems to have studied this issue. Considerable questioning at all levels, and scanning the Chronicle, did not disclose any studies or data.

Since UCR is now rapidly growing to the size of UCSB and UCI, one might expect a budget of similar size to theirs—subject to planning for retroactive buying, bringing staff up to reasonable levels, etc. If UCR grows to Berkeley-UCLA size, as has recently been proposed (25,000-30,000 by 2015 is a figure now being mentioned), we will need a Berkeley-sized library budget. Berkeley’s library budget is now approximately $35,000,000.

If extramural funding and research productivity do indeed follow library resources, budgetary increases to the library would be good investments, sure to be repaid (possibly manyfold) over the years.

Another problem of low funding—far less serious, but highly annoying to students—has been the antiquated computer terminals in the libraries. This is being addressed. It is worth remembering, for the future, that computers become outdated soon in this day and age.

**Staffing**

One thing that has impressed us is the high quality and professional competence of the library staff. Morale is surprisingly high, also, given the financial situation. However, several important staff members have left in recent years, culminating in the early retirement of University Librarian James Thompson. Professional staff has increased since 1986, but overall staff is less. This is a worrisome trend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Professional staff</th>
<th>Support staff</th>
<th>Student FTE</th>
<th>Total staff FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library is refraining from filling some positions, in line with hold-back policies across campus (for budgetary reasons). This reduces the availability of staff and puts considerable pressure on existing staff members. Collection development, acquisitions, and reference are among notably affected departments of the library.

One effect of thin staffing that irritates students far more than faculty (judging from informal sampling of the former, vs the questionnaire to the latter) is the inordinate number of books that cannot be found. Sometimes these are stolen; often they are simply mis-shelved. A major program to find these lost sheep is beginning; the chaotic situation in Rivera has made things worse and inhibited dealing with the problem till now.

**The Questionnaire**

When Dr. James Dillon was Chair of the Library Committee some years ago, he circulated a questionnaire concerning the adequacy of the library. We decided to repeat the exercise. His questionnaire could no longer be found. We re-created it in spirit if not in letter. The results are attached.

In general, faculty are moderately—but only moderately—satisfied with the library. We did not ask respondents to identify their home college, but it is clear that science faculty are more satisfied than CHASS faculty—especially those in the humanities. The most dissatisfied respondents were self-identified Arts faculty.

The Committee suggests that this questionnaire be followed up by questionnaires in future years, with responses broken down by college and perhaps by department, and with graduate students surveyed. The possibility of an annual survey, or one at regular multiyear intervals, was raised.

**Deans' Participation**

Beginning this year, a plan to devolve library planning functions on the Deans’ offices is now in place. This plan was released by Executive Vice Chancellor David Warren. Details are not yet worked out. At the beginning of the year,
the Library Committee contacted the deans of the various units, offering support, and mentioning the possibility that the Library Committee could be a liaison between the Deans and between them and the library itself. The Library Committee seems logically placed to be the honest broker, and to take some part in the planning function.

No responses (beyond brief acknowledgement) were received, except from CHASS. Dean O’Brien indicated interest and detailed Associate Dean Philip Brett to deal with the question. Dr. Brett was extremely helpful, carrying out his own survey of the faculty and developing a long and thoughtful report on the whole issue. He has continued to work on library matters. Unfortunately for us, he is leaving for UCLA, and the future of library planning in CHASS is now up in the air.

Conversation with some deans indicated that they are already heavily committed, and have little time to devote to library planning. Many other matters (e.g. benefits, graduate affairs, and space planning) have devolved more and more on Deans’ offices in the last few years, and they are overwhelmed. One is reminded of the “unfunded mandates” of American politics a few years ago.

Library staff reported to the Library Committee that they have also tried to contact the Deans’ offices, and had similar experiences.

At present, in short, the plan to devolve library planning on the Deans’ offices is in an incipient state only. It cannot be made the basis for planning or funding until it is more formally elaborated. We strongly urge that library or college funding not be made contingent on Deans’ involvement until this formalization is done.

Summary

The good news is that UCR has an excellent, professional, competent, dedicated library staff. We are also blessed with space that is the envy of several other UC campuses. The library is basically strong, is still a Research Library, and is quite good in many areas of the sciences. Electronic forms are moving rapidly into place after some initial hitches and shortfalls.

The bad news is that the library is under-funded, leading to reduced staffing in some areas and, above all, to failure to acquire basic important materials—especially journals and databases. Funding is inadequate even for a campus of 10,000. For the enrollments projected for the immediate future, funding levels are not compatible with maintaining a research library or an adequate teaching library. We will be failing our faculty and students if funding does not keep up with faculty and student growth, and with the inevitable diversification, development of new programs and centers, and other aspects of expansion.

A decision will have to be made soon, at the highest levels of budgeting, as to whether we are to maintain a research library or not.

Needs should be prioritized. Library staff have done an excellent job preparing and maintaining suggested priority lists, but the Deans are now involved and need to participate in the planning process.

Acknowledgements

In addition to the library staff at UCR, who have been more than helpful over the year, this report draws on information from several staff members at other libraries and at Systemwide, particularly former UC Librarian Richard Lucier, and Gary Lawrence, Director of Library Planning and Policy at UCOP, as well as Gerry Munoff (UCI), Sarah Pritchard (UCSB), Tom Leonard (UCB), and others.

We are very grateful to the faculty of UCR who answered our questionnaire.

Lucille Chia, History
Robert Luck, Entomology
Mark Midland, Chemistry
John Moore, Biology
Dan Ozer, Psychology
James Thompson, University Librarian
Christine Chang, ASUCR Rep.
Amos Tubb, Graduate Student Rep.
E. N. Anderson, Anthropology (Chair)
Library survey
123 forms were returned.
Results are tallied below. Note that numbers below rarely add up to 123, because some people left some cells blank due to lack of knowledge, or of relevance to their work.

Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiar/books:</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar/jrnls:</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar/elec:</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate/books/res:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/grad:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/UG:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adeq/jrnls/res:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/grad:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/UG:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adeq/elec/res:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/grad:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/UG:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL/research:</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/grad:</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/UG:</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questions about frequency of use produced wildly disparate answers, many of them extremely vague (“many,” “frequently,” “10-50”). Nothing consistent or meaningful can emerge from averaging them. The range is more important:

Books: 1/quarter to over 100 (mode 10/10+)
Journals: zero to over 100 (mode 10)
Electronic: zero to over 100 (many responses of 100 or over 200; the mode was 100/100+!)
ILL: 0 to over 100 (mode 5)

Anonymity is preserved everywhere except on explicitly signed comments, but it was clear from general indications that faculty in the sciences are far more content with the library than are those in the humanities. Among other things, the very highest rankings were from identified science faculty, and the very lowest rankings were all explicitly from humanities faculty, especially in the arts.

Journals emerge as the clear leader in concerns mentioned; 36 comments singled them out (usually journals in general; often specific journals or fields). Books were a long second with 24. Other concerns frequently mentioned include need for hard-copy journal backfiles; lack of staffing; inadequate electronic access. In general, users were satisfied with the staff and management, though there were the inevitable few negatives.

There were a few comments about the problem of missing books and the very slow replacement thereof. I know this is far more of a concern among the students—it would probably rank as their #1 complaint.

Comments

“You find the Native American collection has some of the older books but many never were bought. Since the 1970s much has been published and we have only a few of these. This is the worst collection of books and older journal articles that I have encountered in 30 years of teaching Native American history. Our Ph.D. programs must rely on original works from regional and national repositories and loans.”

“Needs more resources related to wetlands.”

“I have just visited the Univ. of Wisconsin in Madison. Their E-access situation in much like ours. For some journals (e.g. Organic Letters) you can easily call up the current issue, but not previous ones. Inadequate access to back numbers of our electronic journals is a major problem, and it exemplifies why we need to continue our print subscriptions.”

“The library holdings in my field—African history—are not adequate. Leaving aside my own research needs, they are not sufficient for graduate and undergraduate teaching and research. R. Kea.”

“If I were to include media (the media library) in some of the above, the answers would change. You should be asking about media too. The library has terrific staff, as does the media library. But they have been terribly underfunded for years (the two libraries). (Here and throughout I refer to Rivera Library—I rarely use the Science Library.) Several years ago when I was on the Library Committee UCR was ranked 107 of 108 research universities. I learned then of years of underfunding by various chancellors. The most serious inadequacies are with journals and emdia holdings. Years ago (early 90s) we were asked to cut journals dramatically and many were
never added back to the subscription list. Some that have been are missing most or all back issues. I surveyed my department as library liaison this year and was given a huge list of journals to ask for—Public Archive, (illegible), Textual Criticism, GLQ, Journal of Asian-American Studies, Diaspora, Differences, Third Text, Gender and Sexuality, (illeg), and more. I also learned that people were most unhappy with the media library, which has a good collection, independent videos and films but is missing many Hollywood titles and has inadequate viewing and storage facilities. Faculty and grad students also complained about the library’s taking a long time to bind journals and being unwilling to do interlibraryloan resquests for them while they were unavailable.”

“1. Make sure that leading journals are not discontinued!
2. Collection development in specific areas (e.g. Russia and Esat Europe since there is a graduate program in this field)”

“We lack major journals and many more electronic journal subscriptions. Nature and Cell are not available to us on line. Library still does not have Nature Cedli Biology (may be coming) nor does it have Natgure Review Molecular Cell Biology.

“The use of student Business Services to dun for fines without documentation, and with a harassing attitude, and arbitrary power to levy penalty charges. The office is truly Kafka-esque, worse than the IRS.”

“PLEASE DO SOMETHING! My main concern is not with the science library but the humanities library. This has become so bad there have been threats to demote its status from ‘research-level’ to worse. There are large nubmers of uncatalogued boks in storage.”

“Hours of operation and staff help.”

“The staff in the library are wonderful. The help given to faculty is exceptional. The library needs more money-a much larger budget to hire more staff and bring the library collections in all areas up to other UC campuses. We lag behind all other UC libraries. We can never become a first-rate university without a first-rate library collection. Expand the budget of the library. Also, raise the salaries of the library staff. They are wonderful and we are fortunate to have them at UCR. Alexandra Maryanski.”


“Lack of up to date collection of books and journals in my area.”

“New books acquired should be listed in an email or posted in addition to having them on the shelf near the entryway. The books should be grouped by subject. New book acquisitions are needed for tree crop epidemiology, and mycology.”

“The library must be funded to purchase all appropriate books and journals”

“Continue and augment the Interlibrary Loan Dept. Without it, research and teaching in my field would be impossible! Increase the money for electronic and CDRoms—as well as buying more books!”

“Use CAL/Current Contents daily, sometimes several times daily. Also have 2 weekly automatic updates with key words.”

“Many journals in my field (developmental psychology) we do not hold and interlibrary loan and request services are quite slow.”

“No copying services on weekends?! Would be good to collect Asian-language material in a discrete area.”

“None, I think it is excellent, esp the quick response of ILL.”

“Not enough staff in the various sections of the library. This is important for safety reasons as well as to obtain assistance.”

“I think that the library is excellent. Over 90% of the time, it has what I need, and the other 10% of the time, the interlibrary loan is fast. I especially like the on-line catalogue so I can check for things from my office.” (Entomology)

“Most of the specialized research I do has required interlibrary loan requests; basic and introductory materials are often found at Rivera, but just as often they seem to be lost or misplaced (due to the renovations?).”

“1) Lack of call number guide. Most computer terminals are occupied, so if I am led from one reference to another in the library, I have to go downstairs to check the call number by reference to current holdings. I have suggested a tasteful listing on each floor, but to no avail.
2) Even better would be to have journals arranged by title. I voted for this at the time of the move as did everyone else I know, but it didn’t happen.
3) The book collections are terribly out-of-date even for teaching purposes (med students).
4) I understand the horrendous costs of journals, but hopefully these costs will come down in the future at least for on-line versions, so that we can subscribe to more.
5) with modern computers, I do not understand why last checkout has to be 15 mins before closing.
6) In summer the building is too cold. I have a special library sweater, but this is frequently insufficient.”
“It is important to maintain a good collection and not revert to electronic holdings which are expensive and not always accessible. Periodical collections must also be maintained in face of rising costs. More funds should be allocated to non-electronic books and periodicals.”

“A quiet secured environment in which to escape interruptions.
Continued telnet access to Melvyl.”

“Expanding its general collections (i.e., all of them), and its collections of contemporary fiction and poetry.”

“Continue to get access to electronic holdings.”

“The collection is inadequate—both in terms of books and journals; we are falling hopelessly behind; insufficient funding for collection development; poor leadership; poor physical resources; UCR’s Rivera Library is a joke with respect to the Chancellor’s goal of a preeminent research university.”

“I have 2 major concerns:
1- Plans to switch to electronic journals in order, presumably, to save space. This is a terrible idea, if it means the library will no longer possess any hardbound copies of journals. Computerization is all the rage right now, but the implications for reading and scholarship have not been thought through well. We should not dispense with actual books!
2- The lack of funds for book and journal purchases. Rivera library lags far behind other UC campuses—or so it seems to me—And yet the funding of a research library with broad and deep holdings is a key prerequisite for a 1st-rate university.” (History)

“The staff is very slow, often unhelpful, and seem badly trained. I’m very concerned that our acquisitions in my area are slow and inadequate. We’re falling behind other UC schools.” (Art History)

“We must start considering set the East Asian collection aside from the rest of the library, as all major research libraries do. Not to do so is simply too provincial and short-sighted.”

“Strong points: 1) Collections development (staff and collections), 2) interlibrary loan (staff and efficiency), 3) special collections (staff and knowledge).
Weak points: 1) Circulation (not reference) – knowledge of staff. 2) reserve. 3) Architecture of Rivera redesign—poor design, inappropriate renovation—was Academic Senate consulted on this?”

“The library is doing a great job. In general it is important to get as many on-line subscriptions as possible as accessing articles via the web is our current most frequent use of the library.” (Cell Biology)

“Some important new items in the field of Victorian Lit. not acquired. E.g Tim Hilton’s new life of Ruskin (vol 2).”

“More money, more permanent staff, more books, more journals, far better attitude of collection and development toward faculty needs; entirely new UCR administration.”

“Too many relevant journals are not accessible at UCR.”

“Overall that we increase the budget to purchase new books in the Humanities, especially cultural and ethnic studies, and film and visual cultures. The Latina/o Studies holdings across the board need bolstering.”

“Purchase of recent books and maintaining scholarly journals.”

“Better selection of journals.”

“I’m a new user, but I can see problem areas in electronic access coverage and hard copy coverage. The overlap in simply incomplete.”

“Several major journals are still not online: Cell, Nature, Nature Biotech [? Illegible]”

“Medical journals are being phased out!”

“Media collection (films and other media) is pathetic; even when funds exist for purchase, cataloguing is slow and communication with possible users barely sporadic. Subscription to electronic databases, etc., has improved this year (for example, thank you for OED, ARTFL!), but has a long way to a true world-class research library.
Some areas are very well collected, others largely ignored (example: Francophone literature, Italian literature). I realize as a faculty member that I no longer have time to give the input I once did (and should again), but that doesn’t solve the problem.
Many thanks, though, for your recent efforts!
I’m not blaming the librarians who are very dedicated, but rather the funding situation. If we’re going to be a world-class university we must develop a true research library.”

“—Godawful noise and poor behavior of students in library—it’s disgusting inside.."
“Overworked librarians
Systemwide non-book lovers”

“Sorry to present such as negative evaluation [mostly 2’s] but your holdings in my field (Native American history east of the Mississippi) are simply not very good.”

“Our Rivera Library does, indeed, contain many important works, even some of a rather esoteric nature. However, many of the more modern works of literature, for example, especially those of Latin America (including Brazil and the French- and English-speaking Caribbean) we do not have. Important journals, such as, for example, *The Journal of Caribbean Studies* or *America Negra*, are also not being subscribed to. We need to update our collections in Latin American stuff and in African literature, especially now that Africa is receiving more attention than ever in the media and elsewhere. Perhaps, as Professor Raymond Williams and I suggested some weeks ago to Assoc. Dean Philip Brett, we might consider the purchase of some private collections as they become available; we gave Dean Brett a list of one of them to pass on to the folks at the Rivera Library. Now that we finally have another Latin American bibliographer, we hope that our Latin American collection can be brought up to date, especially not forgetting countries such as Belize, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Guyana, Surinam, French Guinana, and Brazil.

Tibi a me gratia referenda est.”

“The library needs to renew subscriptions to foreign-language journals in history of science, medicine, and technology.
2) The library needs to have an aggressive, well-funded program to build up a special collections in science, medicine, and technology. No grad program can be offered in these fields w/o extensive special collections on this campus. Lack of special collections is a sign that we are not a real or serious research university in these or any fields.”

“1. Losing access to hard copies of journals.
2. Keeping up subscriptions to existing journals and starting subscriptions to new journals.”

“Concerned with low/shrinking financial support for acquisition of journals and books.”

“1) Journals—Budget hopelessly inadequate.
2) Books- almost as bad
3) Electronic media—almost as bad
4) Staff—FAR too little staffing, especially in collection development and acquisitions. Need to at least double staff there. Current situation is getting rapidly worse—the faculty is losing the ability to do research here.”

“I’m the new Chair of Anthropology and need to look more carefully at library resources; hence my responses are tentative ones. T. Patterson.”

“Building electronic journal database; accessibility off-campus; maintaining high-quality book collection.”

“My greatest concern is the lack of journals in my field. My second greatest concern is the lack of books in my field. My fields are 19th, c20th and 21st Century American literature as well as criticism and critical and cultural theory. History is a strong secondary field. I am also concerned that in the past I have been billed for books I returned.”

“Increase electronic holdings; make easier to find e-journals.”

“Some of the books, in series, are classified differently as quasi-journals, and are thus restricted in circulation. This should be improved since it hinders research referencing. Missing books are rarely found, and have to be replaced. This problem exists both in Rivera and Science libraries.”

“Not enough journals, not enough books. I’m forced to use interlibrary loan often! (Whereas in other universities I almost never had to).”

“Need to incorporate Lexis-Nexis as a permanent feature of the library.”

“When I came to UCR I was surprised to see that the library did not have some commonly used editions of classic works in philosophy (my field) that I have been using in my undergraduate courses for several years.”

“I believe that every researcher including graduate students on campus needs to have online access, from their office, to full text research articles from every important journal. I doubt that the journals actually in the library will be used very much in the not too distant future.”

“I was at a meeting/event with student leaders last night. They long for the library to have a small social section where coffee is available (Starbucks was mentioned, of course!). They want to study there in the evenings, but think a coffee area, a la Barnes and Noble, would enhance the appeal. They recognize the challenges, as the library isn’t a bookstore. But I thought you would want to know of this interest.”
“The science library staff is just superb. My particular area of research is unusual for UCR (veterinary and animal science). Consequently, our holdings fairly often are inadequate. However, the interlibrary loan works well. I think the electronic ILL will be nice.”

“—Ill-trained students who mis-shelve books
--deteriorating quality of reference services; many of staff either ill-informed, apathetic, or impolite
--missing/not readily available books, allegedly due to current relocation/storage.”

“We are hopelessly behind—in art, film/video, new technologies, support of DVD acquisition.” (Art; from a form giving particularly low ratings to collections)

“Most concerned about periodicals—particularly as they come to be distributed online: cost of online seems very high. But, hard-copy costs are great, as well.”

“It needs more books.”

“Journal collections are inadequate and deteriorating, it seems.”

“The library is understaffed and underfunded, particularly as far as journals are concerned.”

“I’m very concerned about limited journal holdings in the areas of math education, science education, and education of linguistically diverse students. Please contact me for a list of journals that I would like to see at Rivera/Science library. M. Echevarria.” (This form ranked the library particularly low.)

“$!”

“Keeping up with journal and electronic subscriptions.”

“Have no concerns—science library and librarians are excellent!”

“I am concerned that electronic resources will replace hard resources to an unreasonable extent in the future but at the moment I’m satisfied.”

“For me it is most useful to have university site licenses for journals, so that they can be accessed by any university IP address. I find I use the UCSD library electronic journal site (biomedical) a lot.”

“Books are underbudgeted, journals are underbudgeted, poor leadership at the highest levels of library, lack of concern for faculty input, poor organization.”

“—Dropping behind in acquisition for undergrad teaching
--Persistent staff shortages
--Weak reserve system; little used by students (according to their reports, which seem odd…)”

“Maintaining journal subscriptions; loss of the van to UCLA”

“The only problem I have is being unable to access the electronic holdings while out of town (e.g. on sabbatical or other travel). Could some type of proxy service be set up for faculty?” (Botany; the only form that ranked the library 5 in all categories!)

“Librarian salaries are too low. We are not competitive and will lose our best people unless a remedy is expeditiously implemented.”

“I worry about not keeping buying journals and new monographs because of the cost. I encourage increased budgets for books and journals.”

“A larger proportion of available funds needs to be allocated to journals rather than books. G. I. Hatton.” (Cell Biology)

“1. Purchase of new books/journals is lagging…this becomes more and more problematic over time.
2. Materials in the library collection often not available, and when checked out, takes too long to gain access.”

“More hydrologic journals.”

“Comments on the Collection
Eric Schwitzgebel, Philosophy Department
Research Areas: Philosophy of Psychology, Philosophy of Mind
Currently serving as library liaison for the Philosophy Department
Books
The collection is mostly adequate. I depend heavily on Interlibrary Loan for specialized texts that UCR is unable to afford. The choices of texts are good, but I’d like to see more books. Often important texts that are lost are not swiftly replaced.
**Journals**

The collection is pretty good, though limited in its choice of journals in specialized subfields.

**Electronic Holdings**

I make constant use of, and greatly appreciate, the PsycInfo database, but in other respects the electronic holdings are inadequate. First, it is essential to the health of philosophy research that The Philosopher’s Index be made available electronically. This should be a top priority of the library. Currently the Philosophy Department pays for a subscription to the Index, receiving a CD every quarter, which is kept in the Philosophy Department office. Only one person can use it at a time. It is unavailable from off campus. It is unavailable for spontaneous searches when one wants to look something up quickly in passing (in the midst of composing an email, say). It is unavailable to undergraduates in philosophy. It is unavailable to people in other disciplines doing interdisciplinary work that intersects philosophy. I wish to convey this point as strongly as possible. The only reason I marked a “2” instead of a “1” on the quality of the existing electronic resources is because my research involves a lot of psychology, and the PsycInfo database is excellent.

Furthermore, the electronic journal database is very disorganized and difficult to use. Often journals listed as available are a year or more behind the print versions. Sometimes journals are not available through CDL but are available if one goes directly to a provider’s website (e.g., Ingentia). Articles available only in html format are sometimes difficult to print accurately. If the University of California wishes to have a serious electronic database of recent journals articles, the interface needs to be redesigned and much more clearly organized. The collection of journals available is also strange (though I know that some of this is due to the publishers)—major journals unavailable and insignificant journals available.

A comment on interlibrary loan: Patrons should be able electronically to access their pending ILL requests—for articles as well as books.