

March 14, 2004

Report on 2003/2004 GSA Library Survey
by Jim Rovira, GSA President 03/04

Table of Contents

1. Who participated in the survey? Student Demographic Data.
2. Overview of Section I: Library Equipment and Environment.
3. Overview of Section II: Library Orientation and Services.
4. Overview of Section III: Library Carrels and Lockers.
5. Overview of Section IV: Library Holdings.
6. Conclusion.

Who participated in the survey? Demographic Data

As of 5 p.m. on Friday, March 12th ninety Drew graduate students completed the 2003/2004 GSA Library Survey. Two additional students completed the survey by 7 a.m. the following morning, but since data analysis had already begun their numerical data wasn't incorporated into the survey. However, their comments are included with other student comments. It should be noted that even though 90 students participated, not every student answered every question nor was required to answer every question, so results are based upon the number of students that did answer. Some students mentioned that they didn't answer questions because they were not pertinent to them, others may have simply not clicked their mouse button/touchpad hard enough. No certain conclusions can be drawn from unanswered questions, and they were not factored in to averages for numerical data. Most questions saw over 80 student responses. Some, such as those about lockers, had somewhat lower response rates, but this is probably reflective of an overall low interest in lockers by the graduate student population as indicated by survey data.

Ninety graduate students is a significant response, representing 16% of the 552 graduate students enrolled at Drew as of the Fall 2003 term (*Drew University Fact Book*), and a great improvement over the 47 students who participated in the GSA Housing Survey and the 37 students who participated in the Office of Financial Assistance Cost of Attendance survey used to set student budgets.

Where did survey respondents live? Ninety responses is an even larger percentage of Drew students who have interest in the Library, as a significant number of Drew's graduate students live well off campus so are largely unable to benefit from Library services. As of August 25th, 2003, only 342 of 552 currently enrolled students resided in New Jersey (e-mail sent to Jim Rovira by the Office of Institutional Research 8/25/03). Demographic data collected by the survey reflects that student interest in the survey drops dramatically for students who live outside New Jersey. 56 respondents lived in NJ, 10 more in NY and PA combined, and one each from CN, OH, MI, Korea, and Canada (72 respondents provided this information). 78% of survey respondents,

therefore, live in NJ, while only 61% of Drew's entire graduate student population lives in NJ. 91% of survey respondents live in NJ, NY, and PA combined.

Survey participation by program: Arts and Letters students were underrepresented, making up approximately 30% of Drew's graduate student population (*Fact Book*) but slightly less than 1% of survey respondents (almost 0.9%). This may be partially the result of Arts and Letters students not checking their e-mail or the GSA website, and it may be partially reflective of the importance of the Library to students in this program. The overwhelming majority of students (74/90 or 82%) are enrolled in the Ph.D. program, with roughly proportional numbers from each program. T&R students made up the largest number of respondents, followed by MHL, Biblical Studies, English, and then students from different religion programs. Forty three respondents are in coursework, 30 students in their dissertation stage (prospectus or writing), the rest either working on their M.A. thesis or in different sections of maintaining matriculation.

The majority of graduate students work part or full time (75 respondents or 83%, about 1/3 of these full time and 2/3 part time) for an average of approximately 22 hours per week, commuting an average of 44 minutes from home or work to campus. 72% of respondents are commuters. Almost half (47%) have children. Almost half consider themselves their children's primary caregiver during the day, while slightly more than half rely upon daycare or spouses to care for their children. The average student uses the library about 15 days per month for about 4 hours per day and previously attended an institution with about 7500 students. This last figure most likely represents a fairly even divide between students who came to Drew from large universities and students who came to Drew from smaller colleges.

Questions I failed to ask on the survey (by oversight):

- Question to determine male/female ratio of survey respondents.
- Question to determine marital status. This would help identify the proportion of single parents and their special needs.
- Option for "graduate special" under "program of study."
- "Are you satisfied with library hours?" Even without asking this question, several students volunteered comments which will be included in the narrative below.
- "Do you work for the library" (at least one respondent self identified as a library employee.)
- "Are you a graduate student?"

Data handling: in questions that allowed students to directly input numerical data (e.g., number of hours worked per week), answers such as "15-20" were converted to a single numerical value representing a midrange: "17.5." Since the "length of commute" question didn't specify length in miles or time, some students answered in hours, some in minutes, and some in distances. Hours were converted to minutes. Distances were converted to minutes at the rate 15 minutes for the first 5 miles then approximately one mile per minute after that, or 60 mph. I made an HTML coding error on questions 44 and 45 that affected the first eleven students submitting data. This error was corrected as

soon as it was brought to my attention. In nine of eleven cases the input for question 45 was not recorded, in 2 of 11 cases neither value was recorded. Since all of the first eleven students submitted e-mails requesting coffee in the order in which they filled out the survey, I was able to explain the problem to these students, query them for their answers by e-mail, and input their answers manually after the survey closed. Seven of eleven students responded to my query, so this error affected only 4 respondents out of 90, and of those four only those who chose to answer both questions 44 and 45.

Interpreting numerical data: it should be recognized that “2.5” is the middle value for questions answered on a scale of 1-4, 1 being lowest and 4 being highest. Averages above 2.26 and below 2.75 will be interpreted as “ambivalent,” while averages above 2.76 will be interpreted as “positive” and averages below 2.25 as negative. Since I’m having to prepare survey data as quickly as possible for an upcoming GSA meeting on March 16th, and a Library Committee meeting on March 24th, I only calculated the mean for numerical data submitted, not the median nor the mode.

Overview of Section I: Library Equipment and Environment

Students are ambivalent about the number of computers, copiers, microfiche viewers, and microfilm viewers in the library, the average response being 2.5. Numerical responses were more negative about their quality (2.33). Comments about microfilm and microfiche viewers were generally very negative, saying they were “abysmal” and “like etching them [the copies] by hand.” Students dislike having to use dimes which occasionally seem like they are “rejected for no reason”: comments indicate that students would like to be able to use their cards to pay for these services as they do at the copier, and would like to have a change machine and a machine that allows students to add funds to their card in the Library. There were some complaints about the quality of the copiers but some positive comments as well (more in the form of expressed non-complaint: “I don’t have problems with the copiers.”) There were consistent complaints about computers not working, sometimes for extended periods of time, and about the screens being “fuzzy,” as well as consistent complaints about unsupervised children hoarding and abusing the computers during evening hours. While no questions were asked about printers, several students commented about them not properly working either.

An overwhelming majority of students queried use the Library website (89%), and are positive about website content (3.13) and less positive about its organization (2.93). 91% of students queried are aware of the ability to log in to the library website to view their student accounts and approximately 81% of students have done so in the past. No one seems to like the new library catalog, especially the search functions, and off campus students consistently said they are unable to access restricted areas (such as journals) – the proxy server doesn’t seem to be working for them. There were no positive comments about off campus access of restricted areas of the Library website on the survey.

Students were generally positive about the bathrooms and there were few, if any, comments about them. A few students complained about the heating; the numerical score for this question was ambivalent (2.7), as was the question about noise in the Library

(2.71). Several students commented about too much noise in the Library, sometimes from undergraduates, sometimes from tours or orientations, one about reference desk staff speaking too loudly in the rotunda. More than one complained about cell phone use. Students are generally positive about feeling safe in the Library (3.32), but think the Library is too small (2.78), and there were several comments to this effect scattered throughout the survey.

The overall feeling in this section was that Library equipment is badly in need of upgrading or replacement. This is at least partially a budgetary issue and the GSA is willing to work with the Library to advocate for funds to improve Library equipment. Some students, however, also feel this is partially a maintenance and use issue, and that perhaps children's use of Library computers should be curbed.

Overview of Section II: Library Orientation and Services

Orientation: Approximately 2/3 of respondents said they attended an orientation session, and students were generally positive about the content of orientation (2.97). Most would not attend a refresher session if it was offered, but a significant number would (42%). An overwhelming majority of students feel they can locate resources in the Library without assistance (91%), and students are generally positive about the organization of the Library itself (3.12). One student complained that orientation was too basic, but another specifically mentioned Jody Caldwell's "step by step instructions" in a very positive light and suggested having smaller orientation groups broken up by program of study (English, MHL, Biblical Studies, etc.). Another respondent said that having the 100s, 300s, and 800s on the same floor was counterintuitive. Since numerical responses were generally very positive these complaints should be interpreted as suggestions for improvement rather than the identification of serious problems; if 91% of students feel they can locate resources without help then either orientation is very successful, the Library's organization is sufficiently transparent, respondents have been on campus long enough to have figured out the Library's organization, or a combination of these.

Circulation Desk: Respondents generally use the circulation desk (3.25). They feel it is well staffed (3.3), competent (3.12), provides the services they need (3.26), and feel very strongly that circulation desk staff is courteous (3.5). Comments about the circulation desk were generally positive as well. One respondent said that circulation desk staff occasionally seems "more interested in studying than in service" and that "sometimes there are 3-4 students in the back office and only one out front," but still qualified his or her comments with, "I have no big complaints about current staffing." One respondent complained about the reserve line getting long sometimes, especially during the beginning of the semester, and that only one student seemed able to process reserve requests. One student commented that the hole punches and staplers by the reserve desk were often in disrepair.

Reference Desk:

Students feel the reference desk is adequately (3.17) and competently (3.4) staffed. Students feel it provides the services they need (3.31) and strongly feel that staff are courteous (3.54). They don't use it as often as the circulation desk, however (2.62). Comments were generally glowing about the reference desk. One student said it was "absolutely spectacular" and another that staff are "wonderful beyond words" (both were combined comments about the Interlibrary Loan Office and the Reference Desk). One student described reference desk staff as "courteous, kind, and accommodating." Negative comments about the reference desk were almost exclusively about the hours it was open. Students who work full time or use the Library in the evening feel they have no support, since they can only use the Library on weekends or in the evening. There is no support for printers out of toner or computers going down when the reference desk is closed. One student felt that reference desk staff weren't adequately knowledgeable about Library computers to service them as needed; one said they didn't go out of their way to be courteous but were "fine," but also mentioned limited experience with the reference desk.

The Interlibrary Loan Office:

Students' most glowing reviews were reserved for the Interlibrary Loan Office. Respondents felt it was adequately staffed (3.55), very competent (3.65) and very courteous (3.68), and that it provides the services they need (3.58). Students seem to use it regularly (2.98). Descriptions of the Interlibrary Loan Office included comments such as "great," "wonderful beyond words," and "one of the best services around." This last student was a dissertation stage student who used ILL regularly, adding to his or her positive comments that this office could use more help. More positive comments about the Interlibrary Loan Office are found in the Library Holdings section below, as students rely heavily upon Interlibrary Loan when Drew doesn't have adequate resources for their field of study.

Library Administration:

Numerical data indicates that respondents generally feel Library administration is competent (3.16) and courteous (3.07), but there is ambivalence in the numerical data about Library administration taking graduate students' needs seriously (2.68). Two students said they had no interaction with Library administration so couldn't comment. One of these students left questions relating to Library administration unanswered. The other student gave Library administration a score of straight 4s, saying in his or her comments that there was no way to answer "n/a." There were no positive comments about Library administration. Rather than try to provide a summary of these somewhat detailed responses, they will just be reproduced here:

"I think that graduate students are a very low priority to library administration, as they are to most of the rest of the university."

"The problems begin with those addressed in questions 34-36, and then it all filters down from there. The library administration is NOT considerate of

graduate student needs. The library administration patently caters to the needs of undergraduates, particularly in terms of hours, study space, and services.”

“The Director reported that he has received complaints about the lack of use of Baldwin and Pilling. There has been no report of formal complaints coming from the College Faculty Committee or the SGA. It appears individual complaints are determining library policy in this matter and I do not think this is a good precedent to follow.”

“Seeing the rate of service and hours maintenance, it does not seem at all that the library is oriented toward helping graduate students. The horrifying level of cutting down hours when the undergraduates are gone, the lack of adequate circulation desk services, the constant maltreatment of graduate students who want to have and keep carrels, the almost kindergarten-like treatment of graduate students with carrels (sign in requirements that are ridiculous and absurd) make most graduate students feel that the library, which is supposed to be the haven for grad students, is the most hostile place for them. The circulation and reference staff are quite helpful, but the attitude of the administrative staff is often quite negative and disrespectful. Hours are short and cut at every chance available, the reason used is lack of staff, which mostly means the undergraduates are gone, and so no one else is deemed important.”

“It is hard to agree that graduate students needs are taken seriously when, just for example, the library is closed 4 weekend days in March and at 5 p.m. during spring break (which has nothing to do with graduate students) when defense copies of dissertations are due on March 22. Also in March, many graduate students are preparing for presentations at the Mid-Atlantic Regional meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and American Academy of Religion (March 18-19), but such students cannot count on using the library on the two weekends that precede it.”

“Seems fine but sense is that grad students needs should be more attentively responded to; e.g., planning without graduate students’ input.”

“Services - I don't know who the library administration is...and there was no place to answer N/A” [This is the student who scored Library administration straight 4s.]

“I haven't had any interaction with library administration.” [This is the student who left Library administration questions blank.]

It should be clear from the comments above that graduate students’ inferences about Library administration are largely the result of Library hours and the treatment of students with carrels. Given the high percentage of graduate students who work (2/3 of respondents) and have children (almost 1/2 of respondents), shortened Library hours (M-F, 9 a.m. – 5 p.m.) during any time of the year effectively bars a significant number of

graduate students from using the Library. While last summer's extended hours are appreciated, this doesn't appear to be enough. It should be kept in mind that many graduate students with children may not be able to come to the Library until after their spouses return from work, and that there is no flexible, affordable, short term child care available on campus.

Overview of Section III: Library Carrels and Lockers

Carrels: The vast majority of respondents know what a carrel is (97%) and are aware of carrel availability (79%). It should be noted at this point that on December 6th I sent an e-mail to graduate students informing them that some carrels were unassigned and encouraging them to apply if they fit eligibility criteria. A link to the online carrel and locker policy was included in this e-mail. The average student expressed interest in having a carrel (2.94) and 60% of students said they could find the carrel policy on the Library website. An average of 64% of respondents either used to have a carrel (37%) or currently have a carrel (27%).

Students are unhappy with current carrel policy (2.15) and availability (2.08), and are probably best described as hostile to the idea of large study tables in place of the current carrels (1.74). This was the most negative response on the entire survey. Comments about carrels were the most extensive and detailed in the survey. Since they would be difficult to summarize, I have copied and pasted them in their entirety below. Overall, carrel comments do reflect a pattern of complaints: in relationship to study carrels, students feel over monitored and over controlled by the Library, not treated with respect, and that the current carrel policy is not working. Only three comments out of 24 in the Carrel and Locker section expressed unqualified praise for the current carrel policy, one of these from a student who said the Library was primarily for undergraduate students. Students did express scattered concern about the Library being too small, and students seem to recognize that carrel space being the only space on campus (almost) dedicated to graduate student study is part of the problem.

Carrels are enough of an issue that four comments were made about them in Section 1:

“We need individual carrels with lockable doors. I am still not sure about lockers--I use the library less since I am doing DS writing--but I would like to be able to use one occasionally. Also--if I had a lockable, individual carrel where I could have a computer, etc., perhaps I might do more of my writing there.”

“The issue and use of library carrels leaves a lot to be desired. That is one area that could do with some organization and sensitivity to the needs of graduate students. Remember these are responsible working people who would like the least of disturbance or unnecessary requirements.”

“As for the library space, I have never had a study carrel. I am finishing language exams currently and will then study for comprehensive exams. I would LOVE to

have the opportunity to utilize a carrel in the near future. Please keep this an option for as many as possible.”

“Though space may be a real concern, so is carrel space for graduate students.”

“Regarding Q10: Having the writing center (with open door) within a graduate study area is a bad idea. Why not put it in the basement by the audio visual? Or within the first floor administration area? Ditto for the noisy classroom off of the Cornell room.”

Section II carrel comments. In addition to those quoted above in reference to Library Administration, students also posted these comments:

“I am frustrated with how many books are supposed to be on the shelf but aren't (are missing). I wonder whether grad students with carrels hoard books without checking them out.”

“I wish graduate students had more space to study without any distraction.”

“I feel the library recall/reserve system should take into account students who have books in carrels.”

And these in Section III:

“I think the current carrel policy isn't working and needs to be seriously revised.”

“Obviously, having a locker only interests me if I can no longer make use of a carrel. The carrel policy is in terrible need of revision. Moreover, the administration's attitude toward those who have carrels needs an adjustment as well. We are not children. My study carrel is being used more than just when I'm sitting there working. I'm not engaged in relatively small-scale work that revolves around the semester cycle. I am preparing for multiple exams of extended length and writing the equivalent of a book, all of which takes place over an extended period of time. Granted, it's not likely that I will bring the school the sort of money that the undergraduates do and will continue to provide. However, as a graduate student working on a terminal degree, I am valuable to the school in other ways, and I am deserved of equal support from the library, considerate of my specific needs (which are different than those of undergraduates), for the successful completion of my program. Large study tables aren't a bad idea, provided they could be used in conjunction with lockers, and that they were reserved for graduate student use only.”

“Graduate students require permanent study space, once in the comp stage onward. To limit that space, and to require constant reapplication while still in same stage (comp, prospectus) is annoying and stressful at a time when focus

should be only on research/study. Thus, the time limitations and length limitations are not consistent with the needs of graduate students.”

“Lockers are a bad idea. Graduate students who use carrels should have 24 hr. access.”

“Graduate students should have carrels available to them. Period. [...] I personally would have answered with a negative number (around -9 on a scale of 1 to 10) had that been an option. I am really frustrated with the carrel situation. All I want is a secure, stable place to work for 3 to 4 LONG days a week without having to worry about silliness like signing in, being checked up on and/or constantly having to renew my application. The 5-hour carrels are also problematic. I tried that route. First, someone had stuffed all the drawers with his books and papers so I had to remove them in order to secure my laptop when I went for breaks (securing my laptop is a major concern as my last laptop was stolen from the library). It was annoying to have to watch the clock and renew after 5 hours. After 10 hours, I was still there. (When I come to the library, I really hunker down). I cleared out my papers etc. and went downstairs. *En route* to returning the key and card, I stopped by the reference to visit with Bruce L. about my dissertation. He was extremely helpful but this made me 15 minutes (or so) late to return my key and card. I WAS CHARGED A LATE FEE. This is petty and ridiculous. To be honest, I've been avoiding/boycotting the library for months due to my irritation at the carrel situation. I saw the library director saw me and made a point of coming over to visit, chat pleasantly and thank me for my patience regarding graduate carrels. Given that and the fact that I had enjoyed a productive day at the library after a long absence, I was feeling fairly good about the library for once. The late fee, however, returned me to my accustomed bitter, annoyed state.”

“The way graduate students are pushed out of carrels is a sad story. I think the GSA should have more say regarding the use of graduate study space.”

“See above comment [in previous section] also. Was unaware carrel policy was on web, etc. Biggest issue here: we need private, locked carrels where our stuff is ours and not open to perusal or theft by any Tom, Dick or Mary that comes by. Drew carrels have always been inadequate. I suggest kicking out faculty offices and moving graduate students in. Faculty should be satisfied with offices in their department areas. There may also be other spaces available in the library--like the Media area in the basement; this simply does NOT need to be in the library; similarly the conference and publications offices. These could and should all be carrels. The library building should be a library, NOT a collection of assorted non-library related university offices.”

“I believe that more graduate students should have access to carrels. Graduate work requires large amounts of library materials which cannot be easily transported back and forth from home or moved from a locker to a work space.

Graduate students should also have access to carrels during comprehensive exams, when they are doing some of their most extensive reading. Getting rid of carrels in favor of open study tables is NOT an adequate substitution. Study tables offer less privacy and leave no space for storage of materials. Use of carrels cannot be adequately determined by the current method of walking through the area at predetermined times to make a head count. People use carrels at different times in the day and may leave the carrel to go elsewhere in the library and be inaccurately counted. In addition, graduate students at Drew receive little funding relative to other institutions. The last thing that they should have to worry about is having enough space to do their work.”

“I believe the carrel policy has become far too rigid. I recognize the fact that there were many students using carrel space only to store books, but at the same time there were several students who regularly used carrels (either daily or a couple of times/week) who were evicted unnecessarily because they were not at the comps. level or because they were not using the carrel often enough. I will be FURIOUS if a shift is made from carrels to study tables. This is hardly conducive to the long term study/research use of graduate students.”

“I don't know what a carrel is, or what it's for.”

“There have been a lot of ill-will and power-play between the library administration and graduate students. Instead of helping them be the serious scholars they are, graduate students are treated like children, with ridiculous expectations and sign-in requirements, and are faced with the attitude that the library administration is its parent/guardian figure, who presumes to tell graduate students how much and how long they must study in order to keep a carrel. The attitude is intensely disrespectful, as if students do not have real lives as well, and the policies of the administration have only made graduate students feel that instead of being an educational service supposed to HELP students, the administration deems itself to be some kind of police service who decide to take control of graduate students' lives. The attitude, and the services offered, with all their conditionality, is not only ridiculous and laughable, but also shows a deeper problem on the part of the administration to accept with due respect who graduate students are and what they do. Please stop this ridiculous behavior, and help us be scholars, instead of hindering us and treating us like children who need to be controlled. If this is a control issue, it needs to be taken care of, and graduate students not victimized. Stupid sign in regulations are irritating, and disturbing, since students become forced to live their lives according to library rules, instead of being encouraged in their scholarship and not adding unrequired stress to their already difficult lives.”

“I have been satisfied with carrels, but I realize that students starting after me have had less opportunities.”

“Have no locker experience to comment on. Carrel space is inadequate; the policy does not take graduate student life or needs into consideration. Please do not expect people who already work 20 hours a week outside the library to come in 30 hours per week just to hold onto their carrel space. That's ridiculous. Also, removing people who NEVER use their space is fair; but limiting the point during our graduate process we should be entitled to a carrel is wrong.”

“To get a carrel was a struggle; to get a 1-person carrel when I reached dissertation writing time (after four years of WORKING in the library) was a struggle too.”

“The library carrel policies, as I understand them, have not only been arbitrarily changed and enforced, but are also unusually restrictive, involving hours logged or random monitoring and the possibility of losing a carrel if one is off-campus for a brief period. This has to change. A graduate program that does not treat graduate students as responsible adults by not giving them adequate space and personal responsibility is unacceptable. Further it is unclear to me why G-deck was cut back (or even how someone got space on G-deck to begin with) or how the study closets are assigned.”

“Graduate students need a repository for their papers and books and the place where they work. Five days/week requirement for use is absurd given the flexibility needed by graduate students, especially at comp/prospectus/dissertation stage. Open study areas are counterproductive for students needing both textual resources within reach and quiet privacy for effective study. Graduate students, once given a carrel should be able to keep it based on seniority for the period of study (providing full-time) and should not be hassled when usage drops a little. When student is at dissertation stage, if they plan to depend upon the library for a working space should be assigned automatically, if they wish one, a securable carrel if available pending use of 2-3 times/week or notice that they are away from Madison on vacation, conferences or necessary dissertation research purposes. Undergraduate students should have low priority on assigned carrel policy.”

“Isn't a library carrel the wooden frame encompassing a desk and light found along the windows, etc. on second floor? Or are they also located in the back room for those working on comps only? What are the little rooms that dissertation people are using?”

“About item 46: I strongly believe the library must work toward the interests of a diverse student body and in that regard, more open study space is a necessity. That being said, I am also not happy about the availability of carrels. For those of us who live in Wendel or Tipple, or who live far from campus, carrels (particularly the more secure type of carrel previously offered on the G-deck) are really a necessity. Such carrels ease severe overcrowding that now exists in small on campus apartments and they can allow students the ability to keep references

and other office materials, including a printer, on campus--that affords commuters the ability to participate in academic programming more fully, for such things as colloquia, lectures etc. Without the efficiency that such a space provides, retaining a viable study period at home precludes attendance at such events. I have heard mention of converting office spaces on the LC 28 level to carrels. I suspect this will be a very helpful initiative indeed. Moreover, other spaces now opened up by the new arts center are now being used as office space: temporary office space for the Caspersen School administrators. I have heard arguments about how difficult converting these newly opened spaces for administrative use would be...it turns out that these spaces presented a viable option for administrative space. I suspect that the cost of installing carpet to make these spaces more comfortable is not excessive. It seems to me also that if HCH/housing office were located in the Commons, that would represent a useful working atmosphere and some increased efficiency. After all, it seems to me that HCH interacts with Aramark and Res Life frequently... these offices would be in close proximity to each other. I also suspect that if there is open office space in Brothers College, locating the University Editor there would also be particularly efficient: most of the activity of this office in my experience relates most directly to the college. In short, I think there are ways to make the library more functional and to provide G-deck type carrel space... it takes only, it seems to me, a real commitment to graduate study in regard to study space combined with a more comprehensive understanding how the type and availability of carrels relates to housing issues. I must admit that I find most often a rather narrow view on the part of different university offices: housing does not recognize how housing space issues relates to the library and decisions about carrels; the library administration does not recognize how their decisions are related to housing space issues. Both the library administration and housing officials tend to function independently... and both are providing the most minimal of space for one aspect of life here that I think is of some importance: one's ability to study. For Ph.D. students, study requires some space...more than I suspect is necessary for undergraduate students. Until the university mindset is more open to distinctions between the needs of undergraduates and graduate/post graduate students, any constructive effort on these issues will be truncated.”

“Given limited number of carrels and high demand, I feel the library is doing an adequate job of assigning them, based on objective criteria. Lockers would be more useful to me if more centrally located.”

“Having a carrel this year (my second year of Ph.D. class work) would have been extremely helpful to me. I am also a T/A, so I have to juggle a lot of books. I am a commuter student and travel quite a distance to be here so I stay Tuesday through Thursday. A carrel would have actually been much more helpful to me this year than next when I don't anticipate being on campus every day.”

“Carrels and lockers are not a concern for me because I do not study on campus.”

“We need more carrels available for graduate students. The waiting list is outrageous.”

“I used to have a carrel until I was required to use it five days a week. I don't always come to campus five days a week and I would sometimes come to school simply to sign in! I realized this was ridiculous and gave up my carrel. My biggest beef regarding the carrels was the inequity in assigning people to carrels. I always had a person sharing with me but I noticed that there were some people who, year after year, had sole possession of their carrel. And although the policy states that you have to have an approved dissertation prospectus to get a private room, I know specific students who were given rooms way before their prospecti were approved. It used to be that you had to be a library graduate student employee to get a private study room (and you could keep it forever!) but that no longer seems to be the case. I think that there should be a one year limit for private rooms because there are only a few and the same people can keep them for an indefinite amount of time. I think a one year limit would be more fair to the rest of us who would give our right arm to have one.”

“I am pleased to see that the library has instituted a policy of walk-in availability of carrels for commuting graduate students, as we often need someplace to study and work when we come onto campus. The other issue I would raise is why are theological students given equal access and footing for graduate study carrels, when they have the Cornell Room and Seminary Hall? A nit-picky question, true, but valid when we consider the lack of study space for graduate students.”

“Please make this available to as many as possible, with Graduate and Theological students receiving highest priority. I don't think the policy of dissertation, comps, thesis, etc. is a poor policy necessarily, but it must be practiced with both wisdom and consistency.”

“Face it, the library is primarily for the undergraduates. Graduate students have no business dictating how space in the library should be allocated. The library is too small for that. It needs to grow.”

Lockers: Lockers are far less of an issue to graduate students than carrels. Comments about lockers in addition to their mention above were limited to two: one student responded, “What lockers?”, and another said his or her locker was working out fine. Most graduate students know what a locker is (72%) and feel aware of locker availability (64%). Graduate students are generally uninterested in having a locker (1.85). The average respondent has never had a locker (81%) and does not currently have a locker (87%). Students are ambivalent about locker policy (2.63) and availability (2.74).

Overview of Section IV: Library Holdings

Students are reservedly satisfied with the quantity (2.82) of Library holdings, and more satisfied with the quality of Library holdings (2.98). The average student uses the

Library's online journals (3.03) but is ambivalent about being able to access journals needed (2.56). Again, since most respondents are commuters (73%), this lack of access may be partially reflective of the unreliability of the proxy server. Students were ambivalent about more than one or two journals needed not being accessible (2.55); this may reflect the belief that most students feel that while some needed journals are not available at Drew, this is limited to only one or two journals. Students are ambivalent to positive about the Library's ability to expand its holdings (2.74) and about the Library's holdings being adequate for graduate study (2.72).

Some student comments reflect the belief that students are unable to request acquisitions, and when they do, their requests are not met. One student requested that an order form for new acquisitions be placed on the Library website. This may be a good means to identify specific journals that a number of Drew students would like to have. Specific fields mentioned as needing improvement include foreign language journals; contemporary critical theory; *ArchivesUSA* or *RLIN*; journals in the psychology of religion; late 20th/21st century literature, politics, and history; *Philosophy Now*; Roman Catholic theology; *Origins*; the *Avery Index*; scholarship on Jewish issues; philosophy as a discipline, especially post-structuralism; sociology journals; *EEBO*; and new titles in American history and American studies. There were one or two complaints that theology holdings were "staid," but another complaint that they followed "fads."

Again, students used this section to express concern about the overall size of the Library, to complain about the proxy server, and to praise the Interlibrary Loan Office, which some students feel they rely upon too much because Drew's holdings in some areas of study are inadequate. One student specifically praised Drew's holdings in English literature.

Conclusion

Drew's graduate student population cares very much about the Library, seeing it as a central component of their careers as scholars. As a result, they are very happy when Library services work well (such as the Interlibrary Loan Office, the Reference Desk, and the Circulation Desk) and very frustrated when they do not (such as carrel policy and Library equipment). Both help and insensitivity are taken personally by graduate students. Space is clearly an issue, and will become even more of an issue as Drew implements the *White Paper's* goals of expanding the size of the College of Liberal Arts by 100 students, along with moderate growth in the Graduate and Theological school programs. Library holdings will need to be increased significantly if Education and Business programs are to be put in place at Drew. Drew's record for dealing with space shortages has not been favorable to graduate students. Graduate students have already lost G deck carrels and the Townhouses due to space constraints. Graduate student treatment in relationship to carrel space may be reflective of the ultimate goal of taking away either the Baldwin or Pilling study rooms, or both, to make room for future holdings needed for the new Education or Business programs. Given the high cost of a graduate education at Drew, limited scholarship funds, and high graduate student debt, should this happen student frustration will undoubtedly peak.

Drew, as an institution, needs to communicate more strongly to Drew's graduate student population that they are an important and valued part of the Drew community, and that they are being taken into account in the development of policies affecting them. This should primarily be communicated through the development of policies sensitive to Drew graduate students' needs. One way of doing so would be for the Office of Student Life, the Housing Office, or the Office of Institutional Research to collect demographic data even more extensive than the data collected by this survey for every incoming graduate student class and to publish this data for Drew students, administrative offices, and faculty, so that it can be taken into account in the development of Drew policies. Merely conducting a survey communicates an appreciated interest in hearing graduate students' opinions. This simple and necessary first step is often not taken but it is, after all, only a first step.