
This paper discusses an assessment case study conducted at the Ullman Classics Departmental Library at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The aim of the project was to discover the effectiveness of independent, departmental libraries at serving their primary faculty, graduate student, and undergraduate populations. The research was conducted using mixed methods. Usage statistics from the main UNC library system were analyzed and compared with user-reported usage information regarding similar items in the Ullman Library collection. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with eight representative members of the population group to provide a context for the statistical usage data. The data revealed that elements including convenience of access, continuity of the departmental community across generations, and the departmental library as a physical information commons all contributed to a more positive library experience as an independent, isolated collection than would be gained from integration with the main library system.
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Introduction

While most University Library Systems have absorbed scattered departmental and satellite library collections into their main university systems to increase access and functionality, there are still a few independent libraries and collections dispersed throughout some university campuses. The reasons for the lack of integration of these collections seem to vary widely from institution to institution based primarily on the sentiments of the faculty and library staff involved, the varying levels of technological advancement on a campus, and the topical subject matter of the departmental collection in question.

While many studies have been done about the process of integration of departmental libraries and collections, the predominant literature on the subject views the topic through a very narrow and pragmatic lens. Most research discussed in the literature of the past fifty years solely address issues of access and the physical processes involved with integration. Very few stop to ask the question of why certain departments might wish to remain independent and whether it would be in the best interest of all parties involved for them to remain that way. Even if researchers do stop to discuss why a department might not want to integrate, it is usually only to posit that the department does not understand the full implications of integration with the main library system. However, there may be potential benefits of a departmental collection beyond convenience that the main library system may not provide upon integration.
Therefore, through my research, in an attempt to fill a gap in the existing literature of the field and provide a more accurate depiction of the full range of issues surrounding these complex cases of integration, I have performed an assessment case study of one of these independent, departmental libraries on a university campus to determine the various advantages for the department and examine the situation as a whole.

**Case Study Setting**

I looked specifically at the Ullman Classics Library located at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for this case study, where I currently work as the Departmental Librarian in addition to my employment at the Walter Royal Davis Main Library (Davis) on campus. As a researcher, I was presented with a unique opportunity for an internal comparison and assessment of the situation, since I technically work on both sides of the fence.

The Ullman Classics Library presented a new and unique opportunity to look at these issues *prior* to an actual integration being conducted. At the point which I conducted my study, neither the main library system nor the Department of Classics strongly desired or intended to pursue any kind of integration, but the predominant factors which have provided an impetus for collections to merge at other institutions, such as budgetary cuts and dwindling space in a swiftly growing collection, were beginning to crop up in both environments.

The product of over half a century’s worth of active collecting and Emeritus Faculty donations, the Ullman Classics Library currently possesses approximately 12,000 volumes, nearly all of which are duplicates of materials existing in the main UNC Library System (Linderski, 2008). In addition to the primary monographs collection, the Ullman
Library also possesses a private archive of Journal Offprints from the last two hundred years of scholarship. Currently, Classics employs one part-time, paid librarian to manage the collection, supplemented by four unpaid interns. In the past, graduate students and faculty from the Classics Department and other assorted volunteers and part-time librarians have managed and shaped the collection (Linderski, 2008). The Ullman Library currently uses standard Library of Congress cataloging, and possesses both its own independent database and online catalog. Technological and physical updates have been regularly undertaken at the Ullman Classics Library to keep it current with recent library practices and policies of small institutions, though no moves have been made to push for an integration of either the physical holdings of the library or the online catalog interface with the main UNC Library System.

**Research Questions**

In order to ascertain the full range of the issues surrounding integration or isolation of a departmental library collection, there were a variety of potential questions I desired to investigate. The specific research problems I was interested in investigating were:

1. How effective are departmental libraries at serving the research needs of their faculty, graduate student, and undergraduate populations?
2. How often do departmental users resort to the main library system for materials vs. the departmental library? Do they only use the main library materials when the departmental library does not possess a copy of something or is there overlap?
   a. If there is overlap, are there features (practical or sentimental) of the departmental copies, such as marginalia or older, rare editions, which influence these users’ decisions to prefer the departmental collection over
the main library if both hold the work? Or is it usually just an issue of convenience?

3. At what point would it become mutually beneficial for the departmental library to integrate their holdings with the main library’s catalog to allow for increased access and better searching features? What disadvantages might this bring to the department to cause them to shy away from integration?
   
a. Is this “point” determined by usage numbers? New technologies? What seems to constitute the tipping point for these decisions?

4. What are the implications for collection development for both the departmental library and the main library for continued separation versus some form of integration, especially as the departmental library begins to grow significantly in size?

Finally, as more of an overarching approach to the whole process, I was interested in assessing the level of resistance by the department in question over the topic of collection integration. I was particularly interested in comparing the current tensions on a university campus today to the sentiments and concerns from the early decades of the nineteenth century when these initial situations began to crop up at institutions across the country.

**Literature Review**

One of the most surprising things that I came across when beginning to survey the literature about departmental library collections was the fact that the same issues have been occurring in the United States since as early as the turn of the twentieth century, and in fact not much has changed beyond the numbers game. While it is safe to say that
centralization has clearly won the day in terms of achieving a majority situation on university campuses in this new digital and technological age (Evans and Tilton, 2010), it is interesting to note that the same concerns universities and individual departments were raising over integration and centralization fifty to a hundred years ago are still the same problems many hold-out departments continue to possess today (Miller, 1939). Because of this theoretical continuity, it is both important and incredibly useful to begin by reviewing the history of departmental library collections and the development of university library systems in the United States as a whole.

The majority of the departmental library collections in the United States grew out of imitations of the German seminar model in the early years of the nation, and “it was only after the War between the States that true departmental libraries were installed in American Universities along with other innovations imported from Germany” (Thompson, 1942, p. 59). Part of the difficulties in tracking the exact development of such satellite and departmental collections in the formative years of the previous century stemmed from a lack of a true definition for exactly what constituted a “departmental library,” and it seems that even now a hard-and-fast definition of a departmental library is a difficult thing to come by, as the understanding changes from university to university and case study to case study. In Thompson’s 1942 article, “The Historical Background of Departmental and Collegiate Libraries,” he explains that the origins for this semantic confusion come from the lack of standardization among institutions when describing their own satellite collections:

For example, some institutions have reported departmental libraries that enjoy little more independence than a reserve reading-room. Some descriptions of the Harvard University libraries have failed to mention collections as large as ten thousand volumes, while many small
institutions have consistently reported laboratory and classroom collections often containing less than a hundred volumes. (p. 50)

He continues to explain that in particular the distinction between a “collegiate” library and a “departmental” library led to much of the initial confusion on the subject. In his terms, a “collegiate” library was developed to address the needs of the students of a professional school or college, with the primary examples being medical and journalism schools, and differed quite drastically in size and purpose from the “departmental” libraries possessed by individual teaching groups within liberal arts colleges (Thompson, 1942, p. 52).

It is interesting to recognize these early distinctions and reflect on the current state of departmental and satellite collections with this idea in mind. By Thompson’s definition, I would posit that the majority of “collegiate” collections have been integrated into main university systems through the centralization movement of the twentieth century, since their primary goals included sufficient access to materials and were often developed to require interdisciplinary resources as the twentieth century progressed. In fact, the majority of the empirical case studies on the subject from the later decades of the twentieth century seem to come out of the health sciences and medical libraries (Stefenacci, Wood, & Huff, 1977; Craig & Grefsheim, 1977) whose patrons required ease of access perhaps more than any other topical area in the interdisciplinary push of the later part of the century. The departmental collections of liberal arts colleges, however, which would have been drastically more specific and narrowly focused to the individual teaching needs of a faculty, were so specially cultivated and regarded by the professors who developed and used them that it is not surprising that factors of sentimental attachment and hesitation surrounding technological advancement in these small, isolated
environments led to tense and complex socio-political environments on university campuses across the country.

In addition to the historical beginnings of departmental libraries, it is also necessary to examine the issues surrounding centralization and decentralization in university library systems as a whole and how they have progressed throughout the past hundred years. The same kinds of issues, including budgetary concerns and limited space, that plague the current library scene, were equally relevant and evident in the library literature of the thirties and forties. Robert Miller, in his 1939 article “Centralization versus Decentralization” divides the issues up into seven categories: “Accessibility, Cost, Efficiency, Adequacy, Use, Interrelation of Subject Fields, and Educational Significance” (p. 75). He then proceeds to provide a pro and con argument for each of these categories, keeping in mind that despite their differences, a desire for “efficient and adequate library service is the end in view for both centralists and decentralists” (Miller, 1939, p. 75). Overall, in terms of accessibility, Miller (1939) found that the pros of decentralization clearly outweighed the cons, claiming “studies have shown that immediate accessibility is probably the most important factor in the use of books” (p. 75). On the cost and administrative efficiency fronts, the centralized approach was clearly favored, but overall the conclusion of the article was that it really depended on the individual situation and could not be determined by a set of overarching principles (Miller, 1939).

In a slightly later article published in *The Library Quarterly*, J.C.M. Hanson (1943) argues:

There are so many angles to this question of the central as against the departmental library; and many, perhaps most, of them are hard to grasp
for one who has not for years been in the closest possible touch with the
details of technical administration as affected by efforts to operate several
libraries as a unit through centralization of administration in spite of the
decentralization of the book” (p. 132).

While Hanson’s statement seems a bit ambiguous, it provides some key insight into the
fact that a combination of these ideals through centralized administration and distributed
collections does not necessarily provide a magical solution to the problem. Taking a very
practical stance, Hanson reiterates many of the same concerns articulated in Miller’s
article regarding accessibility versus cost and efficiency issues. Ultimately, for Hanson
(1942), “in the long run, economic considerations must decide the issue, not the personal
convenience or predilections of professor or librarian” (p. 135). Hanson’s article was
written in the years immediately following the Great Depression and the beginning of the
Second World War, and given the similarities currently being drawn between the
economic situations of that era and the present day, his conclusion has probably been the
harsh reality for many institutions in recent years.

The battle over the idea of centralization versus decentralization could not be won
simply by force of economic need, however, and in 1983 a symposium was held entitled
“Centralization or Decentralization of Library Collections,” providing a pro- and con-
based forum for discussion of these same ideals. Despite the fact that the symposium was
held in a time when technological advances were already starting to drastically redefine
the library landscape, the fundamentals of the pros and cons provided remain largely the
same. The one key difference that I found in many of the symposium papers was in the
inclusion of concerns regarding journal subscriptions and serial subscriptions between
central and departmental libraries. One of the papers, written by Thomas D. Watts
(1983) at the University of Texas at Arlington, argues very strongly for centralization in
an age where communication and sharing of resources is becoming drastically easier. He warns of “brushfire effects” where “every division, no matter how small will desire its own branch library” if care isn’t taken to curb these advances (p. 197). Watts tempers his argument by explaining, “There is no quarrel here with the broad subject division approach within centralized library collections,” but he sticks to his guns that departmental libraries only breed unhealthy loyalties and decreased accessibility in an increasingly interdisciplinary academic arena (1983, p. 197).

This background information on the development of departmental and collegiate library collections in the United States provides an excellent canvas for contextualizing my study of the Ullman Classics Library at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Having examined the arguments for and against centralization throughout the twentieth century, it was fascinating to realize that despite the significant technological advances of the past several decades, these fundamental differences are still being argued today in largely the same capacity and with strikingly similar language. These similarities bolster my desired approach of exploring the vast array of political and social implications surrounding departmental libraries in addition to the usage statistics and expense reports, grounding the pragmatic approaches of librarians today with the perspectives of their users on multiple library functions.

I would posit that, particularly in the liberal arts disciplines many of these early sentiments and issues are still being harbored by faculty and librarians alike, causing tension beyond the end result of the effectiveness of online public access catalog (OPAC) or physical holding integration. If a researcher does not take time to understand or address the full historical context of the subject he or she is studying, fallacies could arise
out of conclusions drawn from contemporary data that might have been influenced by previous factors other than those readily available on the surface of a problem. Since the goal of most of these current studies is to provide a model for others to follow when beginning the same procedures, this oversight is particularly troubling. I hope to attempt to fill this gap with my own research by providing an empirical study that looks at the usage and access statistics, but weighs this information with all the other historical, social, and contextual factors associated with the integration process as a whole.

As previously stated, most modern research studies of departmental libraries are primarily looking at the numerical logistics and statistics concerning access and the number of staff hours required to accession collections that may or may not have been previously cataloged in some format (Bell, 1995; Evans and Tiffton, 2010). I imagine that much of the cause of this focus comes out of the fact that often the research itself is being done out of necessity and being facilitated and coordinated by library practitioners rather than formal scholars or researchers, as evidenced by the job titles provided in the introductory matter of the majority of the research that I have consulted. Some of the case studies of the 1990s, including Suzanne Bell’s article “Integrating Access to Formal and Informal Collections: What is Important and What Succeeds” do touch on the fact that political issues regarding the faculty made an impact on the transition process, but as is the case with Bell, it is a side note to other more logistical concerns (1995). While I do believe that this narrow-sighted focus hinders many of these studies, the fact remains that access to materials by potential patrons is always going to be the most important priority of an academic or research support institution, and so these empirical studies are still highly valuable to examine for purposes of comparison and my intended research.
The earliest contemporary study that is notable is the previously mentioned study by Suzanne Bell (1995), which looks at data gathered concerning the integration of departmental libraries at twenty-one different sites throughout the United States. Bell’s study incorporates newer issues and services into the centralization debate, including issues of more efficient and economic Interlibrary Loan requests and integration of OPAC systems on a university campus (1995, p. 181). Through use of a survey distributed across a prominent library listserv, Bell recorded information from different libraries that had previously undergone the centralization process. Out of the libraries surveyed, there were many success stories and a few words of warning. Bell (1995) concluded that out of the success stories, the most successful were the cases where the independent collections were informal enough that conflicting catalog records did not create a mass amount of work for the integration staff at the main library (p. 183-184). Overall, however, she found that “despite many reservations expressed about adding records to the OPAC, the majority of the reported success stories used that approach” (Bell, 1995, p. 185). Bell’s study was highly relevant to my own research on the subject, as potential OPAC integration is likely the first step either Davis Library or the Ullman Classics Library would undertake if they ever decided to address potential integration in the upcoming years. Her treatment of social factors is a useful comparison to micro-changes in faculty throughout academia in the last two decades.

The immediately recent empirical literature, perhaps influenced by the declining economy, has seemed to focus on ways of compromise and solutions to some of the previous issues mentioned in departmental integration. For example, a study done at the University Libraries at Bowling Green State University looked at the ways in which a
content management system could assist in the integration of “a collection of VHS cassettes and DVDs for the Dr. Ralph H. Wolfe Viewing Center” (Evans & Tilton, 2010). The goal of their project was to increase patron knowledge of satellite collections, while utilizing departmental funds over library funds to help mediate the costs. Using some of the newest technologies, including cloud computing initiatives and open source content management systems, Evans and Tilton (2010) were able to provide a positive study that allowed for the goals and feelings of both the main university library and the individual departments to be validated. Using a kind of post-custodial approach, the study gave the departmental libraries the tools needed to assist with the integration, while providing professional guidance that didn’t exhaust either group’s budget (Evans and Tilton, 2010).

Calling their project the “un-catalog,” the Bowling Green State Library used a WordPress MU application to create a sustainable and accessible way for independent collections to merge their existing catalogs with the main library system (Evans and Tilton, 2010, p. 49). This innovative approach provides a great deal of hope and promise for the development of future standards of integration that might satisfy the needs of both the departments involved and the main library system without forcing either party to feel that they are making significant sacrifices.

Other studies of the last few years begin to incorporate these ideas of cooperation rather than sacrifice. In a 2008 study entitled “Bringing in the Sheep: Using Insourcing to Access Departmental Resources,” Sharon Moyonahan looked at the possibilities of using main library catalogers to create records for the departmental libraries, while the departments themselves would continue to run all other aspects of the collection (p. 91). Similarly, a 2011 study conducted at the American University in Washington D.C.
experimented with the idea of OPAC-only integration to increase access without compromising the integrity of a collection (Elguindi, Kelshian & Sandler, 2011, p. 56).

Providing a similar example of technology use within the University of North Carolina library environment itself, a previous School of Information and Library Science (SILS) student at UNC-Chapel Hill did his master’s paper on the use of a blog interface to allow faculty members to comment on potential collection development decisions for the SILS departmental library collection. The methods employed by Weis were threefold: first, he helped the librarian craft the initial posts for the blog that would record faculty feedback and test the system technically, including attention paid to metadata fields that would most interest the faculty being solicited, second, Weis conducted a structured, open-ended interview with the departmental librarian to address issues of use and functionality from the institution’s side of the issue, and third, he distributed a user satisfaction survey to the participants, consisting of a mix of open-ended and binary questions (2011, pgs. 12-14). I believe that Weis’s methods of data collection were highly similar to my own, using both qualitative and quantitative survey data and some structured interviews, and his use of current technologies to facilitate these needs was also something that I emulated, at least in terms of survey questions and topics covered in interviews.

Ultimately, while the research and case studies in the predominant literature of the past fifty years are highly relevant to understanding the physical processes that accompany the centralization and administrative issues that accompany departmental library integration, they often fail to provide a true depiction of the full depth of the situation, including stressful and tedious resistance on the part of many faculty members
and librarians involved. Although the authors of many of these case studies might not believe socio-political and contextual information to be relevant to other universities that might intend to use their plan of integration as a model, and in fact might endeavor to hide some of these facts out of a fear of presenting their home institutions as divided or dysfunctional, the issues have not and will not go away in the immediate future. I think if a truly successful model for the integration of satellite collections is ever to emerge from the current research, a complete understanding of all problems and concerns, not just the ones emergent on the surface and able to be examined through statistical analysis, must be undertaken and incorporated into the development of new tools to facilitate the transition. I hope my research may take some strides in this direction, and help fill a gap in the existent literature regarding incorporation of historical precedents and social concerns with statistics and new technologies, while simultaneously providing valuable information to both the department in question and the main library system on the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill campus.

**Methodology**

The major research studies addressing departmental library collections that have been conducted in the past two decades have used a mixed methods approach. Most included a survey or set of interviews to determine the perceived success or failure of departmental integration, while also looking at user statistics related to departmental collections. The statistics usually involved things like Interlibrary Loan Data (Evans & Tilton, 2010) and page view analytics of newly integrated OPAC records (Bell, 1995; Elguindi, Kelshian & Sandler, 2011). The mixed methods approach is highly relevant in the world of Library and Information Science, particularly as it continues to blend issues
of human interaction and public service with technological data and services, such as search engines and information retrieval practices. R. Burke Johnson and Anthony T. Onwuegbuzie, in their 2004 article, discuss how mixed methods research has really come into its own in the last decade, solidifying itself as a viable third option to positivism or purely qualitative research (p. 14). They explain, “The goal of mixed methods research is not to replace either of these approaches but rather to draw from the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of both in single research studies and across studies” (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 14-15).

I performed the same kinds of empirical research done in predominant departmental library studies of the past ten years, using mixed methods, but I approached it from a totally different point in the integration timeline, with the ultimate goal being an understanding of the full range of associated issues and factors surrounding departmental library usage, rather than an explanation or analysis of an integration process itself.

For my study, I compared the use of Ullman Library resources by department faculty and graduate student populations to their use of parallel Classics resources held by Davis Library. To accomplish this goal, I received redacted circulation data from the main UNC Library system via the Millennium circulation software. The data listed the total number of items that were checked out or requested from Davis by the full population of officially registered UNC Classics Department faculty and graduate students over a three-week period. In order to facilitate the gathering of this data, I provided the main library with a list of official Classics Department affiliates. The data was be broken down by population (faculty vs. graduate) to see what trends, if any, arose among specific population usage of the main library system collections.
Because the Ullman Library does not keep detailed records of their own circulation at this time, the numbers regarding Ullman Library usage specifically relied on user-reported data gathered via means of a brief survey. This data does not necessarily serve as a direct comparison to the data from the main UNC Library System, but provided a good base understanding of the general topics and types of resources the main user groups recognize as their primary uses of the departmental collection. Of course, because this data was user-reported it will not be as accurate as the initial empirical data generated from Davis Library, but it did provide enough information to get an idea of the overall issues surrounding the library usage and allow for some statistical comparisons with the data from Davis, especially along subject and topic area lines. Since UNC Classics faculty can take out books from Ullman for an unlimited length of time, I was also interested to see how the graduate and undergraduate populations report their usage of Ullman materials, specifically how often they have attempted to use materials in Ullman but found them checked out, with no means of a recall or knowledge of knowing when the item might be returned due to the current processes.

As I have mentioned extensively, to truly address the full range of issues associated with the use of departmental collections I believe that one must address social and preference-based concerns, which necessitates the inclusion of qualitative data to provide context and balance to the quantitative statistics. Without either the qualitative or quantitative data, I felt that my study would strongly suffer and not provide an accurate representation of all the facets of the issues involved. In order to gather this qualitative data, I conducted semi-structured interviews with several representative members of the Classics Department faculty and graduate student populations to paint a broader picture
of the issues surrounding the situation. I recruited these interview individuals in person on a purely voluntary basis. Following the collection of the interview data and the full collection of the Davis Library circulation information, I spent approximately three weeks analyzing the data and coding the interview transcripts. For the circulation data, I used standard statistical software to analyze the patterns, and for the interview transcription and coding process, I used coding software to try and locate trends or patterns in the kinds of issues raised and vocabulary used to discuss the collection and any political aspects of potential integration. UNC’s Davis Library intends to use the information gathered in this study in a collaborative wiki project addressing assessment issues and best practices, and might ultimately develop a guide or standard for departmental libraries interested in these issues and potential integration in the future.

Overall, I believe that the mixed methods approach to this research problem provided an effective data set addressing the various contexts of departmental library usage and factors both influencing and surrounding potential integration with the main library system.

**Davis Library Circulation Data**

Out of all the data collected and generated for this study, the redacted circulation data was the most surprising. Out of a total population pool of 16 faculty members and 36 graduate students, only 5 different individuals requested or checked out items during the three week period surveyed. The collection of this data was performed just before the midpoint of the Spring 2012 semester, and during a time when instruction and research for the semester should have been fully underway. Given the size of the population group and a collection time that should have taken into account multiple types of usage of
main library materials, it was particularly astounding and telling how few materials were
actively checked out by the Classics Department Faculty. Since the data table is so small,
it is included in the figure below. The first column of data represents the total number of
items that a particular patron had checked out during their time in the UNC Library System. The second column of data represents the total number of renewals the
individual had ever requested on checked out items, and the third column of data
represents the number of items currently checked out from the UNC Library System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATRNS IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th>TOT CHKOUT</th>
<th>TOT RENWAL</th>
<th>CUR CHKOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY PATRON 1</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY PATRON 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE STUDENT 1</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE STUDENT 2</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY PATRON 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Redacted Davis Library circulation data, collected Feb. 3, 2012*

Perhaps more surprising than the initial figures was the fact that three weeks later,
the data set had not changed by a single figure. None of the individuals who currently
had materials checked out returned or renewed any of these materials, nor had any
additional faculty or graduate students checked out any materials from Davis Library.

One possible assumption and conclusion that can be drawn from this data is the
fact that the majority of current research and scholarship is being conducted via the use of
online resources and serialized subscriptions. Despite many active research projects and instructional courses occurring during the data collection time period, the faculty and graduate student populations of the Classics Department were actively utilizing a significantly small amount of monographic materials. Though I did not consider the implications of such a conclusion at the time the data was collected, further research on similar subjects might include a comparison of database access by the same list of individuals to monographic circulation statistics to get a more accurate picture of the full usage of the main library system.

However, the relative size of this data was also significant considering the existence of the departmental library. Such a small amount of circulated monographic materials indicates to this researcher that a majority of the departmental users who could in fact circulate items from the departmental library were prioritizing use of these materials over the necessity for monographs from the main library system. In order to fully support this assertion, it becomes necessary to examine the results and data of the user-reported Ullman Library usage survey and the contextual semi-structured interviews that were conducted alongside this data.

**User-Reported Survey Data Analysis**

The Ullman Library usage survey produced a varied array of responses and data, but overall was quite insightful as to the general use practices of the primary user populations. Since the data from Davis Library represented such a minute fraction of the total population groups I was interested in, only 9.61% of the faculty and graduate students’ combined population totals, the Ullman usage survey served to fill in the gaps of what was a surprisingly small amount of monographic usage in the main UNC Library
System. It is first essential to more specifically quantify the survey results by percentages of the population groups represented.

Interestingly, the fixed term and adjunct faculty populations were the highest responding population group on the Ullman survey, with a response rate of 40%. These individuals, though not technically faculty or graduate students do have an office assigned to them in Murphey Hall, and thus are allowed to borrow materials from the Ullman Library during their tenure with the department. The faculty and graduate students were close behind, with a response rate of 37.5% for the faculty and a response rate of 36% for the graduate students. The undergraduate response was fairly low, with only a 12% response rate; however, the responses I did receive from this group were fairly consistent and still provided a good amount of helpful data. Figure 3 below shows the numerical data for the first question and how it was broken down by population group. The smaller inset figure beneath (Figure 4) represents the optional fill-in section for the “other” category or respondents, which represents the fixed term individuals.

1. What affiliation do you have with the UNC Classics Department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other (if other, please describe your affiliation in the box below)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. First question of survey response, breaking down response groups by population
Other (if other, please describe your affiliation in the box below - e.g. Visiting Scholar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>post-baccalaureate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>retired faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currently visiting scholar; also sometimes as faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Supplementary responses to “Other” category**

Out of the total respondent pool, the length of affiliation was quite varied, with responses in all five of the potential response categories. The majority of respondents, 57%, had been affiliated with the department between one and five years. This data is consistent with the relative length of different potential affiliations, particularly as the graduate students and fixed term respondents were among the highest, with these affiliations usually being temporary or limited in the number of years. The numerical breakdown of these responses can be seen in Figure 5 below.

### 2. How long have you been affiliated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-11 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11+ years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5. Length of respondent affiliation with department**

Moving past the strictly biographical and population-centered data, the next three questions on the survey addressed how many times individuals who had borrowing privileges checked items out from the Ullman Library, how often these users had trouble locating materials within Ullman Library, and subsequently, how often they resorted to Davis Library in order to rectify an inability to procure the needed items from the departmental collection. Consistent with information I discovered in the interviews, very few users reported large numbers of checked out items per month. This data was
unsurprising, as the majority of departmental users tend to work either within the library itself or use the items from Ullman merely as more of a glorified reference collection for last minute information checks and reserve space for their students. The highest check out range reported fell in the 1-2 books/month category, with a representation rate of 35% of the total respondent pool. The next closest responses were either 0 books/month or 3-5 books/month, both falling just under this percentage. Figure 6 below details the exact breakdown of the responses for this question. Again, there were responses in all five potential answer choices, despite the fact that all undergraduate respondents left the question blank due to an inability to circulate items from the Ullman Library.

### 3. How many times/month do you check out materials from Ullman Library (if possible)? **If you cannot check items out from Ullman Library, please leave the question blank.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6. Circulation estimates/month by primary Ullman Library user populations.*

Given a perhaps now outdated notion that professors and graduate students would require large numbers of monographs at a time for their research, I was surprised initially how few items were reported to be checked out monthly by the faculty and graduate students, however, the clarifying remarks that were discussed in the interviews, which will be discussed below, support this data in indicating that the Ullman Library is primarily utilized as a communal study space and an expanded reference collection.
Out of all the survey response data, the final two questions about difficulty of locating materials in Ullman Library and subsequent use of materials in the main UNC Library System were the most telling, and it actually surprised me how few patrons reported having major issues locating materials within the Ullman collection. The previous Ullman Library catalog was unavailable for nearly a year due to database concerns and other technical considerations. Patrons during this time period were using either their own knowledge of the layout of the stacks or the physical card catalog that still remained in the library, though it had not been updated in nearly five years. However, despite these technical issues causing a rather jarring transition period, most respondents reported either rarely or occasionally having trouble locating items in Ullman Library. Figures 7 and 8 below demonstrate the responses for these two questions.

### 4. Do you ever have trouble finding items within Ullman Library (either hard to locate or the items are already checked out)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7. Difficulty level of locating items in Ullman Library**
5. How many times/month do you think you check out Classics materials from Davis Library as a result of not being able to find an item in Ullman?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Subsequent use of Davis Library materials as supplement

Overall, the Ullman Library usage survey provided a wealth of information, particularly in relation to the seemingly sparse Davis Library circulation data. Across the board it seems that professors are using the physical space of the library more as a reference collection and communal work area than as a place to find materials for primary research, and I would posit instead that the low check out figures from both libraries reflects the changing technological advancements driving the current online serialized scholarship environment. With that in mind, it becomes almost more important than ever for faculty and students of a department to have a communal and specially designated space to keep commonly referenced monographs without having to travel to the main library or peruse potentially spread out stacks. The information collected in the interviews quite cohesively supplemented and qualified the findings of both the circulation data and the usage survey, and it is in their analysis that the true recommendations and clarity surrounding the benefits and current usages of a departmental collection lie.
Interview Data Analysis

For the interviews, I recruited the participants either via email or through in-person interactions. The interviews were recorded on an audio recording device and stored on a password-protected computer. Once the interviews were transcribed, the initial audio recordings were destroyed. Participants could choose to include their name and identity in the final output, or to remain anonymous, and signed consent forms indicating this preference. Out of a total request pool of ten individuals, I ended up interviewing eight people, with six of these individuals being faculty members and two of the individuals being graduate students.

Across the board, particularly among the faculty members, I found in these interviews that the primary user populations of the department view the Ullman Library as an invaluable reference collection for them and for their students, rather than a center of intensive research. Professor Robert Babcock, a current Professor of Latin in the UNC Classics Department and previous curator of the Beinecke Rare Books Library at Yale University, explains this notion of the Ullman Library as a specialized reference collection clearly, stating:

It is the reference books [in Ullman] that I use, and while mostly reference books don't circulate at Davis, they are also not gathered all together in one place. It's a lot easier to look up something quickly [in Ullman]. Sometimes ten minutes before class, I'll realize I can't remember whether Severus came before or after Antoninus Pius, and so I just want to look at basic historical facts or something very basic about a reference sort of question. And having it nearby [is invaluable], but also having most of the major works together. (Appendix D)

Professor Babcock’s sentiment that the primary appeal of the collection is as a specialized, collected reference source was certainly echoed throughout the other faculty interviews. In Davis Library, while the majority of the Classics books are grouped
together, they are often in small sections under the appropriate Library of Congress subject headings, potentially with several floors of stacks between two desired texts. The size and granularity of the Ullman Collection allows the faculty members to save both time and energy by having a much smaller set of books to peruse before finding the appropriate title. Another anonymous faculty member echoed similar sentiments, explaining:

I guess one thing I would mention is that when you finish a book, you or your research assistant have to check all the quotations, and that's a wonderful time to have all the basic texts in one place, rather than far different shelves. So when I do that, or a graduate student does that for me, they're all a couple of feet apart, and that's one of the strengths of [Ullman Library], the basic texts of things. (Appendix C)

In addition to attributing the success and value of the Ullman Library to its function as a specialized reference collection, several of the faculty members and graduate students highlighted its important role in the support of the teaching mission of the department. When asked whether he believed that the Ullman Library Collection successfully supported the research needs of the current faculty and graduate student populations, Professor Robert Babcock explained that he did not believe the function of Ullman Library was really to support the research needs of the faculty as a primary purpose. Instead, he offered, “I would say teaching. I think it's about teaching. It really is helpful for teaching; a lot of what we need sort of basically is there” (Appendix D). These sentiments were reiterated among the other professors, with at least three additional faculty members (Appendices C, E, G) and both graduate students (Appendices I, J) mentioning the reserve shelving that the Ullman Library offers for classes every semester as one of the key features of the collection.
The final way in which the interview participants really highlighted the positive value of the Ullman Library was as a physical space and information commons for the department. While not a single participant actively acknowledged that the provenance of library materials, most of which are from Emeritus faculty members, made a significant impact on their decision to prioritize materials as I had initially anticipated, Professor James Rives, the incoming Department Chair for the Classics Department explained:

Well, I think another dimension of it is simply the physical space. It gives a common space to the department; everyone uses it. I think it’s important for our communal identity. And also, going back to your question about marginalia, although I don’t use that myself so much, I think other people might. It does create a sense of community over time, as well, that we have the collections from Ullman and Broughton, and people from the past, previous members of the department, and so I think it has got an important substantive, you might say symbolic, significance which is important. (Appendix F)

The importance of the library as a physical space and communal gathering place was the single most brought up topic for additional discussion at the end of the interview, particularly significant since the topic was entirely unprompted. Out of all of the interviews, only three individuals did not mention the library as a physical space. Ted Gellar-Goad, a current doctoral student in the department, even recognized the importance of this information commons in the development of libraries at large and the success of the Ullman Library at fulfilling this need:

I think, you know, it's also a good space. That's one of the things that libraries have been doing more recently, [they have] been thinking about [the library] as a place to be, not just as a place to store books, and I think ours is good for our purposes and has nice little bits of department history. (Appendix J)

With these sentiments and preferences in mind, it is interesting then to turn to the interview participants’ views regarding a potential integration effort of the Ullman
Library materials or online public access catalog in the present or at any undetermined date and time in the future. Some of the limitations of the current collection that could potentially be mitigated through integration with the main UNC Library System included a more user-friendly catalog system, akin to that provided by the Davis Library catalog, as well as assistance with copy cataloging from the main library system and potential use of the main library’s preservation services.

In general, the participants seemed much more open to the idea of OPAC integration rather than any efforts at physical integration or the designation of Ullman Library changing to an official branch library. Many of those interviewed actually were strongly in favor of integration of the catalog to reduce the number of places that they have to search for materials. Professor Robert Babcock voiced his support of catalog-only integration, indicating:

> It would be very helpful to me actually, if when I search Davis catalog it would tell me there was a copy here. Sometimes when I just want a Latin text or Greek text, I would be glad to know it was here and I could run and get it quickly instead of having to have it delivered two days later. (Appendix F)

Several other interview participants voiced similar sentiments, usually centering on the idea of assistance with search time and the ability to perform more robust searches using the main library system’s Endeca catalog. Emma Buckingham, an archaeology graduate student, was strongly in support of integration of the catalog and some library services, explaining:

> I think, I'm generally for it, just because I think it's super convenient to order books and have them sent to Davis, or I don't know if you're integrating it that much, but if you could have books from Davis sent to the Classics library (as if it was a branch) that would be helpful. The only concern I would have is that because no one really knows about the library, outside of the Classics Department, books [would be] more likely
Her concern about issues of security and availability of materials was a major balancing point for most faculty who did support catalog integration and definitely served to temper all participants from totally endorsing the idea of some level of integration with the main UNC library system.

Additionally, recent updates to the Ullman catalog system that were implemented this past school year seemed to mitigate some of the major concerns faculty and graduate students had on that particular front. When Professor Bill Race, a current Emeritus faculty member, was asked whether he had difficulty locating items in Ullman Library, he reflected on how previously this might have been a more pressing concern, but the recent changes in updating the catalog system had alleviated much of this need. He commented:

Well, you've just absolutely done wonders with the catalog system here. I mean it was unusable before, unreliable, everything bad about it, and you've just taken it to a new dimension. And so, I think it's just fabulous now. (Appendix E)

Professor Race’s sentiments were echoed throughout the interview participants, including mention in the comments another anonymous faculty member who explained:

I had trouble with the catalog before it got easier. The first online catalog was where you had to log in, and I never log in, and I'm also on a Macintosh. So, most recently its been easier than it used to be, when I would sometimes go there and just not know how to log in because I hadn't done it in 11 months, but it's easier now. (Appendix C)

The unanimity with which the faculty members seemed to prefer and feel comfortable using the updated catalog system seems to denigrate this aspect as a strong potential impetus for collection or OPAC integration and allows catalog functionality to become
less of a reason to favor integration, particularly when considering the issues of security that were the primary fear of all those interviewed.

In addition to their increased use of the Ullman Library catalog due to functionality and interface updates, the Classics Department faculty members were not highly keen on witnessing physical integration with the main library system, particularly if this would result in any amount of departmental control of the materials being lost in the process. Ted Gellar-Goad, a current PhD student in the department, summarized these sentiments succinctly, explaining:

    I would not like making it a branch, if that would end up encouraging non-Classics people to go there, or relinquishing any control. I think that our department should have complete control over how it operates. (Appendix J)

A fear over a loss of departmental control is consistent with some of the socio-political factors witnessed throughout the literature of the past several decades, and the financial situation of the Classics Department itself with the library being endowment funded allows them the unique ability to maintain this control where other departments at universities throughout the country have been forced to compromise due to a lack of resources and the ability to personally curate the materials in-house. Ultimately, the interviews were highly informative and provided a mixture of expected and surprising results and preferences with regards to the Ullman Library collection. Across the board, the interview participants viewed the resource as a key element of their departmental community and as an invaluable source of both reference and teaching support for their day-to-day needs. In the absence of any true financial or curatorial reason to require the main library system’s support, I find it highly unlikely based on the results of these
interviews and the majority of the data gathered that the department would ever be strongly in favor or pursuing such an integration initiative.

**Limitations**

The primary limitation in my study was reliance on self-reported circulation data for the Ullman Library statistics and usage information. This was mitigated through attempts at securing as large of a data set as possible, and over 25% of all respondent group populations, save the undergraduates, was achieved. Since the department is of a manageable size, I did not use a representative sample for the survey, but actually distributed the survey to the full population of registered Classics Department affiliates via the email listservs in order to facilitate the largest possible response rate.

Limitations of the Davis Library circulation data included the fact that the data set represented a snapshot image of the currently circulated materials on the particular days surveyed, and not a comprehensive change over time perspective. If future study of this subject area were to be undertaken, a more inclusive and detailed look at the circulation activities of affiliates, including their use of e-resources and a more fluid analysis of the monograph circulation activities would be extremely beneficial.

Another major limitation of my study included avoiding the bias that accompanies serving as both as the Head Librarian of the Ullman Library and also as a member of the Research and Instructional Services department at Davis Library. I mitigated these potential issues of bias by crafting very open-ended, semi-structured interview questions and avoiding any loaded vocabulary when addressing any participant.
Conclusions & Recommendations

Ultimately, though for different reasons than I initially hypothesized at the onset, I believe there are many valuable features that the Ullman Departmental Library provides that could not be replicated or enhanced through a combination with the main library system. The idea of a specialized, topic-specific reference collection is something that could never be replicated in a major academic research library due to the size and overwhelming number of departments and research areas supported.

Relinquishing department control, even so far as making the Ullman departmental library a “branch” library, could subject the collection to weeding, theft, and security issues, as well as place an additional burden on the main system in a time of already shrinking budgets. Additionally, since the majority of the materials in the Ullman Library are duplicates of items already held within Davis Library, a total integration of the collection would be a wasted and pointless endeavor for all involved, resulting most likely in mass weeding of what is currently a valuable reference source for the department. Given the current needs of major research libraries to continually do more with less in trying financial times, it makes one wonder whether the twentieth century trend towards centralization was in fact the most efficient system in an age where many monographs have been relegated to “reference” rather than “research” materials. As is evidenced in the circulation statistics gathered and the testimony in the departmental interviews, private, enhanced reading rooms and departmental collections are actually serving to reduce some of the strain of the main library system at supporting the faculty and graduate students in monographic services and insubstantial reference interactions,
allowing the subject librarians to focus more heavily on securing the necessary serial subscriptions and electronic databases essential to the more intensive research process.

Finally, having the Ullman Library as a communal, departmental space allows for greater continuity between the faculty and students that pass through the department, and imposes a more positive view of libraries on the affiliates of the department in general. For these reasons, it would be my recommendation and conclusion as a result of this assessment study that the Ullman Library remains an independent entity from the main university library system and continues to support the teaching and reference needs of its department through small technological advancements and a keen eye on the developing needs of its patrons.
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Appendix A

Ullman Library Usage Survey Questionnaire

1. What affiliation do you have with the UNC Classics Department?
   a. Faculty Member
   b. Graduate Student
   c. Undergraduate Student

2. How long have you been affiliated?
   a. 0-11 months
   b. 1-5 years
   c. 6-10 years
   d. 11+ years

3. How many times/month do you check out materials from Ullman Library (if possible)?
   a. 0
   b. 1-2
   c. 3-5
   d. 5-9
   e. 10+

4. Do you ever have trouble finding items within Ullman Library (either hard to locate or the items are already checked out?)
   a. Always
   b. Frequently
   c. Occasionally
   d. Rarely
   e. Never

5. How many times/month do you think you check out Classics materials from Davis Library as a result of not being able to find an item in Ullman?
   a. 0
   b. 1-2
   c. 3-5
   d. 5-9
   e. 10+
Appendix B

Ullman Usage Survey Results

1. What affiliation do you have with the UNC Classics Department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other (if other, please describe your affiliation in the box below - e.g. Visiting Scholar)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (if other, please describe your affiliation in the box below - e.g. Visiting Scholar)

- post-baccalaureate
- retired faculty
- Emeritus faculty
- currently visiting scholar; also sometimes as faculty

2. How long have you been affiliated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-11 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11+ years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How many times/month do you check out materials from Ullman Library (if possible)? **If you cannot check items out from Ullman Library, please leave the question blank.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do you ever have trouble finding items within Ullman Library (either hard to locate or the items are already checked out)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How many times/month do you think you check out Classics materials from Davis Library as a result of not being able to find an item in Ullman?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Interview #1: Anonymous Faculty Member, UNC Department of Classics

K¹: So, could you state if you are a faculty member or a graduate student, and how long you have been affiliated with the department?

P²: I am a faculty member, and this is my 11th year at UNC.

K: Great. What has your experience been using the departmental library throughout your time here at UNC?

P: I use it quite frequently. I use the collection of journals occasionally. I use the texts, especially the texts and also the monographs, sometimes for my research, often for classes I'm teaching. I put them on reserve and have students use them. I'll often run in there to check something if I don't have the book in my own office.

K: In what ways does this compare to your use the main UNC Library System holdings of Classics materials?

P: I think of needing to use the main library for extensive specialized research in my own field, but sometimes checking something quickly or doing specialized research where we happen to have the monograph, the collection of texts especially. Someone mentions Cicero supports this, and I run down (say I don't really know that) so I'll run down and I'll check it. I may Xerox something for a class or for something I'm writing on. It's much more convenient, though I know we're not that far from the graduate library, but I don't go to the graduate library that often.

K: Sure, okay -- do any factors about the departmental library outside of convenience influence your decisions to use these materials, like provenance or marginalia, notes, things like that?

P: No, I'm mildly amused that we have certain famous people's books and seeing the notes occasionally is nice, but that's not a strong factor in my use.

K: So do you think that the library has been successful at serving the research needs of the faculty and graduate students especially as people turn over and research interests change and things like that?

P: Yes, it doesn't serve the full research needs, but it serves to make life much easier by having basic texts and monographs, and some journals there, so it makes life easier. I imagine, you know, at some future date many more things will be available online, but so

¹ K represents the interviewer (Katy) in all interview transcripts
² P represents the interview participant in all interview transcripts
far it has been a great thing to have and it makes it seem like, huh, it's like, I had a situation like this in graduate school in Ann Arbor, and it was a big part of the department, especially as a graduate student.

K: Definitely. And what are your thoughts regarding any potential integration with the main library system, now or at any point in the future? And this can address either physical integration or just integration of the catalog, where they would take over cataloging and then these items would appear in the main catalog.

P: I'm not really worried about that, except to the extent that if it involves huge beeping things that you have to go through, which seem physically difficult. Popping in there seems like a good part of it, though I know security is important too.

K: So, have you found difficulties using the current catalog system that you would see integration might fix just with the catalog, or do you usually use the card catalog?

P: I had trouble with the catalog before it got easier.

K: Could you elaborate?

P: The first online catalog was where you had to log in, and I never log in, and I'm also on a Macintosh, so most recently its been easier than it used to be, when I would sometimes go there and just not know how to log in because I hadn't done it in 11 months, but it's easier now.

K: Okay, sure.

P: And I do also know when I can use the physical catalog because something is old and I've seen it before, and just want to know where it is.

K: That makes sense. Okay, great -- and was there anything that we didn't discuss that you think is important to add on the topic of the library and any particular ways that it supports the faculty and grad students?

P: I guess one thing I would mention is that when you finish a book, you and or your research assistant have to check all the quotations and that's a wonderful time to have all the basic texts in one place, rather than far different shelves, so when I do that, or a graduate student does that for me, they're all a couple of feet apart, and that's one of the strengths of it, the basic texts of things.

K: Okay, well thank you for time!
Appendix D

Interview #2: Professor Cecil Wooten, UNC Department of Classics

K: What is your name (if you're willing to provide it), and are you a faculty member or graduate student, and how long have you been affiliated with the department?

P: My name is Cecil Wooten, I am faculty member, and I've been affiliated with the Classics Department here off and on for 45 years.

K: Great. What has your experience been using the Ullman Departmental Library throughout your time here at UNC-Chapel Hill?

P: I would describe my use of it as regular, not heavy, I mean I use it mainly to check reference and check things, to keep me from having to run over to Davis Library.

K: Right, and so the next question is just in what ways does this compare to your use of the main UNC Library System?

P: I mean normally if I'm going to check a book out I get it from Davis, but I use the library upstairs to check references and that sort of thing. It's more reference than anything, because I do sometimes take books out up there and take them down here and use them, but not usually, usually I just use them up there.

K: So do any factors about the departmental library outside of convenience influence your decision to use departmental materials, such as the provenance of an item or marginalia, notes, things like that?

P: Not usually, no, it's mainly convenience.

K: Okay, do you think that the Ullman Library is successful at serving the research needs of the current faculty and graduate students?

P: Yes. Definitely.

K: Great. And what are you thoughts regarding integration with the main library system, now or at any point in the future? And this can address either physical integration or just integration of the catalog.

P: Well, I wouldn't want physical integration because I want this library to be over here. As far as integrating with the catalog, I wouldn't see that that was any problem.
K: And is there anything that we didn't discuss that you would like to add regarding the topic that you think analyzes how it supports the faculty and graduate students or just anything about the library?

P: No, but I think it's a real draw, I mean when I'm trying to persuade perspective graduate students to come here I take them up and show them the library and talk about how wonderful it is to have that. It's a wonderful resource and it's a very pleasant space to work, and I've taught in university's that didn't have a departmental library, and it really adds a lot. When I taught at Indiana University, there was no departmental library, the main library was 20 minutes away, and it was often snowing, and it's really detrimental to everything [not to have one] -- preparing for class, doing research, and so I think it's extremely useful.

K: Right, and lastly do you ever have trouble finding things within the library?

P: No, I mean I've used that library so much I know where everything is. I hardly ever look at the card catalog, I mean if I don't know exactly where the book is, I know pretty much what shelf it's on or what aisle it's in, and most of the time these books are books I've used many times so I know what they look like so I just go to the right aisle, look up, and there it is.

K: Great, well thank you very much for your time and participation!
Appendix E

Interview #3: Professor William Race, UNC Department of Classics

K: What is your name, are you a faculty member or graduate student, and how long have you been affiliated with the department?

P: William Race. Faculty Member. And, I have been here fifteen years.

K: So, in your time here, what has your experience been using the Ullman Departmental Library?

P: It's really improved with your coming here, actually, we've had a succession of work study students, etc. who did little things, or nothing at all -- sometimes the library just got piled up with books that were not re-shelved, it was quite honestly, not kept up very well at all. Surprisingly enough, it seems, and maybe you know better, whether or not many volumes were missing? It's hard to tell.

K: Yes, there were actually.

P: Yes, so there were many volumes missing. Once again, it was a whole succession of work-study students and sometimes none at all and so really, when you came to it was in quite bad shape.

K: So, it what ways does your use of materials in Ullman compare to your use of the materials in the main UNC library system?

P: Of course the convenience of being right here, and especially the convenience of putting the materials on the reserve shelf for each of my classes, I mean that's really a major thing. But I also bring Davis books over to supplement, but the first order of business is right here with these, so it's a wonderful convenience to be able to put those on the reserve shelf.

K: Are there any factors about the departmental library outside of convenience that influence your decision to use these materials instead of Davis materials? Things like provenance, who owned the previous books, or marginalia, things like that.

P: No, nothing like that. Sometimes, condition. If they're in really bad shape in the departmental library from overuse, then of course I would prefer to either use my own books to put in there or Davis books.

K: Definitely, okay, and so what are your thoughts regarding integration with the main UNC Library System, now or at any point in the future, either physically or just integration of the catalog system.
P: Well, you've just absolutely done wonders with the catalog system here. I mean it was unusable before, unreliable, everything bad about it, and you've just taken it to a new dimension. And so, I think it's just fabulous now. And one question I have for you and I haven't even tried it yet, can I access it from outside the department?

K: Uh, you can still access a version of the old web catalog from home, but the new catalog that's in there, there is support via the program that we use to have that interface be available on the web, and so we're in the process of getting that done.

P: Now that will be super.

K: The interface is just so much better, and there is a way to have that interface as a web interface, but it's a few steps out.

P: Well that's wonderful, even to get to that point, is a huge tribute to you. So, now you're talking about further integration as a sub field or?

K: As a branch, or something the way that the journalism library or some of the other libraries. I suppose when I say physically it doesn't necessarily mean the books would move, but it would become more of an actual branch library as opposed to just a departmental library.

P: What would be the advantages of that?

K: Um, you would have access to the main library's preservation services, though now we're providing our own in house, but you would have access to the main library's preservation system, they would help with the cataloging, we could use millennium, which is the main integrated library system that they use. So, there would be some elements of convenience, the only problem, I think some of the hesitations that some of the faculty members have raised is that if we integrated with the catalog, so for example, the nice thing would be you could search Davis' catalog and our materials would show up that there is a copy here, but on the other hand then other people outside of the department would be able to see that there are copies here and even though they're not supposed to be circulating, it could lead to problems with security. I think those are kind of the two sides of the coin in trying to decide what would be better.

P: I agree that, I don't see why the integration would really be a good thing. I really don't. Especially if one could access this [catalog system] from outside, that would be wonderful, but to integrate it, I don't like the search engine for the Davis Library very much anyways. It's not very friendly. You have select whether it's the author, etc., and I also look at a lot of music, and music is impossible, because it's either author or work,
and "author" you know, is this the conductor, is this the composer, etc. I think that your system that you've got here is perfectly wonderful for us.

K: Okay great, well and I'm glad that access has really increased with those updates. Do you ever have trouble finding materials, or I guess, has that changed with the new catalog as well?

P: Oh it's much better, it's much much better. I like the way it lists them, that's really nice.

K: And is there anything that we didn't talk about that you'd like to add regarding the library itself and its support of the current faculty and graduate student populations? Do you think that it does support the current research needs of the faculty and graduate student populations adequately?

P: Very much so. It's really surprising. One of the things though, that there are multiple copies of some things in there. And at some point, the library is going to get a HUGE infusion from Jerzy [Linderski]’s library. And so I assume that many of those duplicates are going to have to go to make space.

K: Okay, well thank you so much for your time and participation.
Appeudix F

Interview #4: Professor Robert Babcock, UNC Department of Classics

K: What is your name, and are you a faculty member or graduate student, and how long have you been affiliated with the department?

P: I am Robert Babcock, I am a professor of Latin, and I've been here since August of 2008.

K: So, in your time here, what has your experience been using the departmental library?

P: Well, that's not so easy to answer. I've used it in a lot of ways. First, for my own research, because the basic reference books are there, especially the [text name], and some of the major dictionaries, not all of them. A good many of the paleographical volumes are there, in the folio section, and that I've used both for my research and when I've taught paleography. But I also use them a lot for my classes, and if they weren't in the building I really couldn't use them, so. I have a reserve every semester, for my classes, and put the sort of standard things undergraduates read on those reserves, and copies of the texts that we're reading. And, I use the library a lot, as everyone does, for receptions and giving students exams, etc.

K: Okay, so in what ways does this compare to your use of the main UNC Library System's Classics holdings?

P: All very similar, but of course the main library has a lot more books and it certainly has the books that I use for my research for the most part. They also deliver books to me. When I actually go there, it is actually to use the paleography room or to use things that don't circulate. Usually, I will just have them send it. I also just go over every morning and read the newspaper there, but that's a bit less relevant.

K: Do any factors about the departmental library outside of simply convenience influence your decision to use the materials, such as provenance, marginalia, and things like that?

P: No. There aren't much of that in it anyways, but the only factor that would lead me to use it instead of the Davis copy of the same books (and I don't think there's anything there that's not in Davis) was that I wanted it in my class, and I didn't have to carry it through the rain or the snow, or even carry it period. That it would be in the building and available.
K: So do you think as it stands now, the library is successful at serving the research needs of the current faculty and graduate students?

P: I would not say research needs, no. I would say teaching. I think it's about teaching. It really is helpful for teaching; a lot of what we need sort of basically is there.

K: But for research you tend to rely much more heavily on the main library system?

P: Absolutely, I wouldn't say I don't use anything upstairs in Ullman for research, but very little.

K: And what are your thoughts regarding integration with the main library system at any point in the future, and this can address either physical integration or just integration of the online public access catalog?

P: It would be very helpful to me, actually, if when I search Davis catalog it would tell me there was a copy here. Sometimes when I just want a Latin text or Greek text, I would be glad to know it was here and I could run and get it quickly instead of having to have it delivered two days later. The catalog I think would be useful, but if it's integrated [physically] into Davis it just ceases to be a library.

K: Right, and I guess it's a bit of a moot point since most of the books as they stand right now are duplicates.

P: I do think that, as I said, when I do use it, it is the reference books there that I use, and while mostly those reference books don't circulate at Davis, they are also not gathered all together in one place. It's a lot easier to look up something quick. Sometimes ten minutes before class, I'll realize I can't remember whether Severus came before or after Antoninus Pius and so I just want to look at basic historical facts or something very basic about a reference sort of question. And having it nearby, but also having most of the major works together. The other thing that I've used there a lot has been L'Annee Philologique, but now it is online so I don't really need to go there to use it.

K: Okay, and just was there anything that we didn't discuss that you have thoughts on or would like to add regarding its support of the current populations?

P: I think that it would be very good to have more comfortable seating in there. The lounge chair that's in the back corner is so ratty, I don't even like to sit it in. It's torn, the whole upholstery is torn. But, I think there should be almost half a dozen comfortable chairs to sit in there rather than just the wooden chairs at the table. Most people are using the tables obviously, and using a laptop and they have three or four things spread out there, you need a table, but there is the little area there underneath the photographs where there could be some more comfortable seating. And, as I was saying, I do use this as a meeting place, it's a place for sort of social interactions as well, and it would be nice also
when I pick up a Latin text where I just need to read a couple of pages to have a comfortable place to sit. I would bring it down here to my office because it is so uncomfortable to sit up there, and it would be better just to skim it there. The one other thing I would say that would improve it for me and I think for everybody, is if there was a shelf for re-shelving, and if someone else did the re-shelving.

K: Well, we have done that this semester at least, we added one by the door.

P: I didn't even know that, actually.

K: And mostly, it's been for undergraduate use for people who can't check things out and so they've just pulled things and are using them in the library, and previously were re-shelving them themselves, but we have actually talked about having a book return box.

P: Yeah, when people re-shelf things themself they put them in the wrong place, and then it's just lost forever.

K: Yeah, one of the interns has spent three Saturdays shelf reading just trying to get everything back in order.

P: But it would be helpful just to be able to [place books on a return shelf]. It would make it more attractive to use it more, if I could pull out the two things I need, and then just throw them by the door as I left rather than re-shelf them. I guess it would make it more useable for the undergraduates if there were more computer terminals in there, and not just a computer that was the catalog, but actual, I mean a computer that they could get to Davis catalog, that they could get to the internet. I don't think we need to be providing them email access or web surfing, or casual things, they can get that at the House Library, but I think it would be useful it were possible. But I mean, I don't know where they'd go, they take up a lot of space. But I do think that so much of what we do in the libraries today is online, so many of the databases are online, and I'm constantly having students search the online dictionaries and the online databases of Latin texts and if they could do that where they have the text, especially where they have a set of Loeb's, so that they could search it, find the six places they need to read, and then go get the Loeb so they could have the translation along with the Latin. You know, most of them have laptops; I don't know how much it matters to them, but some of them it would help. It would make that library more useful place for them to work. Because they do really have to go to Davis.

K: Great, well thank you so much for your time and participation.
Appendix G

Interview #5: Professor James Rives, UNC Department of Classics

K: What is your name, and are you a faculty member or graduate student, and how long have you been affiliated with the department?

P: My name is James Rives, I am a faculty member, and this is my 6th year in the department.

K: What has your experience been using the Ullman departmental library throughout your time with the department.

P: My experience...

K: Specifically, as far as usage of the materials.

P: Well, I use it mostly as a reference collection, both for research and for teaching. So, I use its resources for reserve shelves for teaching, for my own class preparation, although less frequently for that, and also for my own research, working on projects and need resources that I don't have myself.

K: And in what ways does this compare to your use of the main UNC Library System's Classics holdings?

P: Well, I rarely use the main library for teaching purposes. I do, sometimes, but I rely more on the Ullman collection. And probably, I use the main library more for research, because my research tends to be on subjects that are not so much covered by our collection in the library.

K: Do any factors about the departmental library outside of just convenience influence you decision to use these materials instead of Davis materials, so for example, provenance or marginalia, notes, things like that?

P: Not so often, no, although I always enjoy noting who had books earlier, and as a result sometimes I do pay attention to the marginalia. But it's more about convenience.

K: Do you think that the Ullman Library as it is right now is successful at serving the research needs of the faculty and graduate students?

P: Yes, I think so. My sense would be as much as any collection like that could be, it is probably more geared towards some people than others in terms of research area, but it provides really crucial support. If I had to go to Davis for general reference purposes and general texts and commentaries that would really be a pain.
K: And so what are your thoughts regarding integration with the main library system now or at any point in the future, and this can address either physical integration, such as turning this into a branch, or integration just of the catalog?

P: Well, I'm not sure what the ramifications would be, I'd want to know more about that first. Because I think it's useful having it be under departmental control. How much control we would lose if we were to be integrated into the system, I don't know that. I would want to know first.

K: I guess the main things that people have kind of discussed, the balancing act would be you would get access to their preservation services, the stuff would be in Davis' catalog, those things would be good. On the other hand, more people would know that the books were here so there could be security issues and like you said, potential loss of control. So those are kind of the two sides of the coin.

P: Yeah, yeah, that would be a concern. I suppose if it was part of the full system anyone could check them out or?

K: You could still keep it as a non-circulating library, but it would show up in the catalog so people would know that they were here.

P: Right, which probably wouldn't matter so much because I would think relatively few people outside of people in the department or adjuncts, people who were already adjuncts, would know about it, and but it would come up.

K: And was there anything that we didn't talk about that you would like to add regarding the topic of the library or its support of the faculty and graduate students?

P: Well, I think another dimension of it is simply the physical space. It gives a common space to the department, everyone uses it, it provides, I think its important for our communal identity. So I think that's a very important aspect of it. And also, going back to your question about marginalia, although I don't use that myself so much, I think other people might, it does create a sense of community over time as well, that we have the collections from Ullman and Broughton, and people from the past, previous members of the department, and so I think it has got an important substantive, you might say symbolic significance which is important, I think.

K: Great! Well thank you very much for your time and participation.
Appendix H
Interview #6: Professor Brendan Boyle, UNC Department of Classics

K: What is your name (if willing to provide as indicated on the written consent form), are you a faculty member or graduate student, and how long have you been affiliated with the UNC Classics Department?

P: Brendan Boyle – faculty, nearly five years.

K: What has your experience been using the Ullman Departmental Library throughout your time here at UNC-Chapel Hill?

P: My office is just across the library – I often pop in, perhaps two or three times a day, mostly to check a reference quickly.

K: In what ways does this compare to your use of the main UNC Library System’s holdings?

P: I suppose that I don’t really make “quick,” “pop-in-and-out” visits to Davis. I don’t check out many books from Ullman, either, though I do from Davis. I don’t sit down and study in either. But sometimes I will just go into Ullman and browse around, and I don’t really do this at Davis. Something about the size of the Ullman collection makes such disinterested browsing more pleasant, and somehow more productive. It doesn’t – from my perspective – make a ton of sense to just head on over to Davis without a plan. Just browsing the stacks isn’t really that easily done. There are just too many books.

K: Do any factors about the departmental library, outside of simply convenience, influence your decisions to use departmental materials?

P: Something about the size of the collection makes, as I said before, browsing the shelves more pleasant and rewarding. I find myself actually picking up and reading books I hadn’t read before. That very seldom happens at Davis.

K: Do you think that the Ullman Library is successful at serving the research needs of the current Faculty and Graduate Students?

P: It’s certainly not unsuccessful. But it is hard to compare with Davis when it comes to “serving research needs.” The success of Ullman seems something else entirely.

K: What are your thoughts regarding integration with the main library system now, or at any point in the future (this can address either physical integration or integration of the Online Public Access Catalog “OPAC”, or both)?
I’m not sure I know what this means, but I hope that Ullman would not be opened to non-Classics faculty and graduate students. It might be okay to have its results included in the Davis search catalog (as they may well already be), but borrowing privileges should be restricted to members of the Classics department except in very extraordinary circumstances.

**K:** Was there anything we didn’t discuss that you would like to add regarding the topic of the Ullman Library and its support of the current Faculty and Graduate Student populations?

**P:** The library is a gorgeous place and that physical space is a beautiful addition to the department. I think I didn't mention it -- but feel free to add my name to the list of those who value the library in that way -- because I don't spend an awful lot of time there studying or reading.

**K:** Thank you for your time and participation in this research study.
Appendix I

Interview #7: Emma Buckingham, Graduate Student, UNC Department of Classics

K: What is your name, and are you a faculty member or graduate student, and how long have you been affiliated with the department?

P: My name is Emma Buckingham, and I am a graduate student, and I have been a graduate student in this department for two years, or almost two years.

K: So what has your experience been using the Ullman departmental library throughout your time here so far?

P: It's been good, I don't really have any complaints. I mainly go there to use the books on reserve, and occasionally, since I mainly do archaeological research, there isn't as extensive [materials] in the library as there is for Classical research, so if I use the books there it's usually for the Classics classes. I use a lot of the Oxford stuff, a lot of the Loeb texts. And, yeah, I have recently started using the new search engine and it has been super useful I think.

K: Great! So in what ways does this compare to your use of the main UNC Library System's related holdings?

P: Well, if I'm looking for a Classics-related book I usually search first in the Classics Library just because it's more convenient, and if I can't find it there I'll look in Davis. I guess one of the main differences there is that the [Ullman] catalog isn't online, I don't know if it has previously been available online, so I don't extensively, or as extensively use it as much as I do Davis. Just because I can always request books sent from Davis and I can't do that here. But, I think it's a lot more convenient for me generally because it's a lot easier to get books there.

K: Do any factors about the departmental library outside of convenience influence your decision to use the departmental materials, such as the provenance, who owned the materials before, or notes in the margins, things like that.

P: Not generally, just convenience.

K: Do you think that the Ullman Library is successful at serving the research needs of the faculty and graduate students?

P: Yes, I think for Classics. I think for archaeology, history, I haven't had that much success finding books I had wanted. On occasion, there are some, but it's just not that extensive. I think it is more Classics-centered.
K: Okay, so what are your thoughts regarding integration with the main library system, now or at any point in the future? And this can address either physical integration or just integration of the catalog?

P: I think, I'm generally for it, just because I think it's super convenient just to order books and have them sent to Davis, or I don't know if you're integrating it that much, but if you could have books from Davis sent to the Classics library (as if it was a branch) that would be helpful. The only concern I would have is that because no one really knows about the library, outside of the Classics Department, books are more likely to be checked out here. So that's the main concern that I would have.

K: Right, okay, and so was there anything else that we didn't discuss that you'd like to add regarding the topic of the library or its support of the faculty and graduate student populations?

P: I can't really think of anything right now.

K: Well thank you very much for your time and participation.
Interview #8: Ted Gellar-Goad, Graduate Student, UNC Department of Classics

K: What is your name, are you a faculty member or graduate student, and how long have you been affiliated with the department?

P: Ted Gellar-Goad, I am a graduate student, and I have been affiliated with the department since Spring 2004, so I guess 8 years.

K: Okay, and what has your experience been using the Ullman Departmental Library throughout your time here?

P: I didn't use it when I was an undergraduate, so for the first two years, but since I've been a graduate student for the last six years it's been fantastic.

K: What ways does your use of materials in Ullman compare with your use of Classics materials in the main library system?

P: Well, the main library system is much more complete and I am actually allowed to take things home with me, so, I use that when possible, especially since I found out that I can do a request system and I don't even have to go to the stacks and they bring it to me, which means they resent me a lot, but it means I only have to show up to the desk and check out like twenty books right there. So, I use that a lot more, but the library here is good for if I just need to check a line or I used to use it when I was in charge of the Latin poetry group for getting lots of copies of one text to just use for an hour and then take back. And it has, there are some things that our library has that the Davis one doesn't, and that are very important and very useful. Or ones that Davis marks as core so I can't take them out of the building, whereas here I can get away with it if I need to.

K: So do any factors about the departmental library materials outside of simply convenience influence your decision to use them, such as things like the provenance, who owned the materials previously, or notes in the margins?

P: No, not really. The provenance of the Loeb collection at Davis is really cool, actually, because it comes from Di Phi, the Dialectic and Philanthropic Society, which besides being like the oldest, or one of the oldest student organizations on campus, had the first or one of the first academic libraries in the state, and so that's kind of cool knowing the heritage of those books. But no, it's mainly convenience. I mean, sometimes it's neat to see from some big name scholar to some UNC Emeritus professor on the front page of a text, that's kind of cool.
K: Do you think that the Ullman Library is successful at serving the research needs of the current faculty and graduate students?

P: Yeah, I think it does a good job. There's always more you can do with a library, but that's true of any of them, and I think it's very useful, it's very good.

K: What are your thoughts regarding integration with the main library system, now or at any point in the future, and this can address either physical integration (turning it into more of a branch library) or just integration of the catalog?

P: Integration of the catalog is fine, and I think would be a good thing because right now I don't use the Ullman search function at all, and I basically just go up there hoping something is there, and if I can't find it I go to Davis. So that would be a good thing, I think. I would not like making it a branch, if that would end up encouraging non-Classics people to go there, or relinquishing any control. I think that our department should have complete control over how it operates.

K: And just then, is there anything that we didn't discuss that you would like to add regarding the library and its support of students and faculty?

P: I think, you know, it's also a good space. That's one of the things that libraries have been doing more recently has been thinking about it as a place to be, not just as a place to store books, and I think ours is good for our purposes and has nice little bits of department history. Maybe a more conscious focus on decor and space might be a nice way to go, but I think it is good.

K: Well, thank you very much for your time and participation.