Working Effectively with LibQUAL+®

Raynna Bowlby
Martha Kyrillidou

Association of Research Libraries

Library Assessment Conference
Baltimore MD
October 24, 2010

www.libqual.org
Desired Outcomes
As a result of our work together today, you will be prepared to…

- Initiate a process of continuous assessment
- Perform some simple analyses of the LibQUAL+® survey results data
  - Working mainly with the 22 core LibQUAL+® questions
- Utilize the data to target areas for improvement
- Communicate results to different stakeholders
- Organize your library colleagues to work with LibQUAL+® results
- Identify your Next Steps
What’s in your Work Plan?

• Initiating a Process of Continuous Assessment
  – Thinking in terms of a “culture of assessment”, re/confirming survey objectives, organizing the library, colleagues and groups to work with LibQUAL+® results

• Understanding the Data and Results
  – Interpreting representativeness, performing simple analyses of the quantitative and qualitative results data, preparing charts & graphs, making comparisons, mining LibQUAL+® Analytics, when to use SPSS, identifying what is actionable, and more…

• Developing the Organization
  – Presenting results to stakeholders, engaging staff in utilizing data

• Using LibQUAL+® Effectively
  – Targeting incremental improvements, establishing SMART goals, applying data in decision-making, finalizing tasks, roles, & responsibilities, planning Next Steps in a cycle of continuous assessment and improvement

    See Handout #4: Work Plan: After the LibQUAL+® Survey
Work Plan: Tasks, Roles & Responsibilities

- Develop an understanding of the work that your library may want to undertake after the LibQUAL+® survey
- Decide what work your library will / won’t do
- Determine if your library will assign the responsibility to a single individual or will assemble a group / team
- Identify the knowledge, skills, abilities (KSAs) needed to successfully perform the desired work
- Assign the work to match the KSAs and/or acquire the needed KSAs

(Consider the above for all library assessment, not just LibQUAL+®?)
Initiating a Process of Continuous Assessment
A Culture of Assessment is an organizational environment in which decisions are based on facts, research and analysis, and where services are planned and delivered in ways that maximize positive outcomes and impacts for customers and stakeholders. A Culture of Assessment exists in organizations where staff care to know what results they produce and how those results relate to customers’ expectations. Organizational mission, values, structures, and systems support behavior that is performance and learning focused.

Originally developed by Amos Lakos (University of Waterloo) and Betsy Wilson (University of Washington) – 1998
Revised and updated by Amos Lakos and Shelley Phipps (University of Arizona) – 2002
Developing a Culture of Assessment

“The issue is this: libraries, in general, recognize the value of collecting and using data for planning and decision-making, but they do not do this systematically or effectively”

“We’re not just measuring, we’re aiming for improvement.”

Shelley Phipps, August 5, 2008
Organizational Performance Assessment for Libraries (OPAL)

• How prepared is your library to demonstrate the value of its contributions to the institution and to the work of faculty, students, researchers and clinicians?

• OPAL consulting has two main thrusts: user-centered focus and strategically aligned assessment.

• OPAL is the successor to, and builds upon, the Effective, Sustainable, and Practical Assessment initiative developed by ARL Visiting Program Officers Jim Self (U. of Virginia) and Steve Hiller (U. of Washington), working with Martha Kyrillidou.

• Beginning in 2011, Raynna Bowlby will join the ARL team and augment the capabilities of these experienced ESP consultants with additional expertise in consulting, training, and organizational development.

• An OPAL consultation is suitable for libraries that may have previously had an ESP consultation but are ready to align and advance their planning and assessment or for libraries early in their development of an assessment program; the consultation will be customized to an individual library’s unique situation.

• OPAL can also help libraries take advantage of the analysis and community building capabilities of StatsQUAL®, ARL’s gateway to library assessment tools.
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PLUG IN …
brought to you by LAC

Don’t miss LAC PARALLEL SESSION 3:

Building Scorecards in Academic Research Libraries: Organizational Issues and Measuring Performance

Vivian Lewis, McMaster University
Steve Hiller, University of Washington
Elizabeth Mengel, Johns Hopkins University
Donna Tolson, University of Virginia

Tuesday, October 26 10:30 a.m. – 12 noon
Re/Confirm Survey
Objectives/Desired Outcomes

• Conducting LibQUAL+® is not an end in itself

• Review (or articulate) WHY the library wants feedback from users; be specific
  – Why did your library administer LibQUAL+®?

• Be mindful of potential targets of interest, e.g.:
  – Customer input for library Strategic Planning
  – Assessment for institutional accreditation
  – Intention to become more user-centered
  – Focus on specific institutional or library strategic initiatives such as:
    • space/facilities issues
    • collection(s) changes
    • web re/design
    • customer service, etc.
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Enlisting Colleagues: An Assessment Group or Team

What are the responsibilities of your Library’s group or team vis-à-vis LibQUAL+®?
Enlisting Colleagues: An Assessment Group or Team

See Handout #5: Implementing a Group or Team
Implementing a LibQUAL+® or Assessment Group/Team

Consider the purpose / scope of the group’s work:

– Broad (all assessment) vs. specific (LibQUAL+® only)?
– On-going vs. situational?
– Task-oriented
  • administer, analyze?
– Facilitative
  • communicate, present, assist others in understanding/utilizing data/results?
– Leadership-focused
  • synthesize, recommend, direct others to implement changes?
Components of the Charge for a Group/Team

• Purpose and/or Scope
• Products / Deliverables
• Assumptions and Parameters
  – the extent of the group’s autonomy / authority
  – approval process(es)
  – w/whom and how often the group will communicate w/colleagues
  – suggested approaches for methods of operation and how the group will function
  – available resources (budget, people, etc.)
• Timeline
• Member knowledge, skills, & abilities
Don’t miss LAC PARALLEL SESSION 6:

Recruiting for Results: Assessment Skills and the Academic Library Job Market

Scott Walter, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Megan Oakleaf, Syracuse University

Wednesday, October 27 8:30 a.m. – 10 a.m.
Don’t miss ARL SPEC Kit #303:

Library Assessment

Stephanie Wright (U. Washington) &
Lynda White (U. Virginia)
Understanding LibQUAL+®
Data & Results

Don’t fear the data
libqual.org
http://www.libqual.org/home
These LQ Data Tools are Your Friends
Most are available at: http://www.libqual.org/home

• Results Notebook
• [Custom Notebooks*]  
• Comments file
• LibQUAL+® Analytics
• Excel data files
• [SPSS data files]

*These files requested during LibQUAL+® survey registration
Results Notebook
In Adobe PDF format

• Sections for Overall, Undergraduates, Graduates, Faculty, Staff, Library Staff include:
  – Demographic Summary
  – Core Questions Summary
  – Dimensions Summary
  – Local Questions
  – General Satisfaction Questions
  – Information Literacy Outcomes Questions
  – Library Use Summary

• Appendix describing changes in the dimensions and the questions included in each dimension.
## Results Notebook

### Demographic Summary

9. College or University Libraries Demographic Summary for ARL

#### Respondents by User Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Group</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh year</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth year</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth year and above</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>3,164</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3,383</td>
<td>11.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree or Undecided</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>6,319</td>
<td>22.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Faculty</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Staff</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>3,296</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Head of Unit</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Staff</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff positions</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,343</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language: American English
Institution Type: College or University
Location: ARL
User Group: All
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## Results Notebook
### Core Question Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Desired</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Affect of service: Employees who instill confidence in users</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving users individual attention</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employees who are consistently courteous</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Readiness to respond to users' questions</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Employees who have the knowledge to answer users' questions</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Employees who deal with users in a caring manner</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Employees who understand the needs of their users</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Willingness to help users</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Willingness to help users</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Willingness to help users</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectancy in handling users' service problems</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Information Control: Making electronic resources accessible from any source</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A library Web site making me to locate information on any issue</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The printed library materials I used for my work</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The electronic information resources I used</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Modern equipment for me to easily access needed information</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on any issue</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Making information easily accessible for independent use</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Print and/or electronic journal collections I used for my work</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Library Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Desired</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Library space that augments study and learning</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quiet space for individual activities</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A comfortable and inviting location</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A gateway for study, learning, or research</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Consultative space for group learning and group study</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Desired</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Key Term: Zone of Tolerance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Minimum Mean</th>
<th>Desired Mean</th>
<th>Perceived Mean</th>
<th>Adequacy Mean</th>
<th>Superiority Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Service</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>2.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Control</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>2.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library as Place</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>2.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall:</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>2.448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Local Question Summary

This table shows mean scores of each of the local questions added by the individual library or consortium, where $n$ is the number of respondents for each particular question. For a more detailed explanation of the headings, see the introduction to this notebook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Minimum Mean</th>
<th>Desired Mean</th>
<th>Perceived Mean</th>
<th>Adequacy Mean</th>
<th>Superiority Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenient service hours</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing me of useful library services</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing direction to self-navigate the library</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing help when and where I need it</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching me how to locate, evaluate, and use info</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.4 General Satisfaction Questions Summary

This table displays mean score and standard deviation for each of the general satisfaction questions: Satisfaction with Treatment, Satisfaction with Support, and Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Service, where \( n \) is the number of respondents for each particular question. These scores are calculated from responses to the general satisfaction questions on the LibQUAL+® survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1-9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( n )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>15,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>15,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>15,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.5 Information Literacy Outcomes Questions Summary

This table displays the mean score and standard deviation for each of the information literacy outcomes questions, where \( n \) is the number of respondents for each particular question. These scores are calculated from responses to the information literacy outcomes questions on the LibQUAL+® survey, in which respondents rated their levels of general satisfaction on a scale from 1-9 with 1 being "strongly disagree" and 9 representing "strongly agree."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Literacy Outcomes Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( n )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>15,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>15,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>15,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>15,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>15,766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results Notebook
Library Use Summary

This chart shows a graphic representation of library use (both on the premises and electronically), as well as use of non-library information gateways such as Yahoo!® and Google®. Bars represent the frequency with which respondents report using these resources: Daily, Weekly, Monthly, Quarterly, or Never. The table below the chart displays the number and percentage of respondents who selected each option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you use resources on library premises?</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>97.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>95.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you use Yahoo!(TM), Google(TM), or non-library gateways for information?</td>
<td>13.81%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>85.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language: American English
Institution Type: College or University
Degree: Bachelor
Year: 2009
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Comments File
Available from: Data Repository link
Plus, real-time access to the comments during Stage 2) Monitor Survey Progress

Basic demographic information such as user group, age, sex, and library branch (if available) is provided with each comment. Comments are also tagged with a unique identification number that enables you to link each comment to the individual’s survey response.

Comments are not visible to other institutions participating in LibQUAL+®; only your institution has access to your comments.
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LibQUAL+® Analytics
http://www.libqual.org/SurveyInstruments/LibQual/Analytics.aspx
LibQUAL+® Analytics

http://www.libqual.org/SurveyInstruments/LibQual/Analytics.aspx

• Basic Statistics
  – Means and Standard Deviation

• Institution Explorer
  – User Group and Standard Discipline analysis
    • Representativeness graphs
    • Radar chart
    • Library Use chart
    • Thermometer chart
    • Cumulative percentile distribution

• Longitudinal
LibQUAL+® Analytics

http://www.libqual.org/SurveyInstruments/LibQual/Analytics.aspx

The analytics engine is under construction. Thank you for your patience as we migrate content and verify data to this page during the coming months. For survey years not in the list, please visit [http://www.libqual.org](http://www.libqual.org).

**Disseminating Results**

Institutions may share their OWN data within their institutions in any way they see appropriate for promoting and improving library services. Institutions should NOT use other libraries' data in ANY WAY that would compromise and harm the reputation of other institutions. Institutions may use other libraries' data in a confidential manner without disclosing the institutional identity of other libraries. Access to this password-protected area where the results from LibQUAL+® are posted should be controlled by the director, or the designated coordinator, of the participating library.

In a “New Measures” environment, if we are to learn from one another and improve libraries, we must refrain from comparisons that suggest that some institutions are better than others based on the LibQUAL+® protocol. LibQUAL+® allows institutions to compare user PERCEPTIONS of service delivery against expectations; a library may assert that it is doing a better job of meeting user expectations (based on Gap Scores), than another but it is not useful to assert that a library is BETTER than another. Libraries may compare their results with those of peer institutions for identifying best practices and emulation in meeting user expectations and in managing user perceptions. Perceptions and attitudes can change rapidly as a result of local circumstances; rank ordering is not useful in this context. LibQUAL+® attempts to serve as a tool for local diagnostic purposes and cross-institutional comparisons for learning from one another.

LibQUAL+® is only one of multiple methods an institution may adopt in evaluating their services regularly and systematically to ensure that they are meeting the needs of their users. ARL will continue to offer opportunities for libraries to share their experiences and uses of the data so that libraries can learn how to better meet user expectations from an exemplar and identify best practices in the area of meeting user expectations and managing user perceptions.

### Positions (Hide Details)

- Undergraduate
- Graduate
- Faculty
- Library Staff

### Disciplines (Hide Details)

- Agriculture / Environmental Studies
- Architecture
- Business
- Communications / Journalism
- Education
- Engineering / Computer Science
- General Studies
- Health Sciences
- Humanities
- Law
- Military / Naval Science
- Other
- Performing & Fine Arts
- Science / Math
- Social Sciences / Psychology
- Undecided

[Update]
LibQUAL+® Analytics
http://www.libqual.org/SurveyInstruments/LibQual/Analytics.aspx
Before we go on…

These LQ Constructs can be Challenging!

- Means and Standard Deviation
- The Zone of Tolerance
- Radar Charts
- Standard vs. Customized Disciplines
- Representativeness
Understanding Means & Standard Deviation

• Mean = arithmetic average
  – A measure of central tendency
  – Takes into account all scores
  – Sensitive to all values and affected by extreme scores

• Standard Deviation = average distance
  – A measure of dispersion
  – Takes into account all scores
  – Sensitive to all values and affected by extreme scores
Means & Standard Deviation

Exercise

• Evaluate the means and standard deviations
  – How do you interpret mean scores?
  – How do you interpret standard deviations?

Don’t fear the data
Understanding the Zone of Tolerance

• For the 22 items LibQUAL+® asks users’ to rate their
  – Minimum service level
  – Desired service level
  – Perceived service performance

• This gives us a ‘Zone of Tolerance’ for each question; the distance between minimally acceptable and desired service ratings

• Perception ratings ideally fall within the Zone of Tolerance

www.libqual.org
Understanding the Zone of Tolerance
Understanding the Zone of Tolerance
Understanding Radar Charts
Understanding Radar Charts
Understanding Disciplines

Standard Disciplines
• LibQUAL+® provides standard discipline options that you can customize to your institution’s disciplines or other affiliations. The standard disciplines used on the American English version of the survey are adapted from those used by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for U.S. institutions of higher education, based on the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP).

Custom Disciplines
• You may choose to create your own discipline categories, using your local terminology. If you choose to add your own categories, each MUST be mapped to a LibQUAL+® standard discipline for data analysis purposes. (Please make sure your new term(s) relate to the standard disciplines.)
Understanding Representativeness

Conclusions and recommendations are grounded in an understanding about your survey respondents and the population you surveyed.
Representativeness - Standard Disciplines

An Academic Library

Respondents vs Population
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Representativeness - Customized Disciplines

An Academic Library

Respondents vs. Population

www.libqual.org
Raw Data Files
In Excel and SPSS Format
Data Repository Link

• You will receive access to your complete raw survey data in Excel format
• You will also receive an SPSS syntax file that you can apply to the Excel file to analyze your data in SPSS
• All records—partial, invalid, and completed—are included in the Excel file
• It may be downloaded from the Repository
SPSS Data Files
Statistical Package for the Social Sciences … bought by IBM!

• More complex analysis than Excel in an easier way
  – Excel can do a lot of things that SPSS can do but not everything

• Analyze datasets – LQ Questions you can answer:
  – Discipline means and SD
  – Relationship between different variables
  – Validity and reliability analysis

The SPSS data file production process is now available through the data repository. You will have to download your Excel file and apply an SPSS syntax file that will be available to you through the data repository to produce the .sav file. This way you can have the SPSS datafile as soon as you close your survey.
Don’t miss LAC PARALLEL SESSION 1:

Does Using Item Sampling Methods in Library Service Quality Assessment Compromise Data Integrity or Zone of Tolerance Interpretation?: A LibQUAL+® Lite Study

Bruce Thompson, Texas A&M U
Martha Kyrillidou, ARL
Colleen Cook, Texas A&M U

Monday, October 25 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
BREAK
How do we INTERPRET survey results?
Typical Framework

How do users rate the Library?

What “scores” do users give the Library’s performance?

Note: This is the simplest analysis and does not take advantage of the “gap analysis” opportunity.
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Identify areas where the user community thinks the Library is performing "best" and "worst".

Note: This is the simplest analysis and does not take advantage of the "gap analysis" opportunity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Question Text</th>
<th>Minimum Mean</th>
<th>Desired Mean</th>
<th>Perceived Mean</th>
<th>Adequacy Mean</th>
<th>Superiority Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Affect of Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-1</td>
<td>Employees who instill confidence in users</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>2,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-2</td>
<td>Giving users individual attention</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>2,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-3</td>
<td>Employees who are consistently courteous</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>2,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-4</td>
<td>Readiness to respond to users' questions</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>2,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-5</td>
<td>Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-6</td>
<td>Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-7</td>
<td>Employees who understand the needs of their users</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>2,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-8</td>
<td>Willingness to help users</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>2,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-9</td>
<td>Dependability in handling users' service problems</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>2,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Information Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-1</td>
<td>Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>2,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-2</td>
<td>A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>2,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-3</td>
<td>The printed library materials I need for my work</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>2,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-4</td>
<td>The electronic information resources I need</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>2,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-5</td>
<td>Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>2,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-6</td>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>2,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-7</td>
<td>Making information easily accessible for independent use</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>2,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-8</td>
<td>Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>2,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Library as Place</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-1</td>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>2,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-2</td>
<td>Quiet space for individual activities</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>2,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-3</td>
<td>A comfortable and inviting location</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>2,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-4</td>
<td>A gateway for study, learning, or research</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>2,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-5</td>
<td>Community space for group learning and group study</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>2,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>2,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Interpretation Framework
Example Library Core Summary “Perceived” - 2008
Interpreting Service Quality Data

Three Interpretation Frameworks

#1 – Zone of Tolerance
#2 – Longitudinal
#3 – Peer Comparisons
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Interpreting **Perceived** Scores Against Minimally-Acceptable and Desired Service Levels (i.e., “Zones of Tolerance”)
Framework # 1 – Zone of Tolerance
Example Library Core Summary - 2009
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Identify areas where the user community has the highest “wants”
Framework # 1– Zone of Tolerance

Example Library Core Summary - 2009

Identify users’ highest “wants”
Identify areas where the user community thinks the Library is 
“furthest from meeting minimum needs”
Framework # 1– Zone of Tolerance

Example Library Core Summary - 2009

Identify areas where the Libraries are furthest from meeting users’ minimum “needs”
Framework # 1 – Zone of Tolerance

Example Library Dimension Summary - 2009
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Interpreting Service Quality Data

Interpretation Frameworks can also be applied to data gathered by separate User Groups, by Discipline affiliation and by primary library (Branch) use.
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Framework # 1 – Zone of Tolerance

Example Library Core Summary by User Group (Grad Students)

Identify highest “wants” for Grad Students
Identify areas where the Libraries are furthest from meeting Grad minimum “needs”
Framework # 1– Zone of Tolerance

Example Library Single Core Item by Discipline

Identify disciplines with highest “wants” for e-resources
Identify where the e-resources are furthest from meeting discipline minimum “needs”
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Interpretation Framework #2

Benchmarking Against Self, Longitudinally

“Nobody is more like me than me!”
--Anonymous
Framework # 2 – Longitudinal

• An interpretation framework that allows you to compare performance over time

• Are my scores increasing or decreasing?

• Are my scores increasing or decreasing for specific subgroups of my population: faculty, grad, undergraduates, and/or disciplines or branches?
Framework # 2 – Longitudinal
Example Library Satisfaction (All Users, 2004 – 2008)

General Satisfaction
Overall 2004 to 2008
*All user groups (excluding Library Staff)

In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?

Increase in satisfaction in all 3 satisfaction measures for Total Population
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Framework # 2 – Longitudinal
Example Library Satisfaction (Faculty, 2004 – 2008)

General Satisfaction
Faculty 2004 to 2008
*All user groups (excluding Library Staff)

In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?

Increase in satisfaction in all 3 satisfaction measures for Faculty
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Framework # 2 – Longitudinal
Example Library Satisfaction (Undergrads, 2004 – 2008)

General Satisfaction
Undergraduates 2004 to 2008
*All user groups (excluding Library Staff)

Unchanged or decrease in satisfaction in all 3 satisfaction measures for Undergraduates
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Faculty tolerance is narrowing: their minimum needs are higher but their desires are stable.

Space and place needs are increasing over time, though overall remain less critical for faculty than other issues.
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Wow, customer service for faculty is improving even while some expectations are increasing!

Ouch, even though this Library improved slightly, the ability to meet faculty needs for information and access is not keeping pace with expectations

This Library seems to be keeping pace with increasing faculty expectations about library spaces
Framework # 2 – Longitudinal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 8 Information Control</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on the library website</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making information easily accessible for independent study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making electronic resources accessible from my home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A library website enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern equipment that lets me easily access the information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 ** Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ** The printed library materials I need for my work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 * The electronic information resources I need</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect of Service</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to respond to users’ questions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who understand the needs of their users</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who instill confidence in users</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to help users</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving users individual attention</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability in handling users’ service problems</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who are consistently courteous</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library as Place</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A getway for study, learning, or research</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet space for individual activities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comfortable and inviting location</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community space for group learning and group study</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Fred Heath, LibQUAL+™ Results Meeting, ALA Annual Conference, Seattle, WA, January 22, 2007
Interpretation Framework #3

Benchmarking Against Peer Institutions
--1,000,000 Users; 1,000 Institutions!
Framework #3 – Peer Comparisons

• How do I select peers?
  – Listen, talk to, or search web sites of your University Office of Institutional Research, Provost, President
  – Consortium members
  – Descriptive library statistics
  – Type of institution
  – Size of the faculty, student body (in specific disciplines)
In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.

*Data taken from last year of participation*
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.

*Data taken from last year of participation
Framework #3 – Peer Comparisons

Peer Comparison
General Satisfaction
*Data taken from last year of participation

How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?

Library's conclusion: There's still room for improvement!
Framework #3 – Peer Comparisons

Adequacy Gap
The difference between the minimum and perceived score.

Source: Fred Heath, LibQUAL+™ Results Meeting, ALA Annual Conference, Seattle, WA, January 22, 2007
Framework #3 – Peer Comparisons

Library Values

What matters most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 Most Important Services</th>
<th>Desired Mean: All excluding library staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Physical library as a haven for study, learning, or research</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Physical library to provide quiet space for individual work</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Physical library to provide quiet space for individual work</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do we do best

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 Most Satisfactory Services</th>
<th>Adequacy Gap: All (Excluding library staff)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library staff who instill confidence in users</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff who are consistently courteous</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff who have the knowledge to answer users' questions</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to respond to users' enquires</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff's willingness to help users</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvement needed most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 Services where improvement needed most</th>
<th>Dequacy Gap: All (Excluding library staff)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space for group learning and group study</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet space for individual work</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving users individual attention</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.libqual.org

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University  http://libraryassessment.org/bm~doc/chim.pdf
Framework #3 – Peer Comparisons

LibQUAL+ 2006
Faculty Ratings of Journal Collections
ARL Libraries

Top of Blue Bar = Desired Level of Service
Bottom of Blue Bar = Minimum Level of Service
Red Square = Perceived Service Performance

Framework #3 – Peer Comparisons

LibQUAL+ 2006
Overall Quality of the Service Provided by the Library
38 ARL Libraries

Don’t miss LAC PARALLEL SESSION 1:

Canada Lite: Impact of LibQUAL+® Lite on the Members of the LibQUAL+® Canada Consortium

Sam Kalb, Queen’s U
Sylvain Champaign, HEC Montreal
Susan Czarnocki, McGill U
Eun-ha-Hong, Wilfred Laurier U

Monday, October 25 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
Framework #3 – Peer Comparisons:

LibQUAL+® Norms: [http://people.cehd.tamu.edu/%7Ebthompson/libq2005.htm](http://people.cehd.tamu.edu/%7Ebthompson/libq2005.htm)

- Identify your score
- Compare it to a relevant norms table
  - Year
  - Subgroup
  - Dimension
- Norms are stable and are not calculated on an annual basis anymore (see article)
Interpreting Service Quality Data

Putting It All Together!

#1 – Zone of Tolerance
#2 – Longitudinal
#3 – Peer Comparisons

www.libqual.org
INFORMATION CONTROL

FACULTY

Liberal Arts Faculty

Science & Engineering Faculty

Science & Engineering Faculty

IC-3 The printed library materials I need for my work
INFORMATION CONTROL

FACULTY

IC-8 Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work

Science & Engineering Faculty
Science & Engineering Faculty
Liberal Arts Faculty
Liberal Arts Faculty

2001  2002  2003  2004  2005  2006  2007  2008
Exercise:
What do you want to know from LQ?
• Formulate a research question; then decide how you would find & use the data:
  – How do undergraduates rate perceptions of library as space?
  – How do undergraduates that use the library premises daily rate library as space questions?
  – How do health science affiliated faculty rate the library when it comes to ‘the electronic information resources I need?’
Exercise:
What do you want to know from LQ?

• What were your original objectives?

• Formulate a research question; then decide how you would find & use the data:
  – ???
LUNCH
Identifying What Is Actionable

Conclusions and Recommendations are Grounded in Survey Data

Focused on Specific User Populations

www.libqual.org
Identifying What Is Actionable

Conclusions and Recommendations are Grounded in Survey Data:

• Do all user groups have the same wants/priorities, or are there differences?
• Which items clearly stand out as the top wants/priorities of your users?
• Is there a small or a large spread at some point(s) among the items?

Identify the TOP priorities, by user group

• Do all user groups have the same lowest priorities, or are there differences?
• Which items clearly stand out and the lowest wants/priorities of your users?
Identifying What Is Actionable

Conclusions and Recommendations are Grounded in Survey Data:

- Do all user groups have the same weaknesses, or are there differences?
- Which items clearly stand out as the top weaknesses for your users?
- Is there a small or a large spread at some point(s) among the items?

Identify the TOP weaknesses, by user group

- Do all user groups have the same strengths, or are there differences?
- Which items clearly stand out and the strengths for your users?
Identifying What Is Actionable

Conclusions and Recommendations are Grounded in Survey Data:

- #1: MOST DESIRED and LEAST ADEQUATE (highest weakness)
- #2: LEAST ADEQUATE (highest weakness) and LEAST DESIRED
- #3: MOST DESIRED and MOST ADEQUATE (lowest weakness/highest strength)
- #4: MOST ADEQUATE (lowest weakness/highest strength) and LEAST DESIRED
Identifying What Is Actionable

Conclusions and Recommendations are Grounded in Survey Data:

WORK ON

#1
MOST DESIRED
and
LEAST ADEQUATE
(highest weakness)

#2
LEAST ADEQUATE
(highest weakness)
and
LEAST DESIRED

ADEQUACY

DESIRE

UNTIL IT BECOMES

#3
MOST DESIRED
and
MOST ADEQUATE
(lowest weakness/
highest strength)

#4
MOST ADEQUATE
(lowest weakness/
highest strength)
and
LEAST DESIRED
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Identifying What is Actionable
Desired vs. Adequacy
Example Library Sciences Grad Students (2008)
Identifying What Is Actionable
Example Library - Humanities Graduate Students (2008)
Exercise:
Identifying What Is Actionable

Conclusions and Recommendations are Grounded in Survey Data:

ADEQUACY

| #1 | MOST DESIRED and LEAST ADEQUATE (highest weakness) |
| #2 | LEAST ADEQUATE (highest weakness) and LEAST DESIRED |
| #3 | MOST DESIRED and MOST ADEQUATE (lowest weakness/highest strength) |
| #4 | MOST ADEQUATE (lowest weakness/highest strength) and LEAST DESIRED |
Identifying What Is Actionable
Your Library – User Group

Worksheet # 6:
Scatter Plot

FOLLOW ALONG
DEMONSTRATION
INSTRUCTIONS

#1
MOST DESIRED
LEAST ADEQUATE

#2
LEAST ADEQUATE
LEAST DESIRED

#3
MOST DESIRED
MOST ADEQUATE

#4
MOST ADEQUATE
LEAST DESIRED

www.libqual.org
BREAK
You Too Can Chart LQ Data!

Charting LibQUAL+(TM) Data

Jeff Stark
Training & Development Services
Texas A&M University Libraries
Texas A&M University

Revised March 2004
Qualitative Analysis: User Comments

• Why the Box is so Important:
  – About half of participants provide open-ended comments, and these are linked to demographics and quantitative data
  – Users elaborate the details of their concerns
  – Users feel the need to be constructive in their criticisms & offer specific suggestions for action
• User Comments available on the LibQUAL+® Web site
  – Download comments in Excel or text file
  – Skim the comments
• Conduct analysis

www.libqual.org
Texas A&M: Analysis of Undergraduate Comments

Source: Colleen Cook, Presented at QQML 2009 in Chania

http://www.wordle.com/
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are there, whether they are in the library or you have established them yourself to obtain the
materials from either close local libraries, or interlibrary loan, or through document delivery and
when ever possible. Coming into the library itself is something that you just don't do much of
anymore, that your graduate students spend more time in the library than you do. You haven't
heard much about anything that's either any sort of issues that people have much with the lib-
ary or any library. Coming back to the real central issue is access to what ever you want in a
reasonable amount of time as defined as rush when you need rush, and you want someone to
know that it's rush and otherwise within a week to have it.

K: The only thing that I would want to add is that I strongly feel and I've given up making or
lists of journals to request each year, but I still think it's important to what ever degree possi-
table to keep fighting for more funds for current periodicals. I know that it's a battle between the
publishers trying to publish more journals and the budget to buy them. It comes down to being
immediately available.

C: Is it accurate to say that you would prefer journals in electronic form that you can call up
on your desk top rather than having to come over here and get them in print?

K: That would definitely be preferable.

C: Is there anything about physical facilities or that you feel is a part of quality library serv-
you don't come into the library very much, that's why I haven't talked much about it.

K: Well, you've got to have space. I've come into the library more often for meetings I guess.

I am the so-called space chairman of the library and I have been convinced that is direly nee
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In 2005, the Brown University’s LibQUAL+® User Assessment Group used NVivo, a qualitative analysis software, to code user comments collected during the LibQUAL+® survey (819 comments). Determined to make the data readily accessible to library departments and administration the Group decided that it would be helpful to allow staff to be able to sort comments by different topics dealing with library service. To achieve this, the Group took several steps including developing a taxonomy or a master list of common themes (“nodes” in NVivo) based on keywords identified throughout user comments, importing comments into NVivo and assigning “nodes” to each comment based on keywords, exporting the comments into a database to develop a user interface where comments could be easily reviewed by Group members. The final taxonomy yielded 29 nodes that were used to describe distinct themes reflected in the user comments.

Brown plans to expand their user interface for 2008 by adding more labeling capabilities. In 2005, comments could only be labeled as “positive” or “negative”; however since any single comment could contain numerous distinct statements (i.e., “The staff is courteous, but the journal collection in my field is poor.”) having the ability to attach multiple labels comments would have been useful in the previous analysis.

The LibQUAL+® User Assessment Group, consisting of six library staff members (Sarah Bordac, Rayna Bowlby, Diana Birkin, Dan O’Mahony, Eric Shoaf, and Tom Stieve) has made available documentation of their methodology at http://www.libqual.org/documents/admin/BrownU_2005_LQ_qual_method.pdf.
Methodology for Coding Qualitative Data

• Use NVivo software to code & analyze text
• Review the comments as a whole
• Create a taxonomy
  – a master list of themes (referred to as “nodes” by NVivo) and the specific keywords mentioned by users in the survey comments for each of the nodes
  – can generate a word frequency list from the comments file to facilitate the creation of the taxonomy
• Import LQ Comments into NVivo
• Run reports to assign nodes to comments based on the taxonomy/keywords
• Review the assigned nodes for each comment, making necessary corrections & additions
• Evaluate the qualitative data for frequency statistics & analyses of sub-sets of the comments
The following table shows the total distribution of all 4,197 individual comments (or “tags”) according to the 29 topics identified in the taxonomy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic (&quot;Tag&quot;)</th>
<th>Number of comments with this tag</th>
<th>Percentage of all comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiance</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online content</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotable</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Equipment</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Availability</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-computer equipment</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Staff</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t miss LAC PARALLEL SESSION 1:

Coding Practices for LibQUAL+® Comments: Survey Findings

Lynda White, University of Virginia
Eric Ackermann, Radford University
Karen Neurohr, Oklahoma State University
Daniel O'Mahony, Brown University

Monday, October 25 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
BREAK
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Developing the Organization
Engaging Others in Understanding & Using Data

• Spread knowledge about LibQUAL+®
  – Post Notebook on library web
  – Make staff aware of LQ tutorial:
  – All-staff presentation
  – Enable key staff to access LibQUAL+® Analytics
  – Disseminate Comments to depts, units, groups, branches, librarians, etc.

Other?
What have you done?

• Develop a culture of assessment and accountability for listening to customers and acting on user feedback
Engaging Others in Understanding & Using Data

Guiding Library Staff in Understanding & Using LibQUAL+® Results

See Worksheet #7: Being User-Centered
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“Comments were sorted by academic department, which were posted along with department-specific radar charts and gap summaries, in the Research & Instruction Department.

The “Great Wall of LibQUAL+®” provoked discussion, and provided collection managers with insight into the concerns of the faculty and students in the departments they were serving.
Engaging Others in Understanding & Using Data

The Library Retreat: http://www.uri.edu/library/libqualALA09/

At URI, we use an all-day retreat for Library Faculty and Staff to help turn the various LibQUAL+ measures into a concrete plan for improvement.

The retreats used the Retreat Reports, the comparison charts, and selected comments to provide a starting point for discussion.

Tables of 4-6, each with moderators to keep discussion going, spent roughly an hour discussing and half an hour "reporting out" for each of two sessions – the first was spent on examining the data and deciding what it meant, the second in developing a concrete set of actions that the library could pursue to react effectively to the LibQUAL+ findings.

- Retreat Report 2006
- Final Report (with Action Plan and Comparison Chart) 2006
- Retreat Report 2009
- Comparison Chart 2009
Engaging Others in Understanding & Using Data
( & Leading Change: Overcoming Resistance)

“We know what’s best”

“They are wrong”

“We don’t have the resources to…”

“...only customers judge quality; all other judgments are essentially irrelevant.”

Developing the Organization

Developing Accountability for Acting on User Feedback

Work with department leaders & managers

See Worksheet #8: Identifying Library Departments
Presenting Results to Stakeholders

Gaining Stakeholders’ Support

Presenting Results to Library staff

Consultation with students, faculty and senior management

Library Retreat

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
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Presenting Results to Stakeholders

• Identify all of the stakeholders or constituents who want and need to know about the survey results

• Consider the “stake” of each of the above; what specific aspect of LibQUAL+® will be of most interest / concern

• Determine how to communicate with each identified stakeholder
Communicate with your Customers  
(students, faculty, others)

• Particularly those whom you asked to participate in the survey
• Announce incentive award winners
• Inform users of highlights of survey results
• Focused follow-up for more specific insights
• Most importantly, what the library intends to do

“You asked for it…”
KU Libraries: We Listened to You!

LibQUAL+ 2006
Thanks to the more than 1,100 KU faculty, staff and students who completed the 2006 LibQUAL+ survey, KU Libraries has made significant changes over the past few months to better meet your research and service needs.

You requested:
• Access to the electronic resources from your home or office
  • Print and/or electronic journal collections you require for your work
  • A Libraries Web site that enables you to locate information on your own more quickly and easily
  • Librarians and staff members who have the knowledge to answer your questions
  • Dependability in handling your service problems

We delivered:
• More access to print and electronic materials, including 30,000 journals and many other primary resources
  • The new Information Gateway, a primary tool for searching the Libraries' proprietary online resources including databases, journals and images
  • A newly redesigned Web site
  • Access to electronic records for hundreds of thousands of previously inaccessible items
• An ongoing commitment to enhancing service quality through comprehensive training and continuous evaluation
Texas A&M: Annually Informing Users
“LibQUAL+™ is a powerful total market survey . . . with the ultimate goal of improving library service quality.”

Library as Place

“I really appreciate the 24 hours that WCL is open.”

“I think the library is a good source of information . . . I am pleased with the library facilities.”

“The Annex is a good place for group study with rooms to check out.”

“The library is a place for me to access all of the resources I need.”

“I mainly use the Annex and love the media services.”

“I feel it is really a nice place for me to study.”

“Great environment & overall attitude!”

“Temperature control in study rooms would be nice.”

“The library is too noisy.”

“Longer hours open on the weekend for some libraries would be beneficial.”

“The library is a good place for me especially when I need to concentrate and get things done with studies and research.”

User Perceptions About Services

“The overall service of the Library System is very good.”

“The libraries are so helpful and everyone is really nice and helps if you need it.”

“This is my second semester at A&M. I’m learning more about the help I can receive through the librarians visiting the classes. Thanks.”

“I appreciate the helpful comments and that I receive when I have a problem or when I am looking for something that I cannot find.”

“The stuff at the main desk are very kind and helpful. Keep up the good work!”

“Interlibrary loan is awesome.”

“TAMU libraries have improved and really help me get things done efficiently since I can access almost all of what I need from my office or from home.”

Access to Information

“AskNow is a great new service that I enjoy.”

“This is an incredible library! It’s well stocked with relevant books and journals. Moreover, the electronic accessibility is great. Finally, I’ve used the eDocs feature many times and it’s been an extremely important tool for me. Thanks for providing a great service!”

“I’ve been greatly impressed with the use of SFX and TAMU-Full Text options that have become available over the last few years.”

“The My Portal library service is invaluable. Without it, I would spend countless hours looking up papers that I can easily get with a few clicks on your website.”

“iDeliverEdocs is also a great new resource available to students.”

“Great service, always can find someone who knows what to do to meet my needs.”

“I love eDocs. I usually try to mention this to hiring candidates with whom I meet, because it is a great service that is extremely helpful to researchers and is quite a bit above the level of service provided by libraries at other universities.”

“I am an avid user of the Electronic Reserves System and depend on it for my teaching. I use the electronic access to numerous journals on an almost daily basis.”

“The eDocs effort that sends us pdf copies of material we could not find online is the greatest boon to productivity (apart from the computer itself) I have seen in my 30 years of professional work.”

“The Library has made great strides in electronic resources. Good job!”

“Access to electronic versions of journals, SciFinder Scholar and eDocs are indispensable for my scholarly activities.”

“Extremely helpful and knowledgeable online help - first time I ever used online support that has actually been useful - the staff here really know what they’re doing.”

“The libraries staff has done a very good job keeping up-to-date in a very rapidly changing environment.”

“The map room provides outstanding service.”

Texas A&M University Libraries
2005 Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volumes Held</td>
<td>3,437,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Serials</td>
<td>56,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartographic Materials</td>
<td>223,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video &amp; Film</td>
<td>26,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>17,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Electronic Journals</td>
<td>51,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Electronic Books</td>
<td>348,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Presenting Results to Decision Makers: Using the “Mini-Survey” to Explain LQ+® to Stakeholders (Brown U Library)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>My Minimum Service Level Is</th>
<th>My Desired Service Level Is</th>
<th>Perceived Service Performance Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>123456789</td>
<td>123456789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Willingness to help users</td>
<td></td>
<td>123456789</td>
<td>123456789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office</td>
<td></td>
<td>123456789</td>
<td>123456789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td></td>
<td>123456789</td>
<td>123456789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Print and/or electronic journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>123456789</td>
<td>123456789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Library Summit:
Clemson University & U. of Texas at Austin & others


The Library Summit
Now that you have LibQUAL+® survey data, what will you do with it?

The LibQUAL+® notebook, full of feedback about service quality, is an ideal catalyst for constructive dialogue on your campus about where your library should focus its energy and financial resources.

A Library Summit gathers people together who have a stake in the library’s future. These individuals spend a full or half day together in facilitated small-group discussions about the LibQUAL+® results, adding depth and context to the survey numbers, and generating fresh solutions and suggestions for service improvements.

Planning a Summit for Your Library
Clemson University and the University of Texas at Austin are working with ARL to help other academic libraries put together their own Library Summits. Contact ARL or any Library Summit team member for guidance on implementing your own Summit, or to discuss how a Summit could benefit your institution.

The Benefits of a Library Summit

• Goodwill. An organization that makes its weaknesses public and asks for advice and help gains positive regard. Participants and library staff also appreciate having their opinions taken seriously.

• “Closing the Loop.” Library plans based on LibQUAL+-® SURVEY results and Summit discussions provide good structure for showcasing positive outcomes in assessment.

• Personal investment. Participants tend to take ownership of their ideas and may stay more involved and connected with the library to see if their suggestions are implemented.

• Outreach. Everyone involved in a Library Summit learns something about library resources and services.

• Original ideas. Library “outsiders” provide fresh interpretations and insights that might not be generated internally.

• More data. Input from Library Summit participants provides richer and more detailed data for LibQUAL+-® survey items.

• Buy-in. The Summit process is inclusive, so it reduces internal and external disagreements about priorities and decisions.

• Climate change. Administrative, faculty, staff, and student endorsement of a Summit sets the tone for campus-wide collaboration in library success.
Why Hold a Library Summit?

Our intent in holding a library summit is to present the current state of library service quality to the University community and to generate new ideas for change and improvement. What role should the library play in the future of the University? How can the library best contribute to teaching and learning?

We are seeking new perspectives to help us improve the services we provide to the University community. Roundtable discussions will examine service quality trends as reported through our LibQUAL+ survey data over the past three years and generate ideas that will be used in developing strategic goals for the University of Texas at Austin Libraries. The roundtable discussions will be organized around the service quality dimensions defined by the LibQUAL+ tool and participants will choose the roundtables representing the aspects of service quality in which they are most interested.

Specifically, we are seeking input to the following questions:

In what areas is the library performing below your expectations? What do you think contributes to this performance? What do you suggest we do to improve service quality in these areas?

Are there areas in which the library’s performance is getting worse? What can be done to stop the deterioration of service quality in these areas?

In what areas is the library performing at or above your expectations? What do you think contributes to this performance?

In what areas do you think the library’s performance is improving? What do you think contributes to this improvement?

What can the library do to become more relevant to you and your work?
Focused Follow-up


- Who is unhappy?
  - Drilling down by college and discipline
- Why are they unhappy?
  - Reading the comments
  - Conducting targeted interviews
- Focus on areas with low scores
- Diverse group of faculty
- Asked for specific needs and wants
  - Including names of needed titles
- Quick interviews

Source: Jim Self, University of Virginia
Focused Follow-up


- Is the Library meeting your minimal level, regarding journal collections?
  - If not, what can we do? (encouraged to state specific journals)
- Is the Library meeting your desired level?
  - If not, what can we do? (encouraged to state specific journals)
- Does it matter if journals are print or electronic?
- Any other comments about the Library?

Source: Jim Self, University of Virginia
Don’t miss LAC PARALLEL SESSION 3:

Still Bound for Disappointment?
A Follow-up with Faculty about Journal Collections, Based on LibQUAL+® Results

Jennifer Rutner, Columbia University
Jim Self, University of Virginia

Tuesday, October 26 10:30 a.m. – 12 noon
Using LibQUAL+® Effectively
From Analysis to Action

See Worksheet #9: From Analysis to Action: Questions for Planning & Goal Setting
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From Analysis to Action

• From all of the data, determine what can and should be addressed

• Prioritize some action items
  – Align with mission, vision and goals of parent organization
  – Address users’ top priorities, by user group
  – Improve areas of strong user dissatisfaction
  – Build on strengths, if they are truly user needs and priorities
  – Identify work that can be de-emphasized and resources that can be reallocated
From Analysis to Action

Iowa State University Library

First Step
Creating the Team
- Attend meetings
- Ask for participation
- Build enthusiasm

Second Step
Creating PR
- Implement survey
- Celebrate the prize winners

Third Step
Sharing Results
- Create Materials
- Use PR for Outreach
- Use PR to Educate

Fourth Step
Actions
- Ask for input
- Create strategic teams
- Develop an action plan

LibQUAL+ Outreach & Beyond

Fourth Step
ISU LibQUAL+ results determined possible actions
- New signage
- Yearly library orientation for new faculty & for all academic departments
- Part of Library Strategic Plan

LibQUAL+ Implementation & Planning Team

www.libqual.org
From Analysis to Action

“We’re not just measuring, we’re aiming for improvement.”

Shelley Phipps,
August 5, 2008
Using S.M.A.R.T. Goals

• **S** Specific
  - the desired outcome or result is clearly defined

• **M** Measurable
  - accomplishment can be charted and/or observed

• **A** Attainable
  - achievable, goal is challenging but realistic

• **R** Relevant
  - results-oriented, in line with institutional goals and library vision

• **T** Timely
  - deadlines are set for accomplishment

Use Worksheet #10: Targeting Incremental Improvements
Using S.M.A.R.T. Goals

For undergraduates, the **Adequacy Gap** -- the difference between *minimum* service level needed and the *perceived* service level provided by the library -- is smallest* for the following elements:

(*smaller number = less adequate service provided)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Adequacy Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of S.M.A.R.T goal for LibQUAL+® actionable item:

• Add task lighting to 75% of study carrels on north side of library by December 2010

• Reorganize Library space to provide 8 group study areas with flexible furniture and equipment (such as smart boards, plugs, wireless, etc.) by September 2010

Using S.M.A.R.T. Goals

Present GOALS that will enable improvement or growth. Give each goal the S.M.A.R.T. check [Specific – Measurable – Attainable – Relevant – Time-bound]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use Worksheet #10: Targeting Incremental Improvements

Adapted from a worksheet prepared by Pi Beta Phi Fraternity for Women
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Identifying & Using Best Practices

• Seeking out and learning from colleague institutions
  – Participate in LibQUAL+® as part of a consortial, regional, or interest-group implementation
  – Identify peer institutions who may agree to do LibQUAL+® during the same cycle

• Implementing improvements based upon best practices
Applying Data in Decision-Making

• All assessment and LibQUAL+® data and results are easily accessible and present when, where, and with whom decisions are made in your library

• Goals, priorities, and resource allocation are influenced by customer needs and wants
Archiving Data for Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools and Data</th>
<th>Research &amp; Instructional Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-resource Tracking</td>
<td>Annual Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Data</td>
<td>2004 Library Quality/Impact Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Counts</td>
<td>2002 Library Quality/Impact Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier &amp; Printer Use</td>
<td>Graduate Student Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Collection Use (down pending log changes)</td>
<td>Annual Survey of Who Asks Questions Where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BorrowDirect Data Repository</td>
<td>Library Staff Census (under construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZBorrow Data Repository</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Web Log Analytics (down pending log changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t miss LAC PARALLEL SESSION 5:

Data Farms or a Field of Dreams? Libraries CAN Build Infrastructure for Collaborative Assessment.

Joe Zucca, University of Pennsylvania

Tuesday, October 26 3:30 a.m. – 5:00
Integrating LibQUAL+® & other Assessments

- Confirming your conclusions
- Obtaining user specifications for initiatives
- Monitoring progress
Corroborating LibQUAL+® Results w/Other Data

• Consider if your LibQUAL+® data confirms your prior expectations & results from other assessments
• And, vice versa

• For example:
  – Undergrads have increasing needs & desires re: Library as Place and show increases in library gate counts/attendance
  
  – Faculty & grad students have access from home or office as highest priority and library web logs demonstrate increasing use from campus depts.
Cycle of Planning and Assessment

1. Assessment Plan
2. Data Collection
3. Data Analysis
4. Assessment Report
5. Identify Changes
6. Implement Changes
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Using LibQUAL+® to Inform & Assess Strategic Planning

Barbara Cockrell and Bradford Dennis, Western Michigan University Libraries

Role of LibQUAL in Strategic Plan

Like Stewart Saunders at Purdue University we found that our analyzed LibQUAL results had limited value for generating Strategic Goals since LibQUAL+ assesses levels of satisfaction with current operations rather than providing visionary strategic insight.

LibQUAL* X Strategic Goals

However, like Saunders, we found that our LibQUAL data informed several Action Plans that were significant subcomponent parts of our strategic goals.

Strategic Goal: Libraries are actively engaged in the development of a responsive and ethical academic community at WMU

Objective: Develop library-wide commitment to improved customer relations

Action Plan: Implement a library-wide customer-relations training program

Metric for Success: Increased satisfaction as measured by LibQUAL+ Affect of Service measures

Target for success: Increased D-M scores for all Affect of Service (AS) items between LibQUAL+ 2004 and 2007

All 2007 undergraduate AS items will have a D-M score of at least 50%

Outcomes:
- Undergraduates – All measures of AS increased; all AS measures were above 50%
- Graduates – 8/9 measures of AS increased
- Faculty – 3/9 measures of AS increased

Strategic Goal: Library services and resources contribute to the University’s student-centered research mission to build intellectual inquiry, investigation and discovery into all programs

Objective: Improve physical and virtual access to existing collections

Action Plan: Simplify/consolidate electronic access to information and information types

Metric for Success: Increased Information Control (IC) scores, IC1, IC2, IC6, IC7, between 2004 and 2007

Target for success: Increase in identified IC D-M scores for faculty, graduates and undergraduates

Outcomes:
- Undergraduates – 0/4 measures of IC increased
- Graduates – 2/4 measures of IC increased
- Faculty – 4/4 measures of IC increased

LibQUAL* → Action Plans

LibQUAL* → Set Targets

LibQUAL* → Assess Outcomes
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Welcome to the Pool of Ongoing Assessment

LibQUAL™+ 2008

7.0 Service
6.9 Info. Control
6.8 Space

Presented by Lorelei Harris, Leona Jacobs, Donna Seyed Mahmoud

University of Lethbridge
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## Examples of Strategic Plan Metrics Using LQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Metric</th>
<th>Baseline 09</th>
<th>2014 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the perceived level of service quality in ranking of “print or electronic journal collections needed” for All users</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the perceived level of service quality in ranking of “electronic information resources needed” for All users</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase perceived level of service quality in ranking of “easy to use access tools” for All users</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Undergraduates perceived level of service quality ranking of “modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information.”</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Undergraduates perceived level of service quality ranking of library Web site “enabling me to locate information on my own.”</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Undergraduates perceived level of service quality ranking of “quiet space for individual activities.”</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U. Arizona Strategic Plan: Using LibQUAL+® for Quality Standards

• **3-5 Year Measure:** Decrease in the mean difference between desired and perceived service for all UA respondents to the LibQual “Information Control” Dimension.
  
  – Quality Standard: Reduce superiority gap* from -1.09 (average 2005-2007) to -0.87 measured in 2012.

• **3-5 Year Measure:** Decrease in the mean difference between desired and perceived service for all UA respondents to the LibQual “Affect of Service” Dimension.
  
  – Quality Standard: Reduce superiority gap* from -0.87 (average 2005-2007) to -0.70 measured in 2012.

**Source:** [http://intranet.library.arizona.edu/xf/slrp/documents/FY08-12StrategicPlanwithMeasures.pdf](http://intranet.library.arizona.edu/xf/slrp/documents/FY08-12StrategicPlanwithMeasures.pdf)
Planning Next Steps:
Continuous Assessment & Improvement

Overview
The ARL Statistics and Assessment program focuses on describing and measuring the performance of research libraries and their contributions to research, scholarship, and community service. ARL serves a leadership role in the development, testing, and application of academic library performance measures, statistics, and management tools. Grounded in the tradition of the North American research library environment, the program provides analysis and reports of quantitative and qualitative indicators of library collections, personnel, and services by using a variety of evidence gathering mechanisms, and tools.

Library assessment is gaining in prominence as institutional calls for greater accountability abound. The Library Assessment Conference is a biennial event gathering a vibrant community of practitioners and researchers engaged with the noble mission of demonstrating the value of the library in today’s ever-changing environment. The next conference is at capacity with more than 450 people meeting on Oct 25-27, 2010, in Baltimore, Maryland. Post-conference discussion on library assessment issues takes place via the Library Assessment Blog and the ARL-ASSESS e-mail list. If you would like to subscribe to this list, please send an e-mail to ARL-ASSESS@arl.org. Building Effective, Sustainable, and Practical Library Assessment is an ongoing ARL-sponsored service. ARL offers training in relevant skills and methods through such events as the Service Quality Evaluation Academy.
Creating Your Work Plan

• Review the list of steps describing work that can be accomplished after receiving the survey results, including initiating a culture of assessment, understanding the data and results, developing the organization, and using LibQUAL+® effectively

  – Which steps might your library undertake?
  – Will the assignment be individual or a group / team?
  – What KSAs might best support the accomplishment of this work?
  – Who will be assigned?

  – (Who will you consult with to make these decisions)?

Use Handout #4: Work Plan
LibQUAL+® Resources

• LibQUAL+® Web site:
  http://www.libqual.org/home

• Publications:
  http://www.libqual.org/Publications.aspx

• Events and Training:
  http://www.libqual.org/events

• Gap Theory/Radar Graph Introduction:
  http://libqual.org/about/about_survey/tools

• LibQUAL+® Procedures Manual:
Don’t miss
LAC POSTER SESSION
LibQUAL+® Track
Monday, October 25
6:30 p.m. – 9 p.m.
LibQUAL+® Team

• Martha Kyrillidou - Senior Director, ARL Statistics and Service Quality Programs
  martha@arl.org
  202-296-2296, x139

• David Green - Library Relations Coordinator
  david@arl.org
  202-296-2296, x136

• Gary Roebuck - Technical Operations Manager
  gary@arl.org
  202-296-2296, x137

• Yolanda Glass - Administrative Assistant
  yolanda@arl.org
  202-296-2296, x140

• Henry Gross - Applications Developer
  henry@arl.org
  202-296-2296, x124

And sometimes, consultants
Raynna Bowlby
raynna.bowlby@charter.net
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LibQUAL+® Seeks Applicants for In-Kind Grant Program 2011

Apply by December 14, 2010

This is the sixth year LibQUAL+® has sponsored an in-kind grant program.
Service Quality Evaluation Academy Now Accepting Nominations for 2011

Application Deadline: December 15, 2010

The 2011 Service Quality Evaluation Academy, co-sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL), is now accepting participant nominations, with a deadline of December 15, 2010. The academy is an intensive five-day program that focuses on both quantitative analyses (e.g., various descriptive statistics, and score reliability and validity analyses) and qualitative analysis of texts using the Atlas TI software and potentially some related strategies (e.g., focus groups) for analyzing library service quality data. The academy will also provide participants with the opportunity to share library service quality assessment plans/strategies and experiences.
PLUG IN…
brought to you by ARL

LibQUAL+® Training Sessions 2011

Date: Monday, January 10, 2011
Conference: ALA Midwinter Meeting 2011
Location: San Diego, California

LibQUAL+® Survey Introduction, 8:30 am - 10:00 am
[Required for all first-time survey administrators]

LibQUAL+® Survey Administration, 10:30 am - 1:30 pm

LibQUAL+® Survey Results, 2:00 pm - 4:30 pm

This is a set workshops designed to provide potential and current participants with vital information to aid in the survey process. Each workshop covers a variety of topics including the history of LibQUAL+®, developing objectives and goals for administering the survey, marketing your survey, survey process via the LibQUAL+® Web site, analyzing survey results, and much more!
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martha@arl.org
raynna.bowlby@charter.net