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- 26 800 student FTE, 5 900 staff, 30 000 active library card holders (2011)
- Ten physical libraries organized in three library units, one department for digital services and one central library administration
- LibQUAL was first attempted 2004-2006 by individual library units and centrally administered as the LibQUAL Lite version in 2010 for the whole library system
LibQUAL2010

• All library card holders were alerted by e-mail
• 6 156 of 30 462 completed the survey (20.2%)
• Reasonable distribution over subjects, user category and home libraries
LibQUAL2010

http://www.ub.gu.se/info/kval/
LibQUAL2010

- 2252 left a comment in the survey.
- Comments were tagged, grouped and distributed to libraries, functions and groups.
Pros and cons from the work

Pros
• A rich possibility for injection of user perspective into the organization - bringing real change
• Six larger changes (building refurbishment, staff service level policy,...) and many minor changes
• LibQUAL demands less preparation time and focuses the work on analysis of results and implementation
• ARL does the work-up
• Possibilities for benchmarking and population comparisons (even better with a Scandinavian consortium 😊)
• ARL provides a first class manual and customer service level
• Rigid format gives reliable trends
• Comments are especially valuable
Pros and cons from the work

Cons

• Users still see the LITE survey as quite demanding (for being a web survey)
  – The three scales of each question demands an effort - some foul comments
  – Validation generates questions of perceived similar nature
  – The survey is very compactly presented – some comments such as instant tiredness or initial underestimation of effort
• The result and impact of the survey is marginally improved by the three aspects and the possibility to compare user and subject groups
• Hard to generate higher response rates from a web-administered survey
• Cumbersome work with the valuable comments material
LibQUAL - choices for 2013

Pros
• A rich possibility for an injection of user perspective to the organization
• Less preparation yields more time for analysis of results
• ARL does the work-up
• Possibilities for benchmarking
• First class manual and customer service
• Rigid format gives reliable trends
• Comments were especially valuable

Cons
• Users see the survey as being quite demanding (for a web survey)
• The result and impact of the survey is marginally improved by the three aspects and the possibility to compare user and subject groups
• Hard to generate higher response rates on web-administered survey
• Cumbersome work with the valuable comments material