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2003
Sample size = 4,000
n = 279

2006
Sample size = 4,000
n = 286

2009
Sample size = 21,012 (total population)
n = 3,892

2009 Assumptions

• Faculty are dissatisfied with Information Control areas
• Information Control is a priority for all populations
• Desired scores are lower for Affect of Service in all user populations, particularly AS-1 and AS-2
• Library as Place is increasingly important for graduate students and undergraduates

Marketing

We departed from LibQual+ branding, re-naming the survey the “Columbia University Libraries’ 2009 Online Survey”
• Bookmarks were distributed at every library service-point
• Posters were hung throughout campus
• LCD slides were deployed in three libraries
• The survey was a CUL Spotlight on the Libraries homepage
• Placed a color ad in the student newspaper
• Two campus-wide, mass-emails were sent
• Incentives: Flatscreen TV and ten $25 giftcards to amazon.com

Assessment Working Group + Assessment Librarian

• CUL Assessment Forums for library staff
• Fall 2008, invited Cornell Libraries to present on their work with LibQual+
• Spring 2009, AWG reviewed what LQ is, why we do it, and invited staff to participate by taking and promoting the survey
• The AWG began preparing for LQ 2009 12 months in advance, and “practiced” new analysis techniques using the 2006 data
• The AWG, chaired by the Assessment Librarian, used a team structure to prepare for the survey: marketing team, incentives team, literature team, comments team
• The Assessment Librarian was dedicated to the success of the LibQual+ survey, and managed the project; liaised with IT for sampling and mass email; served as LQ survey coordinator, attended ARL trainings, coordinated all LQ teams, organized outreach to staff

Representativeness

In 2003 and 2006, faculty over-responded dramatically. In 2009, we gathered a nearly-perfect representative response from the University community.
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Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>6.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>7.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21,012</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representativeness: Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Population</td>
<td>34.85%</td>
<td>34.86%</td>
<td>32.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Response</td>
<td>35.12%</td>
<td>24.82%</td>
<td>40.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Population</td>
<td>59.62%</td>
<td>59.70%</td>
<td>55.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Response</td>
<td>34.71%</td>
<td>29.43%</td>
<td>53.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Population</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Response</td>
<td>30.16%</td>
<td>45.74%</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LibQual+ 2009

What our users really think of library services.
3892 responses?!

**What we did differently:**

1. **Marketing!**
   - Posters
   - Bookmarks
   - Ad in Spectator Newspaper
   - Spotlight
   - LCD panels
   - Webpage

2. Emailed the total population, rather than taking a sample. **21,012** students, staff, faculty and researchers received the survey.

3. Incentives: flatscreen TV and ten $25 Amazon.com gift cards
Response: Representativeness

Response by **status** across the University matches the population distribution very closely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
<th>% of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>40.03%</td>
<td>32.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>53.21%</td>
<td>55.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greatest difference: **8%**

This is representative data!
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergrad Population</strong></td>
<td>34.85%</td>
<td>34.86%</td>
<td>32.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergrad Response</strong></td>
<td>35.12%</td>
<td>24.82%</td>
<td>40.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Population</strong></td>
<td>59.62%</td>
<td>59.70%</td>
<td>55.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Response</strong></td>
<td>34.71%</td>
<td>29.43%</td>
<td>53.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Population</strong></td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Response</strong></td>
<td>30.16%</td>
<td>45.74%</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red = greater than 10% difference between population and response.
Response: Representativeness

Response by **discipline** across the University matches the population distribution *nearly* perfectly.

Greatest difference: 5%

This is representative data!

Response Rate

18.52% of the total population
LibQual+ is our big picture tool!

**Goals of LibQual+**

- Foster a **culture of excellence** in providing library service
- Help libraries better **understand user perceptions** of library service quality
- Collect and interpret library user feedback systematically **over time**
- Provide libraries with comparable assessment information from **peer institutions**
- Enhance library staff members’ skills for interpreting and **acting on data**
What does LibQual measure?

**Affect of Service**
personal touch, customer service

**Information Control**
scope of and access to print and e-collections

**Library as Place**
the physical libraries and study spaces
**LibQual+ Scores**

**Minimum**
The lowest service level the user can accept

** Desired**
The level of service the user wants

**Perceived/Reality**
Where the user perceives the library service is today
Reading LibQual+ Charts

Desired

Perceived/Reality

Minimum

Superiority Gap

Adequacy Gap

Zone of Tolerance
Affect of Service
AS-1 Employees who instill confidence in users
AS-2 Giving users individual attention
AS-3 Employees who are consistently courteous
AS-4 Readiness to respond to users' questions
AS-5 Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions
AS-6 Employees who understand the needs of their users
AS-7 Employees who understand the needs of their users
AS-8 Willingness to help users
AS-9 Dependability in handling users' service problems

Library as Place
LP-1 Library space that inspires study and learning
LP-2 Quiet space for individual activities
LP-3 A comfortable and inviting location
LP-4 A getaway for study, learning, or research
LP-5 Community space for group learning and group study

Information Control
IC-1 Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office
IC-2 A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own
IC-3 The printed library materials I need for my work
IC-4 The electronic information resources I need
IC-5 Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information
IC-6 Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own
IC-7 Making information easily accessible for independent use
IC-8 Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work
Overall: faculty, grads, undergrads

Overall Responses
Faculty

Faculty Responses

4 4.5 5 5.5 6 6.5 7 7.5 8 8.5 9

AS-1 AS-2 AS-3 AS-4 AS-5 AS-6 AS-7 AS-8 AS-9 IC-1 IC-2 IC-3 IC-4 IC-5 IC-6 IC-7 IC-8 LP-1 LP-2 LP-3 LP-4 LP-5
## User Priorities

### Highest desired mean scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Making electronic journals available from my home or office</td>
<td>Making electronic journals available from my home or office</td>
<td>Making electronic journals available from my home or office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Print and/or electronic journals I require for my work</td>
<td>Print and/or electronic journals I require for my work</td>
<td>A library website enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A library website enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>The electronic information resources I need</td>
<td>Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Weaknesses

**Furthest from meeting desired expectations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A library website enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>Community space for group learning and group study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own</td>
<td>Quiet space for individual activities</td>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>A comfortable and inviting location</td>
<td>Making electronic resources available from my home or office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Weaknesses

Not meeting minimum expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Print and/or electronic journals I require for my work</td>
<td>Quiet space for individual activities</td>
<td>Community space for group learning and group study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A library website enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning</td>
<td>Quiet space for individual activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The printed library materials I need for my work</td>
<td>Community space for group learning and group study</td>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## “Local” Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Desired</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Adequacy Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing help when and where I need it</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making me aware of library services</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of subject specialists</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to navigate library web pages easily</strong></td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to archives, special collections</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Longitudinal: Faculty

Faculty Minimum Scores

- 2003 n=73
- 2006 n=129
- 2009 n=235
Longitudinal: Faculty

Faculty Desired Scores

- 2003 n=73
- 2006 n=129
- 2009 n=235
Longitudinal: Faculty

Faculty Perceived Scores

2003 n=73
2006 n=129
2009 n=235
Longitudinal: Graduate

Graduate Minimum Scores

- 2003 n=84
- 2006 n=83
- 2009 n=1844
Longitudinal: Graduate

Graduate Desired Scores

- 2003 n=84
- 2006 n=83
- 2009 n=1844
Longitudinal: Graduate

Graduate Perceived Scores

- 2003 n=84
- 2006 n=83
- 2009 n=1844
Longitudinal: Undergrad

Undergraduate Minimum Scores

2003 n=85
2006 n=70
2009 n=1387
Longitudinal: Undergrad

Undergraduate Desired Scores

- 2003 n=85
- 2006 n=70
- 2009 n=1387
Longitudinal: Undergrad

Undergraduate Perceived Scores

2003 n=85
2006 n=70
2009 n=1387
Comment Trends

• Circulation
• CLIO
• Collections
• Customer Service
• Delivery
• E-resources
• Film
• Food + drink
• General
• Hours
• Instruction
• Marketing/Outreach

• “More”
• Not-on-shelf
• Study Spaces:
  – Atmosphere
  – Types
  – Seating
  – Environment
  – Enforcement
  – Library access
    “grad vs. undergrad”
• Policies
• Technology
• Website
Comments: CLIO
(IC-2, IC-6, IC-7)

“CLIO is wonderful. Automatic renewal very useful.”

“Basically, I still find the CLIO search hard to use. It always fails to find what I try to search or it shows lots of information I don’t need.”
Analysis: next steps

1. Comment coding (Summer 2009)
2. Departmental reports (Summer 2009)
   1. Overall summary of results
   2. Comments
   3. Departmental data
   4. Guidelines for response
3. Library Summit (Fall 2009)
4. ARL cohort analysis (January 2010)
How can this information help us?
What do you need from the AWG?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our Response</th>
<th>Departmental Response</th>
<th>CUL/IS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Each library will review relevant data and work with AUL to create an appropriate action plan</td>
<td>1. Understand the data thoroughly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Refer-back to LQ2009 data to inform other user-information needs for future projects</td>
<td>2. Set priorities for response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Report back to our users on improvements as we move forward</td>
<td>4. Report back to our users on improvements as we move forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?

jenrutner@columbia.edu