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Authors’ Note

This manual has been created based on the feedback and comments of LibQUAL+™ survey participants. Therefore, we continue to welcome participant feedback and suggestions for change.
Introduction

What is LibQUAL+™?

LibQUAL+™ is a suite of services that libraries use to solicit, track, understand, and act upon users’ opinions of service quality. These services are offered to the library community by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The program’s centerpiece is a rigorously tested Web-based survey bundled with training that helps libraries assess and improve library services, change organizational culture, and market the library. The goals of LibQUAL+™ are to:

- 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
- Identify best practices in library service
- Enhance library staff members’ analytical skills for interpreting and acting on data

As of spring 2003, more than 400 institutions had participated in LibQUAL+™, including colleges and universities, community colleges, health sciences libraries, law libraries, and public libraries – some through various consortia, others as independent participants. LibQUAL+™ has expanded internationally, with participating institutions in Canada, the U.K., and Europe. The growing LibQUAL+™ community of participants and its extensive dataset are rich resources for improving library services.

Project Origin

The LibQUAL+™ survey evolved from a conceptual model based on the SERVQUAL instrument, a popular tool for assessing service quality in the private sector. The Texas A&M University Libraries and other libraries used modified SERVQUAL instruments for several years; those applications revealed the need for a newly adapted tool that would serve the particular requirements of libraries. ARL, representing the largest research libraries in North America, partnered with Texas A&M University Libraries to develop, test, and refine LibQUAL+™. This effort was supported in part by a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE).

The Benefit to Library Users

LibQUAL+™ gives your library users a chance to tell you where your services need improvement so you can respond to and better manage their expectations. You can develop services that better meet your users’ expectations by comparing your library’s data with that of peer institutions and examining the practices of those libraries that are evaluated highly by their users.
Conducting the LibQUAL+™ Survey

Conducting the LibQUAL+™ survey requires little technical expertise on your part. You invite your users to take the survey, distributing the URL for your library’s Web form via e-mail. Respondents complete the survey form and their answers are sent to a central database. The data are analyzed and presented to you in reports describing your users’ desired, perceived, and minimum expectations of service.

Fees

The participation fee for the LibQUAL+™ survey is $2,250 per library. This fee covers a group training event held in January, access to and use of the management interface, results notebooks, and access to the qualitative and quantitative survey data through the online management interface. Participating libraries contribute staff and organizational resources for preparation and administration of the survey instrument.

Participating libraries are either invoiced upon registration or may pay by credit card at the time of registration. Group/consortial bulk payments are also possible, but they must be negotiated before the member institutions start registering. If individual libraries within institutions wish to distinguish their findings by requesting separate handling and deliverables, then a separate fee of $2,250 will be charged for each unit of analysis. For example, if an institution wants to have separate survey implementations for their business library and their main library, a separate fee will be charged for each library. Institutions handling multiple implementations in this way should contact the LibQUAL+™ staff beforehand.

Registering your library for the survey indicates a financial commitment on your part. Once you have registered online, you have authorized ARL to charge your library the full participation fee. In order to keep overhead costs and the price of the service low, no refunds will be issued. This information is also included on the online registration page at <http://www.libqual.org/Register/index.cfm>.

From September 2000 – August 2003 the LibQUAL+™ project was supported in part by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). The project is now a self-sustaining service offered through the ARL Statistics and Measurement Program.

Consortium and International Partnerships

A number of consortial groups have participated in the LibQUAL+™ survey, including groups from OhioLINK, AAHSL, and NY3Rs. Consortia wishing to take part in LibQUAL+™ should contact ARL in advance of registration by sending an e-mail to <libqual@arl.org>. The LibQUAL+™ team will work with you regarding the specifics of your group’s participation.

Participating consortia receive a number of additional benefits, including:
• An aggregate notebook containing data from consortium members
• The ability to add five additional local questions to the LibQUAL+™ survey

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) may be developed between ARL and a participating consortium/partner organization on a case-by-case basis, depending on the complexity of the partnership. In 2003, the survey interface supported 10 different types of libraries and eight different consortia. Implementations were conducted in American English, British English, and French, in four different countries – the U.S., Canada, the U.K., and the Netherlands. Discussions are underway to support other types of libraries, such as national, hospital, and special libraries.

If you would like to pilot LibQUAL+™ in a new library setting or develop a translation for a new language or country implementation, please contact Martha Kyrillidou <martha@arl.org>.

**Additional Information**

For more information, see the LibQUAL+™ homepage at <http://www.libqual.org>, or send e-mail to <libqual@arl.org>.
**LibQUAL+™ Services Staff**

**Duane Webster – Executive Director, ARL**
Works closely with TAMU personnel as a project manager to ensure seamless transfer of administration from TAMU to ARL.

**Martha Kyrillidou – Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement, ARL**
As a project manager, oversees administration of LibQUAL+™ and analysis of data through the ARL offices.

**Jonathan D. Sousa – Technical Applications Development Manager for New Measures Initiatives, ARL**
Leads the technological development of LibQUAL+™ at ARL by recommending, planning, and implementing optimal applications of technology.

**Consuella Askew – Program Specialist, ARL**
Oversees ARL LibQUAL+™ training and assists with communications. (Half time)

**Amy Hoseth – Projects Assistant, ARL**
Coordinates LibQUAL+™ communications and assists with training at ARL.

**Kaylyn Hipps – Editorial and Research Associate, ARL**
Provides editorial and research support to the project.

**Julia Blixrud – Assistant Executive Director, External Relations, ARL**
Builds community awareness of the LibQUAL+™ project and promotes its use through programmed public relations outlets.

**Dru Mogge – Program Officer for Internet Services, ARL**
Responsible for the smooth operation of the network connections and the upkeep of the hardware and networked servers at ARL.
LibQUAL+™ Steering Committee

The LibQUAL+™ suite of services is managed by a steering committee comprised of the project managers and researchers involved in the original development of the project.

Colleen Cook – Executive Associate Dean and Interim Dean, Texas A&M University Libraries
Advises on project activities, conducts mixed-methods, qualitative/quantitative research, writes and publishes on service quality in libraries, and conducts training and educational activities.

Fred Heath – Vice Provost and Director, the University of Texas at Austin General Libraries
Advises on project activities, promotes the services to external constituencies, and conducts research on service quality in libraries.

Martha Kyrillidou – Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement, ARL
Oversees the administration of LibQUAL+™ and analysis of data at the ARL offices, conducts research, writes and publishes on library assessment, and leads training and educational activities.

Bruce Thompson – Professor and Distinguished Research Scholar, Department of Educational Psychology, Texas A&M University
Serves as the LibQUAL+™ quantitative consultant, conducts and publishes research, educates ARL staff in data analysis techniques, and conducts training and educational activities.

Yvonna Lincoln – Professor and Program Director of Higher Education, Educational Administration Department, Texas A&M University
Serves as the LibQUAL+™ qualitative consultant, conducts and publishes research, and educates the ARL staff in data analysis techniques.

Duane Webster – Executive Director, ARL
Works closely with TAMU leadership to ensure seamless transfer of administration from TAMU to ARL, provides leadership and direction, and informs the ARL Board of Directors about developments.
LibQUAL+™
Survey Participants’ Timeline

The following timeline is presented as a checklist of steps that will guide participating institutions through the LibQUAL+™ survey process. A more detailed description of the survey process is provided in the following sections of this manual.

July - October:

- New library types and consortia should establish a relationship with ARL personnel if they are interested in participating in the upcoming survey.

September:

- **Register online for the upcoming LibQUAL+™ survey.** Two automated e-mail messages will be generated after registration: (1) a confirmation of your registration, and (2) an invoice for the participation fee.

  **Note:** Library directors and other contacts listed on the survey sign-up form will automatically be subscribed to the LibQUAL+™ listserv, which is a closed forum for participants only.

- Subscribe to ARL-QUALITY listserv (an open forum). To subscribe, send a blank e-mail to <ARL-QUALITY-feed@arl.org> if you want to be subscribed in feed mode, to <ARL-QUALITY-digest@arl.org> if you want to be subscribed in digest mode, and to <ARL-QUALITY-index@arl.org> if you want to be subscribed in index mode.

- Register for the following ARL-sponsored, LibQUAL+™-related workshops (optional):


  Identify and initiate steps needed to obtain clearance for human subjects research if needed at your institution. ARL does not need to be informed about your local policy requirements.

October/November:

- Identify appropriate data source to provide valid e-mail addresses for selected sample populations (e.g., campus computing or library patron database).
• The online Survey Preferences, Survey Customization, and Representativeness Questionnaire pages will open on the LibQUAL+™ Survey Management Center <http://www.libqual.org/Manage/index.cfm>.

December:
• LibQUAL+™ Preview Survey will be available for participants to pre-test within their libraries. This allows participants to make sure that the survey looks correct before it goes live.

January:
• Training session for libraries participating in the upcoming survey will be held during ALA Midwinter. Institutions are encouraged to register as many people as they would like for this training event on service quality issues and the LibQUAL+™ process. All participants are welcome to attend. Attendance by first-time participating libraries is strongly encouraged.

February:
• Draw final e-mail samples after institution’s spring enrollment process is complete. For more information, see the section on “Sampling.”

• The LibQUAL+™ survey opens to the public.

March/April:
• Using a mock e-mail account, send a personalized e-mail message from the director announcing the upcoming LibQUAL+™ survey to sample groups. See Appendix B for a sample survey notification.

• Make the necessary adjustments to the sample groups (i.e., replacing invalid e-mail addresses with valid e-mail addresses).

• Send e-mail inviting your sample group to participate in the survey. See Appendix C for a sample survey invitation.

  **Recommendation:** Past experience has proven that the best time to send the initial invitation is on either a Monday or Tuesday morning.

After sending out your survey invitation:

• Send 2-3 reminder e-mail messages at three- to five-day intervals after the invitation to take the survey. See Appendix D for sample survey reminders.
May:

- Survey closes to participants and their users. Data analysis begins.

- **Service Quality Evaluation Academy (optional)** held at the Texas Engineering Extension Service, South Central Texas Regional Training Center in San Antonio, Texas. For more information, go to <http://db.arl.org/academy>.

May - July:

- Results notebooks distributed to participants as they are produced.

- Survey results presented to project participants during the ALA Annual Conference. Attendance is strongly encouraged.

July:


- Complete LibQUAL+™ Evaluation Questionnaire. All individual survey liaisons and contacts must complete an Evaluation Questionnaire.
Registration

To participate in the LibQUAL+™ survey, participants must register online by completing the registration form at <http://www.libqual.org/Register/index.cfm>. Registration begins in early fall and runs through December. Information about registration will be made available on the Web site at <http://www.libqual.org/>.

Participants can choose to pay by credit card or request an invoice. Registering your library for the LibQUAL+™ survey indicates a financial commitment on your part. Once you have registered online, you have authorized ARL to charge your library the full participation fee. No refunds will be issued. This information is also included on the online registration page at <http://www.libqual.org/Register/index.cfm>.

After registration, participants will receive two e-mail responses: (1) a confirmation of your registration, and (2) an invoice for the participation fee (if not paying by credit card). This e-mail invoice is the only invoice that participants will receive. Payment is due within 30 days of registration unless prior arrangements have been made.

Library directors and other contacts listed on the survey registration form will automatically be subscribed to the LibQUAL-L e-mail list, a closed forum for participants only.
Preparing to Launch the Survey

Survey Liaison

Each institution should designate a LibQUAL+™ survey liaison. The liaison’s responsibilities include:

- Preparing his/her institution and colleagues for the survey administration
- Corresponding with the LibQUAL+™ team
- Responding to user feedback regarding the survey (note that user complaints are an opportunity to improve patron relations)
- Working with local IT or academic computing contacts and/or the LibQUAL+™ team to resolve technical issues

After you invite your sample to complete the survey, and throughout the survey period, responding to feedback will become an important responsibility for the survey liaison and will provide an additional opportunity to provide quality service. Therefore, it is critical that the liaison, or a designated surrogate with intimate knowledge of the survey process, be available the entire duration of the survey run to respond to user questions or comments.

LibQUAL-L Participant E-mail List

Survey liaisons and contacts will automatically be subscribed to the LibQUAL-L list upon registering. LibQUAL-L is a private, moderated e-mail list comprised of current survey participants. This list will be used to post important announcements, to request data, and as a vehicle for institutions to share information and ask questions regarding the survey.

If you are a past participant who has unsubscribed from the list, you will be resubscribed automatically only if you are the primary liaison registering your institution online. To resubscribe project staff who are not primary contacts and who may have unsubscribed from Libqual-L, send an e-mail with their names and e-mail addresses to <libqual@arl.org>.

Service Quality General E-mail List

For those who are not participating in the LibQUAL+™ survey, but are interested in discussing and learning about issues of service quality in libraries, the ARL-QUALITY e-mail list is a public list to which they may subscribe. To subscribe to this list (an open forum), send a blank e-mail to <ARL-QUALITY-feed@arl.org> if you want to be subscribed in feed mode, to <ARL-QUALITY-digest@arl.org> if you want to be subscribed in digest mode, and to <ARL-QUALITY-index@arl.org> if you want to be subscribed in index mode.
The LibQUAL+™ Web site

The LibQUAL+™ Web site, <http://www.libqual.org>, is a critical source of information and survey resources for both participants and non-participants alike. Among its many features the site includes current news and LibQUAL+™ announcements, a list of events and upcoming LibQUAL+™-related workshops, a bibliography, an FAQ page, and more. This is also where interested institutions will register for upcoming survey implementations and manage their survey process.

Survey Management Center

The LibQUAL+™ site includes an online survey Management Center <http://www.libqual.org/Manage/index.cfm>, which is restricted to survey participants. The Management Center enables participants to effectively manage their survey, gather information, and track their progress during the survey run. Documents and information that are provided via the Management Center include:

- An extensive library of articles and presentations
- Directory of participants
- Representativeness questionnaire
- Links to preview surveys
- Downloadable print versions of the survey
- Real-time data on survey progress, including user comments
- List of local incentive prizewinners
- Survey results in a variety of formats
- Post-hoc and evaluation questionnaires

Participants are able to manage their own data by updating their institutional profile and contact information as needed, making the online survey Management Center the central source of information for, and about, LibQUAL+™ participants.

To access the survey Management Center, participants must use an e-mail address and password selected during registration. Information such as survey results and announcements for survey participants is located within this password-protected area. For details on using the Management Center to administer your local survey, see the section of this manual entitled “Administering the Survey”.

Human Subjects Research Approval

Before launching the LibQUAL+™ survey, identify and initiate steps needed to obtain clearance for human subjects research if needed at your institution. ARL does not need to be informed about your local policy requirements. It is important to contact your campus Institutional Review Board (IRB) to determine if prior approval is needed to conduct the survey. Although at most institutions this approval is sought from the IRB, this department may also be known as the “Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects,” the “Committee for Human Subjects Research,” or the “Office of Sponsored
Programs.” The IRB committee may meet infrequently throughout the year, so this step should be initiated well ahead of the projected survey launch date.

ARL’s official policy for Protecting Human Subjects is available online at: <http://www.arl.org/stats/privacy.html>.

Be sure to provide your IRB with information about any incentives that may be offered to survey respondents. ARL has discontinued the project-wide prize drawing since most institutions prefer to have control over incentives and do not want to wait until May to identify local winners for a project-wide prize. Your IRB might also need to know that summary results of the LibQUAL+™ project will be shared among participating institutions. IRB approval is handled entirely at the local level; ARL does not require proof of your institution’s IRB status.

**The Americans with Disabilities Act**

In order for the project to comply with the Americans With Disabilities Act, be prepared to make special arrangements for any respondents with disabilities. The Web survey form has been tested with JAWS software for the visually impaired. Downloadable print copies of the survey are available via the Management Center. Participants should also address the need for the provision of special assistance at the local level, if necessary.

**Confidentiality of Data**

The LibQUAL+™ approach to confidentiality is guided by the ethical standards of the American Psychological Association (see <http://www.apa.org/ethics/code.html>, note section 5). The research team members are committed to the highest ethical behavior and will take every measure possible to protect the privacy of individual participants. The researchers cannot and will not release information about participants without their permission.

Although some information is captured from respondents, such as their network address and e-mail address, the respondent’s privacy is protected in two ways. First, only very indirect information is captured, which would be difficult to trace back to an individual. Second, everything possible is done to separate personal information from survey responses. E-mail addresses are collected for incentive purposes only and are not saved with the responses. Once they are saved, there is no way to link an individual’s responses to their e-mail address, ensuring confidentiality for participants in the incentive drawings.

**Data Security**

Survey data is stored on a server at Texas A&M University (TAMU), which stands behind a firewall. When the questionnaire data is sent to the database, the respondents’ answers are separated from their e-mail address before they are stored, to ensure confidentiality. Currently, the collected data is archived at TAMU.
Informed Consent

Because this is a Web-based survey, the respondents consent to participate by electing to fill out the survey questionnaire. It will be the participating library’s responsibility to provide an explanation of the survey and information pertaining to its confidentiality (see Appendix B for an example of how this has been achieved using the survey notification letter).
Administering the Survey

Managing Your Survey Online

The survey Management Center enables participants to control their survey administration online. In order to utilize these tools, you must be a current participant with a valid user ID and password, which will enable you to access these Web pages.

Management Center

The Management Center is a secure section of the LibQUAL+™ Web site, accessible only to participating libraries. The individual who registers their institution for the survey will automatically be designated by the system as the “Primary Contact,” and will receive an e-mail message containing a password for the Management Center. Your e-mail address will serve as your user ID.

The Management Center is comprised of four major sections: Personal Profile, Institutional Profile, Manage Users, and Manage Your Survey. A brief description of each section and general instructions for use are provided below.

1. Personal Profile

This form is used to collect contact information for each survey liaison at your institution. You are also able to create or change your password using this form. When editing your contact information, be sure to click the "Save My Changes" button to save any changes you have made.

2. Institutional Profile

This form is used to collect information about your library and institution. You can also upload a copy of your library or institution’s logo using this form.

3. Manage Users

The “Manage Users” page enables you to add and edit your institution's official LibQUAL+™ contacts and assistants. There are two types of users:

- **Directors and Liaisons**
  These are the primary contacts and have the most privileges in the management area. One director or liaison must always be designated as the "Primary Contact."
  This person will be the first point of contact for all LibQUAL+™ matters.

- **Assistants**
  These are individuals requiring limited access to the management area – for printing results or viewing resources - but who are not to be contacted about LibQUAL+™ matters, nor are they allowed to edit online forms.
4. Manage Your Survey

This section of the Web site allows you to manage your LibQUAL+™ survey process. To manage your local survey, you proceed through a series of eight steps outlined in the survey Management Center <http://www.libqual.org/Manage/Survey/index.cfm>, beginning with selecting your survey preferences and ending with the completion of the LibQUAL+™ evaluation questionnaire.

4.1 Survey Preferences Page

The survey preferences page allows you to set your preferences for your local survey run. These preferences include: designating the language for your survey (i.e. French, British English, American English, etc.); your survey start and end dates; whether your institution will offer local incentives; the file format (i.e. Excel and SPSS) in which you wish to receive your raw data; identifying a support e-mail address that will appear on the survey form; and uploading your library’s logo. Responses indicated with an “*” must be completed before you can preview or launch your survey.

A brief explanation of each of these items is provided below:

**Choosing your Language***

One of the first requirements on the preferences page is to designate the language for your survey.

**Survey Start and End Dates**

You are asked to indicate the start and end dates you intend to open and close the survey at your institution. The earliest possible opening date is February 1st; the latest possible start date is three weeks prior to the closing of the survey, which typically occurs the first week of May.

**Project Incentive***

You should indicate if you will offer local incentive prizes to your survey-takers. Some institutions are prohibited from participating in this sort of drawing, so make sure you are allowed to establish an incentive before responding to this question.

If you elect to establish a prize drawing, your survey-takers will be asked for their e-mail address at the end of the survey form. We will provide you with a list of 50 randomly drawn e-mail addresses at the end of the survey run. This list will be made available via the survey Management Center.

**Raw Data File Delivery**

The raw data collected from the survey are made available to participants online in Microsoft Excel format. You also have the option of choosing to have an SPSS file with the raw data e-mailed to your primary contact.
**Library Logos**

Each institution’s logo will appear at the top of their survey Web page to help establish “ownership” of the survey application. To ensure image quality, the following criteria have been set:

1. The image should be similar in color and design to the images available on your institution’s library Web page.

2. We recommend that the image be 50 pixels high by 500 pixels wide (need not be exact), but no larger than 100 by 600 pixels. By following this criterion your image should be in the shape of a rectangle.

3. The image resolution should be 72 pixels per inch.

The image file should be in GIF or JPG format.

**4.2 Survey Customization**

In this area, you may select additional questions to ask on your survey, specify custom labels for academic disciplines, and list library branches for survey-takers to choose from.

**4.3 Preview the Survey**

Access to your library’s preview survey link will be made available in advance of the survey going public. During this time, pre-testing the Web-based survey form is required.

*Testing the survey before launch:* Liaisons should make sure that they thoroughly test the survey, completing the entire survey on their own desktop before launch.

If you encounter problems that your local technical support cannot resolve, report them to the LibQUAL+™ staff at <libqual@arl.org>.

**4.4 Representativeness Questionnaire**

Information collected through the representativeness questionnaire allows the LibQUAL+™ researchers to determine how your institutional demographics profile compares with the sample data collected. The questionnaire will be available for changes and completion throughout the survey run and will be closed at the end of the survey period.

**4.5 Monitor Survey Progress**

This feature allows you to track the real-time progress of the LibQUAL+™ survey at your institution. Using this page, you can see the number of people (by user group and library branch) responding to your survey in real time. The mean and median response times are also provided. You will also be able to keep track of the number of users who have responded to your survey over the past 30 days.
4.6 Incentive Winners
If your institution is offering local incentives, a randomly selected list of 50 e-mail addresses from your institution will be provided in this section.

4.7 Post Hoc Questionnaire
This questionnaire provides ARL staff with information about the survey at your institution (i.e. sample size, number of e-mails sent, incentives offered, etc). All participating LibQUAL+™ institutions are required to report this post hoc data back to ARL.

4.8 Evaluation Questionnaire
This questionnaire is your opportunity to provide feedback to the LibQUAL+™ team and evaluate your institution’s experience with the survey process. All LibQUAL+™ participant survey liaisons and contacts are required to complete this evaluation questionnaire.

Survey Results
This section of the Management Center provides you with access to users’ comments, survey results notebooks, Excel-formatted versions of the data collected at your institution, and norms tables.

Survey Results Notebooks
In addition to their own institution results notebooks, current participants will have online access to the results notebooks of other participating libraries at the end of the survey implementation.

Users’ Survey Comments
This link takes you to a page where you can view your respondents’ comments as collected on the survey form. This page is updated constantly with new comments during your survey run. In addition to the comments you will receive basic demographic information (i.e. user group, discipline, library branch, age, and sex) for each individual.

Survey Data
In this area you may download an Excel-formatted version of the raw data collected during your survey run. All records – partial, invalid, and fully completed – are included in this file.

Norms Tables
After the data analysis is complete and the results notebooks have been produced, norms tables are created, providing yet another perspective on results. The norms tables provide institutions with a means of comparing how they are performing within a particular user group or library type.
**Interactive Statistics**

The interactive statistics area enables participants to make data comparisons, build their own summary spreadsheets, and create additional graphs. The following sections provide some basic guidelines to using the tools on this page:

**Graphs:**
To graph selected data, click to select variables for your X and Y axes. Next, select institutions (to select multiple institutions, hold down the control key and click on the institution names you want), then click on “calculate”. You will get a graph in Flash format that shows the scores. By placing your cursor on top of the dots on the graph, you can see the names of the individual institutions.

*Tip: Choose JPEG as the format for your graph if you want to copy and paste the resulting graph into a PowerPoint presentation.*

**Institutional data tables:**
To create a table using LibQUAL+™ scores for your peer group, hold down the control key and select the variables for which you want scores. Next, select the institutions you are interested in and then click on “calculate”. You will have the option to download the resulting table as an Excel file.

**Printing results from this page:**
Because Web browsers do not have well-established printing features, it may be difficult to print out a clean image from these pages. Some browsers have an option in the “Print Preview” area to “shrink to fit,” which resizes the graph to fit on a single piece of paper. If your browser doesn't provide you with that option, a better plan is to simply avoid the Web browser altogether and work with the graph as an image.

To work with the graph as an image, first create the graph you want. Make sure to select the JPEG format (it won't look quite as sharp, but it should be adequate) instead of the default Flash format. Once you see the graph, right-click on it if you are on a PC or option-click if you are on a Mac. A pop-up menu should appear. Select “Save Image As” or something similar. Save the graph image to your computer where you will be able to open it directly with any image editor or Web browser. You should then be able to open the file, print it, and use it in other documents, such as Word files.

**Resources**

In this section of the Management Center participants can access and download LibQUAL+™ logo files for their public relations use. Print versions of the current survey are also available in this section for downloading and printing.

**Directory**

The online directory provides contact and institution information for LibQUAL+™ participants, enabling them to network with peers regarding service quality improvement issues.
Sampling

Sample Size

The *minimum* recommended sampling figures for *large academic* library systems are as follows:

900 Undergraduate students

600 Graduate students

600 Faculty

600 Non-library University Staff (optional)

All Library Staff (optional)

Smaller institutions may choose to survey their entire population. If your population groups are smaller than the recommended sample size, you may survey your entire population. Including university staff and library staff in the survey is optional.

*NOTE:* When selecting a sample population from more specific groups on your campus, please footnote the method of selection determination. You will be asked to describe your sampling methodology in the Post-Hoc Questionnaire.

Random sampling

A survey of your entire population will not necessarily provide more useful information than a random sample. Therefore, a random sample of the population is encouraged if your library system is large enough. The library’s survey liaison will assume the responsibility for determining the initial sample sizes (see activities for October in the timeline). The liaison will closely oversee the sampling process, making sure the e-mail addresses are drawn from the appropriate database and double-checking the random sample to make sure that the e-mail addresses drawn are proportionately representative of undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and/or staff. In anticipation of faulty e-mail addresses, over-sampling is encouraged. For example, instead of sampling 900 undergraduate students, start with 1,200 and use the extra 300 to fill in as needed.

Each library is responsible for selecting their sample and sending e-mail messages to that sample population. If it is decided that the library’s patron database will not be used to draw a random sample, the library survey liaison may need to contact and work with someone in the academic computing, human resources, or information systems departments in order to get assistance with obtaining campus-wide random samples of students, faculty, and staff. The survey liaison must also work closely with these departments to make sure they are using the correct databases. The integrity of the e-mail database will determine the quality of the sample.
You should contact your information systems people early in the survey process to determine if separation of sample groups is possible, and to find out how much time is necessary for them to create those sample groups. The actual sampling process should take place after your institution’s spring enrollment process is complete to ensure the accuracy of your e-mail addresses.

**Communicating With Users**

Each library is responsible for sending out a survey announcement, a survey invitation, and follow-up messages to their sample groups. Past iterations have proven that personalizing these messages using the library director’s mock e-mail account has a positive impact on the response rate. The dummy e-mail account will also alleviate the problem of compromising the director’s regular e-mail account with feedback and responses from survey respondents during the survey run. All comments and feedback received from respondents should be saved. At the end of the data collection process the research team will request this information.

To best handle communications with sample groups, a separate e-mail mailing list should be set up for each constituent group (e.g., faculty, undergraduates, graduate students, etc.). The mailing lists will enable libraries to keep account of bounced e-mail messages for each group, so that valid addresses can be easily substituted to maintain sample size. For each group, record the initial sample size number, the number of bounced messages, and the final sample size number; this information will be captured in the post hoc survey. A great way to get a handle on your response rate is to use the “read receipt” feature, which is available on most e-mail programs.

Your survey liaison should expect to respond personally to approximately ten percent of the total sample. Make sure the person responsible for responding to these inquiries is well qualified to address survey issues raised by library users.

**Survey Announcement**

The survey announcement should provide an introduction for the upcoming survey. See Appendix B for a sample survey notification. In addition to the announcement message, prior participants have also placed announcements in the school newspaper and posted printed flyers around campus to raise awareness of the upcoming survey.

Preparing alternative ways of reaching user populations by using surface mail, announcements in your school newspaper, printed flyers, and other means is strongly encouraged.

**Survey Invitation**

The survey invitation should address the purpose of the study, the issue of confidentiality, what will be done with the results, and any incentives offered for participants. See Appendix C for a sample invitation. Some libraries have created their own FAQ pages to address common questions and problems that users may encounter while taking the survey. This may help reduce the number of contacts received from
users. The main LibQUAL+™ FAQ is available online at <http://www.libqual.org/Information/FAQ/index.cfm>.

**Timing of survey invitation:** Past experience has proven that Monday morning is the best time to send out your survey invitation message and Friday afternoon is the worst.

**Survey Follow-up Messages**

According to the literature, the number of contacts is the single highest predictor of the response rate for a Web-based survey across the disciplines.¹ Therefore, plan on sending at least three to five notices:

1. Announcement of upcoming survey
2. Invitation with survey URL embedded
3. Follow-up reminders

**Entering Print Survey Data**

Print versions of the survey for various institution types are made available via the online Survey Management Center. ARL recommends that all print surveys be coded (numbered consecutively), in order for libraries to track the number of print surveys that are distributed and returned. A good source of information about print survey protocol is *The Survey Kit*, edited by Arlene Fink.²

The procedure for print surveys still preserves the confidentiality of the respondent. The paper copy bears no name or information that would identify the respondent once the results are published. LibQUAL+™ liaisons, as well as the rest of the research team, have an obligation not to release any information about the participants without the respondent’s permission. Even if an e-mail address is provided on the form, it would be nearly impossible to match that electronic address with the individual’s survey responses once they have been entered via the Web form.

To ensure the respondent’s feeling of confidentiality, set up a drop box in the library to collect completed print survey forms. Doing so should help the response/return rate. If your library offers the option to mail in the survey, the completed survey should be returned to the library and respondents should include in the address, “Attention: LibQUAL+™ Liaison.” Doing so will ensure that when the form is mailed back to the library it will be routed to the correct person. Some respondents may prefer to hand-deliver the completed form; thus, the need for a drop box.

If an institution receives print copies of the survey from participants, the survey liaison should enter all print survey data into the library’s Web survey form and keep a running


tally of the number of forms entered by hand. Print survey data can only be entered
during the time the survey is available to the public. Once the survey period has ended
and the survey link has been closed to the public, print survey data can no longer be
entered.

Representativeness

The survey collects basic demographic information from respondents (e.g., age, sex,
discipline, position) to enable analysis of the results by category and to check the
representativeness of the responding population. Past experience has shown that some
respondents are averse to completing surveys that request this information. However,
because representativeness of response is critical in order to look for response bias, these
questions are an important part of the survey.

The American Psychological Association – and, therefore, most Human Subjects
Research boards – advises that basic sex and age demographics be assimilated in order to
ensure that studies are truly comprehensive. This also addresses empirical concerns, such
as representativeness of response.

One obvious bias that is carefully considered is gender. There is a concern that Web-
based surveys may be inherently biased, inadvertently affected by gender-based
differences in approaches to technology. However, gender has not been found to be an
issue when the LibQUAL+™ survey has been run at institutions of higher education.

Disciplines

In order to provide a more general categorization of disciplines with which all of the
participating institutions can identify, the general discipline categories used in the
LibQUAL+™ 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). The discipline categories used on the survey may or may
not be an exact representation of the discipline areas represented on any one specific
campus. This year you will have the option to map local disciplines, departments, or
categories to our standardized schema.

Additional demographic variables may be created for new types of libraries, to ensure
that the survey is targeted to their user population.

Technical Assistance

Each participating library will be responsible for providing its own local technical
assistance for the survey. There will be designated personnel made available at Texas
A&M and ARL to use as a resource. The behind-the-scenes programming has been
written for maximum efficiency, stability, and compatibility, and the survey does not rely
on erratically supported features such as JavaScript and cookies. On rare occasions,
respondents have encountered problems with the Web survey. The causes of these
problems vary (e.g. proxy server connections, firewalls, browser caching) and most can
be resolved locally through contact with your local network administrator. Others can be attributed to the idiosyncratic nature of the Web itself, and do not reoccur. A few may require our intervention. In those cases where these problems cannot be resolved locally, we welcome your direct contact at <libqual@arl.org>.

**LibQUAL+™ Survey Instrument**

Following years of revision involving data collection from more than 200,000 library users, LibQUAL+™ has evolved into a protocol consisting of “22 items and a box.” The 22 items measure user perceptions of Service Affect, Information Control, and Library as Place. The box secures open-ended comments from users regarding their concerns and suggestions. These comments are an integral part of LibQUAL+™; historically, almost 50 percent of respondents provide comments using the box.

Additional questions include three general satisfaction questions and three usage pattern questions.

To ensure the validity of the responses, each dimension is assessed through at least five questions; therefore, you may notice some redundancy of the questions. This is necessary to insure a sound survey instrument.

**Survey Response Time**

A typical response time for the completion of the 25 questions, 3-scale version of the survey is approximately eight minutes. The average completion time is about 13 minutes although to some Web users it may seem longer!

**Web-based Survey Response Rates**

Research indicates that Web-based surveys typically have low response rates (around 15-20 percent). However, LibQUAL+™’s improved technical interface and refined survey instrument are yielding strong results. Evidence also indicates that institution e-mail lists are generally becoming more accurate and respondents are more likely to have seen or taken Web surveys.

The LibQUAL+™ team is working with libraries that have reported particularly high response rates in order to gather information on best practices that can be shared with all participants. Libraries that achieve response rates above 30 percent are considered libraries with high response rates for Web-based surveys.
LibQUAL +™ Survey Results

Deliverables

All participating institutions receive online access to summary results for all current year participants in addition to their own data. Institutions are encouraged to share what they have learned and how they are using their survey data via the LibQUAL-L and ARL-QUALITY mailing lists. The survey results should not be seen as a measure or comparison of one library’s performance versus another’s, but rather as a means to compare perceptions of service delivery against expectations. LibQUAL+™ is establishing a dialogue among libraries, out of which a set of best practices for library service will emerge. Most importantly, LibQUAL+™ should be viewed as one tool amongst a host of others to use when assessing service quality.

The deliverables are refined with each implementation. Participating institutions can expect to receive:

- A report with an individual, customized summary for their institution, including statistics for all variables.
- Online access to all comments collected in the comments box on the survey form.
- An Excel file of their raw data for local analysis.
- Participants also have the option of receiving a copy of their raw data as an SPSS file.

The survey result reports are made available to all participants on the World Wide Web via a password-protected site. The director or the designated liaison of the participating library should control access to the password-protected environment where the results from LibQUAL+™ are posted.

Data Archiving and Additional Analysis

ARL will be the official archive of the data. Additional custom analysis of an institution’s results may be available depending on the needs and demands of the project and the availability of the LibQUAL+™ team. Such additional analysis will be arranged on a consultancy contractual basis for a fee.

Dissemination of LibQUAL+™ Results

Institutions may share their own data within their institutions in any way they see fit to promote and improve library services. Some institutions have created pages on their Web sites (see Appendix E) as a means of sharing their survey results with their academic community, while others have published articles in their school newspaper. Institutions should NOT use other libraries’ data IN ANY WAY that would compromise or harm the reputation of other institutions. Institutions may use other libraries’ data in a confidential manner without disclosing the institutional identity. In a “New Measures” environment, if we are to learn from one another and improve academic and research libraries, we will
need to refrain from comparisons that suggest that some institutions are better than others.

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 to identify best practices and emulate methods of meeting user expectations and in managing user perceptions. However, 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 in order for institutions to learn 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 data usage 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.

**Publishing LibQUAL+™ results**

Professionals publishing articles using data collected via LibQUAL+™ must sign non-exclusive agreements to comply with the following statement:

“The authors grant ARL the non-exclusive right to reproduce, distribute, post on the Web and disseminate for educational use any articles published in scholarly and other commercial journals as long as the source, author, issue, and page numbers are acknowledged.”

This allows ARL to more effectively disseminate results and research literature related to LibQUAL+™.

Institutions wishing to make their LibQUAL+™ results publicly available (by posting them on an institutional Web site, for example) should acknowledge the role of ARL/LibQUAL+™ in their production by including the following statement:

“This report was produced by LibQUAL+™ for [library name]. LibQUAL+™ is a suite of services that libraries use to solicit, track, understand and act upon users' opinions of service quality. These services are offered to the library community by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). For more information, visit <www.libqual.org>.”

**Past participants meetings**

ARL will organize participants meetings where there will be opportunities for people to share what worked for them versus what needs to be improved, both in terms of the LibQUAL+™ measurement process and in terms of improving local services or
recognizing best practices. Typically these meetings will take place during the American Library Association’s Midwinter or Annual Conferences. Information pertaining to the date, time, and location of the meetings will be made available on the ARL Web site <http://www.arl.org> and on the LibQUAL+™ Web site <http://www.libqual.org/Events>.

Appendices
Appendix A: Sample IRB Forms

Sample Forms for IRB Clearance – Cover Letter

Texas A&M University
Form 1
Summary Cover Sheet
Protocol for Human Subjects in Research

Please check off or provide details on the following (enter N/A if not applicable):
☐ Exemption Requested
See Page 2

Principal Investigator Name: Fred M. Heath
Faculty: ☒ Graduate Student: ☐

College/Dept: Texas A&M General Libraries
Mail Stop: 5000 Phone: 845-8111

Project Title: Association of Research Libraries LibQUAL+ Project: Service Quality Measures

Subjective Estimate of Risk to Subject: ☒ Low ☐ Moderate ☐ High ☐ None

Gender of subjects: ☐ Male ☐ Female ☒ Both ☐ Age(s): 18-75 ☐ Total Participants (est.): 10,000

Source of Subjects:
☐ Psychology Subject Pool
☐ Other TAMU Students
☐ Community
☐ Posted Notices**: ☐ Prisons

Subject Recruitment:
☐ Direct Person-to-person contact
☐ Telephone Solicitation
☐ Newspaper Ad
☐ Letter**: ☐ Other (Please describe)e-mail communication

☐ Other (Please specify) Secondary data from participating universities

Compensation***: Yes ☐ No ☒
Deception: Yes ☐ No ☒
Location of Experiment: participating universities

Invasive or Sensitive Procedures: Yes ☐ No ☒
☐ Blood Samples
☐ Physical Measurements (electrodes, etc.)
☐ Psychological Inventory
☐ rDNA
☐ Urine Samples
☐ Stress Exercise
☐ Review of Medical Records
☐ Other (Specify)

Sensitive Subject Matter: Yes ☐ No ☒
☐ Alcohol, Drugs, Sex
☐ Depression/Suicide
☐ Learning Disability
☐ Other (Specify)

Use of Video or Audio Tapes (please indicate):
Retained: Yes ☐ No ☒
Retained Length of Time: ☐
Destroy/Erase: Yes ☐ No ☒
Other (explain): ☐
Use specified in consent form: Yes ☐ No ☐
Use/access to tapes:

Provisions for Confidentiality/Anonymity:
☐ Replies Coded
☒ Secure Storage
☐ Anonymous Response
☒ Confidential Response

Exact Location Where Signed Consent Forms Will be Filled:
(Must be kept on file for 3 years after the completion of the project).

* Must include signature of committee chair on protocol

10/15/2003
** Please attach
*** Please attach conditions, schedule of payment.
† If yes, attach a debriefing form
REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION from full IRB review

Some research projects involving human subjects are exempt from full review by the IRB. See the attached sheet on research categories exempt from full IRB review.

**Basic for Exemption [Please refer to attached "Categories Exempt From Full IRB Review"]**

- Established Educational Settings/Normal Educational Practices (a letter of approval from a school official must be obtained before the study can be conducted; send copy to the IRB)

- Use of educational anonymous tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, advancement; attach copy).

- Survey or interview procedures, [unless subjects might be identified, put at legal or personal risk, and unless survey or procedures deal with sensitive matters of personal behavior]

- Observations of public behavior [unless subjects might be identified, put at legal or personal risk, and unless observations deal with sensitive matters of personal behavior]

- Anonymous collection or study of existing documents, records, pathological or diagnostic specimens.

- Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies.

The U.S. population is becoming increasingly culturally, linguistically, economically, and ethnically diverse. The research needs to make a concerted effort to ensure that research subjects reflect the population demographically, including these groups who have been traditionally underrepresented. However, it is recognized that the available pool of subjects may preclude having a balanced population. If you cannot use a diverse population in your research, you must justify why not.

______________________________
Principal Investigator Signature and Date

______________________________
Graduate Committee Chair Signature and Date

______________________________
Department Head Signature and Date

______________________________
Institutional Review Board Signature and Date
Sample Detailed Form

Texas A&M University
Form II
Protocol Format for Use of Human Subjects in Research

Part A

Project Title: Association of Research Libraries LibQUAL+ Project: Service Quality Measures

Principal Investigator: Fred M. Heath, Dean of Texas A&M General Libraries
845-8111
fax: 845-6238
e-mail: fheath@tamu.edu

Sponsor/Source of Funds: Association of Research Libraries is the sponsor

Participating university libraries: University of Arizona, Arizona State University, University of Arkansas, Baylor University, Brigham Young University, Clemson University, University of Colorado, Colorado State University, Emory University, University of Guelph, University of Houston, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Iowa State University, Linda Hall Library, Miami University of Ohio, Michigan State University, University of Mississippi, University of Missouri, University of Nebraska, University of New Mexico, Northwestern University Medical School, Ohio University, Oklahoma State University, University of Oregon, Oregon State University, University of Pittsburgh, Southern Illinois University, University of Texas, Texas A&M University, Texas Tech University, University of Utah, Utah State University, Virginia Tech University, Washburn University, University of Washington, Washington State University, University of Waterloo

The project costs are funded by the Texas A&M General Libraries, the Association of Research Libraries, a grant from the U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and by the project participants.

Part B

I have read the Belmont Report, ‘Ethical Procedures and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research’ and subscribe to the principles it contains. In light of this Declaration, I present for the Board’s consideration the following information which will be explained to the subjects about the research activity

SELECTION AND SOURCES OF SUBJECTS

Texas A&M University is working with data from the institutions named above. As background, each university will (a) ask approximately 2,000 members of its community (900 undergraduates, 600 graduates, and 600 faculty) (b) who have in the interest of diversity been randomly selected to respond to a web survey about issues of library service quality. As the sample is randomly
drawn, it is anticipated that (c) the ages will reflect the university range and will be generally
from 18 to 75. There will be (d) no compensation. Each survey will take place (e) in March 2001
from workstations on the campuses of the participating institutions. The data will be collected (f)
on secure servers located in the Texas A&M Main Library, and reported back to the participants
as aggregate mean score data. Individual responses of participants will be wholly confidential.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

In March, each respondent will be invited to log onto the web form created by the participating
institution and respond to a customer satisfaction survey. The survey, LibQUAL+, is a large-
scale, user-based assessment of library service effectiveness that is being developed by the
Association of Research Libraries in collaboration with Texas A&M. LibQUAL+ was patterned
after the SERVQUAL instrument developed by Leonard L. Berry (Distinguished Professor,
Texas A&M University), A. Parasuraman, and Valarie A. Zeithaml. The LibQUAL+ survey takes
about fifteen minutes to complete. The questionnaire is straightforward and involves no deception
or coercion. Potential respondents may elect not to proceed with the survey after reading the
guarantees of confidentiality and privacy.

RISKS AND BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS

(a) There are no risks to the respondents other than the ordinary risks of daily life and chosen
occupation. Respondents are free to decline to participate in the survey and can elect to leave the
survey incomplete.

(b) The benefits to the respondents are those to the universities generally. For the first time, North
American academic libraries will be able to assess the returns on their annual investment in terms
of user evaluations of service quality. Strengths and weaknesses across the several dimensions
defining service quality will be identified; best practices among participating universities will also
surface, allowing libraries to work collegially with other institutions to improve local practices.

SIGNATURE

Fred M. Heath
Dean, Texas A&M General Libraries and Holder of the Sterling C. Evans Endowed Chair

DATE

February 15, 2001
Sample 2003 Survey
Library Service Quality Survey

Important instructions:
Please rate the following statements by selecting your choices from the pull-down menus to indicate:

- **Minimum** -- the number that represents the *minimum* level of service that you would find acceptable.
- **Desired** -- the number that represents the level of service that *you personally want*.
- **Perceived** -- the number that represents the level of service that *you believe* our library currently provides.

You must EITHER rate all three columns OR Identify the item as N/A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When it comes to…</th>
<th>My Minimum Service Level Is low</th>
<th>My Desired Service Level Is low</th>
<th>Perceived Service Performance Is low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Willingness to help users</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Space that facilitates quiet study</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Complete runs of journal titles</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Employees who are consistently courteous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Modern equipment that lets me easily access the information I need</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) A library website enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Timely document delivery/interlibrary loan</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Interdisciplinary library needs being addressed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) A haven for quiet and solitude</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Dependability in handling users' service problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) A place for reflection and creativity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Giving users individual attention</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to…</td>
<td>My Minimum Service Level</td>
<td>My Desired Service Level</td>
<td>Perceived Service Performance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Making information easily accessible for independent use</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Readiness to respond to users' questions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Convenient business hours</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Employees who instill confidence in users</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) A comfortable and inviting location</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Comprehensive print collections</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) A contemplative environment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Employees who understand the needs of their users</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Convenient access to library collections</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Sample Survey Notification

Sample Survey Notification
Fred Heath, Texas A & M University

[Today’s date]

TO: [faculty, staff, or student’s name]

FROM: [dean, director, or university librarian]

SUBJECT: LIBRARY WEB SURVEY

Your opinion counts!

It certainly means a lot to [this university library].

As we plan for the future of [this university library], it is important that we understand our users’ perceptions and expectations so that we can provide the services you need. In a few days, you will receive an email providing you with a link to a library service quality survey. By responding to the survey, you will provide essential information for us to use in planning our future. The survey is part of a North American effort led by the Association of Research Libraries to measure library service quality and identify best practices. We would greatly appreciate your help. When you receive this email, please take the time to go to the web survey and complete it. Thank you for your participation.
Appendix C: Sample Survey Invitation

Sample Survey Invitation

Eileen Hitchingham, Virginia Tech

This is from Eileen Hitchingham
Dean of Libraries at Virginia Tech

April, 2000

Please help us.

You can really contribute to my having a better understanding of what our user community thinks about Virginia Tech library services by participating in a very important electronic survey. Sample responses indicate it takes an average of 13 minutes to complete the form. Your investment of a bit of time now to respond will be greatly appreciated.

Virginia Tech is one of [number of project participants] academic libraries especially selected to pilot a library survey on services. This survey is important because it will:

- Help us better understand how the VT community rates library services
- Allow us to benchmark VT results against other libraries to determine best practices
- Let us know where we can concentrate service improvements for VT users

I am contacting you because you are part of the random sample chosen to represent all Virginia Tech students and faculty. When a sample survey is done it is very important to get good participation so I hope you will choose to respond. Let me assure you that if you participate, your responses will be held in confidence. No identifying links between responses and the individual responding will be retained. Combined data only will be reported.

I would certainly appreciate it if you would complete the online survey at [URL varies by institution] right now, or within the next few days.

We are able to provide a small incentive for your participation. If you choose, you can enter a drawing for [incentive] by keying in your e-mail address at the end of survey. If you have any difficulty in accessing or taking the survey, please contact Don Kenney, Associate Dean University Libraries at libsys@vt.edu or 231-9257

Many thanks for helping us out with this important project.

Eileen

Eileen E. Hitchingham
Dean of Libraries
Virginia Tech

10/15/2003
Appendix D: Sample Survey Reminders

Sample Survey Reminder A
Fred Heath, Texas A & M Libraries

[Today’s date]

TO: [faculty, staff, or student’s name]
FROM: [dean, director, or university librarian]
SUBJECT: LIBRARY WEB SURVEY

[This reminder message should go out three times at three- to five-day intervals after the original message was sent.]

A few days ago you received an e-mail message asking you to assist us in assessing the quality of our library services by filling out a web-based survey.

If you have filled out the survey, thank you! If not, we ask you to take a few minutes to go to the URL below and help us in this important endeavor by taking the survey. Only you can tell us how well we are serving your library needs.

[URL varies by institution]

Please complete the survey no later than [the original date requested]. If you have any difficulty is accessing or taking the survey, please contact [the name of a local liaison at the pilot university] […phone # and e-mail ].

Don’t forget to key in your e-mail address at the end of the survey if you want to enter the drawing for [local and/or project prizes].

Thank you for your assistance.
Sample Survey Reminder B
Eileen Hitchingham, Dean of Libraries at Virginia Tech

THANKS!!!! if you’ve responded to the library survey we sent out to a selected sample of faculty and students in the Virginia Tech community last week.

If you haven’t had a chance to take the survey yet I would appreciate your reading the letter below and going to the search site at [URL varies by institution] to complete the survey.

As I have looked at the overall return rate from all participants it is clear that the response rate from the Virginia Tech community has been first-rate. With your help we can maintain that very good margin.

**********************************
Alternate scenario:
As I have looked at the overall return rate from all participants I am a little disappointed at the returns I see from the Virginia Tech community so far. With your special help we can get our numbers up and assure that Virginia Tech, like the other schools, is a strong participant in this project.

Thanks again.

Eileen

[Original letter followed.]
Appendix E: Examples of Participants’ FAQ and Results
Web Sites

Below are some examples of Web sites created by participating institutions to share information about the LibQUAL+™ survey with their stakeholders. This is by no means a comprehensive list, but rather one that exemplifies different approaches to disseminating information about the survey by various library types.

Cal Poly Pomona University


Duke University

http://www.lib.duke.edu/libqual/

Iowa State University


Kent State University

http://www.library.kent.edu/whatsnew/libqual.html

Lehigh University

http://www.lehigh.edu/its/libqual/libqual.shtml

McGill University

http://www.library.mcgill.ca/LibQUAL/

University of Massachusetts

http://www.lib.umb.edu/libqual/faq.html

St. Louis University

http://www.slu.edu/libraries/pius/libqual/libqual.html

The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio

http://www.library.uthscsa.edu/publications/LibQual.cfm