LibQual 2011 Executive Summary
UAA/APU Consortium Library

Introduction
The UAA/APU Consortium Library administered the LibQUAL Library Service Quality Survey in the fall of 2008 and again in the fall of 2011. Overall, the results of both the 2008 and 2011 surveys were favorable but there are some areas that need attention and improvement. The 2011 results are based on 3,500 completed surveys from both the UAA and APU communities.

LibQUAL is a well-known and respected international survey, administered by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), which allows libraries to "solicit, track, understand and act upon users' opinions of service quality." Survey questions solicit feedback across three dimensions:
- Affect of Service
- Information Control
- Library as Place

The initial survey was administered electronically over a 19-day period, beginning November 3, 2008 and ending on November 21, 2008 (LibQUAL 2008). An almost identical second survey was administered electronically over a 13-day period, beginning November 7, 2011 and ending on November 21, 2011 (LibQUAL 2011). In 2008 and 2011 two separate surveys were administered, one to the UAA community and one to the APU community. The purpose of separate surveys was to be able to analyze the results by institution and make changes based on the individual needs of each community. The survey consisted of 22 core questions, 5 local questions (per institution), 3 general satisfaction questions, 5 information literacy outcomes questions, 3 library use questions, 6 demographic questions, and a text box for submitting open comments.

The Results
Within two weeks of the survey close date, results notebooks were prepared by ARL and returned to the Consortium Library. Two separate Excel files containing the raw comments were also returned at that time. The comments were coded and analyzed by Consortium Library staff. The full findings are summarized here in the executive summary. For full details, please refer to the results notebooks and coded comment files, which are available electronically on the Consortium Library homepage under 'About the Library' then under 'Library Assessment.'

Survey Response Rates and Demographics
The demographic breakdowns included: respondents by user group, population and respondents by user sub-group, population and respondents by standard discipline, population and respondents by customized discipline, respondent profile by age, and population and respondent profile by sex. For simplicity, what are reported here are return rates by user group for each institution. For full details please refer to the results notebook for each institution.

The survey response rate at UAA for 2011 was 15%, which was a 5% increase over the 2008 survey. The number of comments submitted at the end of the survey increased as well, with a total of 39% of respondents submitting at least one comment.

APU response rates increased by 9% in 2011 for a total response rate of 31% and the number of comments submitted at the end of the survey increased with 51% of respondents submitting at least one comment.

While many institutions have seen decreases in response rates, which they contribute to survey fatigue, response rates for both the UAA and APU surveys have increased. The increase may be due to students'

overall satisfaction with the library and the response from the library Dean and staff following the 2008 survey. A number of large and small changes were made, including: increasing the number of electronic resources (both books and journals), adding additional seating, increasing the number of group study rooms, expanding library hours, creating more of an APU presence in the library, reviewing library policies, and more.

Below is a comparison of 2008 and 2011 user response rates.
_____
- UAA Response rates and demographics

UAA 2008
Respondents by user group

Undergraduate	1,388
Graduate	267
Faculty	233
Library Staff	33
Staff	157
Total	**2,078**

10% response rate in 2008
876 respondents submitted comments

UAA 2011
Respondents by user group

Undergraduate	2,372
Graduate	377
Faculty	284
Library Staff	29
Staff	195
Total	**3,257**

15% response rate in 2011
1280 respondents submitted comments

_____
- APU Response rates and demographics

APU 2008
Respondents by user group

Undergraduate	100
Graduate	29
Faculty	27
Library Staff	1
Staff	14
Total	**171**

22% response rate in 2008
86 respondents submitted comments

APU 2011
Respondents by user group

Undergraduate	131
Graduate	65
Faculty	32
Library Staff	1
Staff	14
Total	**243**

31% response rate in 2011
123 respondents submitted comments

Library Use Summary
Respondents were asked about their library use habits, including: how often they use the library, how often they access the library website and how often they visit other non-library gateways such as Google, Yahoo, etc.

UAA respondents reported using the library building more often than they did in 2008, with slight increases in the number of daily and weekly visits and a slight decrease in the number of monthly and quarterly visits. They also reported an increased use in the library website to access library resources and a decreased use of other non-library gateways.

- UAA 2011 – Library Use

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	344 / 10.66%	1,171 / 36.28%	886 / 27.45%	632 / 19.58%	195 / 6.04%	3,228 / 100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	372 / 11.52%	1,246 / 38.60%	885 / 27.42%	471 / 14.59%	254 / 7.87%	3,228 / 100.00%
How often do you use Yahoo(TM), Google(TM), or non-library gateways for information?	2,242 / 69.45%	647 / 20.04%	169 / 5.24%	78 / 2.42%	92 / 2.85%	3,228 / 100.00%

The library saw very different changes in use patterns for APU respondents, including decreased frequency of use of the physical premises. They reported decreases in daily, weekly and monthly use of the building and an increase in quarterly use as well as an increase in the number of respondents who say they never visit the library. This could be due, in part, to an increased use of the library website to access library materials, but we also know that parking and transportation issues between the two campuses pose some challenges for APU users. APU users did report a 3% increase in the use of the library website to access library resources, and like UAA respondents they reported a decrease in the use of other non-library gateways.

- APU 2011 – Library Use

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	4 / 1.65%	61 / 25.21%	75 / 30.99%	84 / 34.71%	18 / 7.44%	242 / 100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	37 / 15.29%	117 / 48.35%	50 / 20.66%	29 / 11.98%	9 / 3.72%	242 / 100.00%
How often do you use Yahoo(TM), Google(TM), or non-library gateways for information?	161 / 66.80%	51 / 21.16%	13 / 5.39%	7 / 2.90%	9 / 3.73%	241 / 100.00%

Core Questions
The 22 core questions covered three distinct dimensions: affect of service, information control (access to materials), and library as place. Patrons were asked to rate core statements by indicating the minimum level of service they find acceptable, the desired level of service they would like to receive, and the perceived level of service they feel the library currently provides. The service expectation ratings are based on a 9-point Likert scale with 1 being low and 9 being high.

Understanding Results for Core Questions
From the ratings provided by the respondents, gaps are calculated to assess how well the institution meets the expectations of its users. A **service adequacy gap** is found by subtracting the minimum from the perceived level of service. An adequacy gap near zero or negative implies a need for improvement in that service area. A **service superiority gap** is found by subtracting the desired from the perceived level of service. A superiority gap near zero or positive implies that the library is exceeding expectations for that service area.

Areas of Superiority

Overall, UAA and APU have fared well. One trend seen in the 2011 data that has also been reported on a national level is a decrease in library user scores in the category "my minimum service level is." This shows a general decrease in user expectations, with scores on both ends of the spectrum moving towards neutral scores. There were fewer areas of superiority as well as fewer areas of inadequacy in 2011. The tables below show the areas that library users rated as superior and/or inadequate for the core questions by institution and user group. Individual scores can be found in the results notebook. These tables only indicate whether a user group rated the service as superior or inadequate. The shaded lines highlight the questions that were rated as superior in 2008 and again in 2011.

- UAA and APU – Core Questions Areas of Superiority 2008 and 2011

2011

ID	Statement	User Group
LP1	Library space that inspires study and learning	APU Faculty
LP4	A gateway for study, learning and research	APU Faculty
LP5	Community space for group learning and group study	UAA Faculty

2008

ID	Statement	User Group
LP1	Library space that inspires study and learning	APU Faculty
LP2	Quiet space for individual activities	APU Faculty, APU Staff
LP3	A comfortable and inviting location	APU Graduate Students
LP5	Community space for group learning and group study	APU Staff, Library Staff
AS6	Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion	APU Faculty

As noted, there are fewer areas of superiority in the 2011 survey results, yet two areas of superiority have remained the same: a library space that inspires study and learning, and community space for group learning and group study. It should be noted that all but one area of superiority in both the 2008 and 2011 surveys are in the LibQUAL dimension 'library as place.' Library space is consistently given high marks, yet it has been a focus for improvement since 2008, because the library gets a large number of comments as part of the survey that say things like: "I love to study at the library but I wish that you would extend hours…increase seating…turn the heat up…allow groups to use the group study rooms for longer periods of time, …" While the high ratings tend to come from faculty, staff and graduate students, the suggestions and negative comments tend to come from undergraduate students.

Areas of Inadequacy

As illustrated in the tables below, the number of questions that were rated as inadequate has decreased from six areas in 2008, to three in 2011. Again, the shaded lines highlight the questions that were rated as inadequate in 2008 and again in 2011. Unlike the areas of superiority that focus on the modern and updated facility, the areas of inadequacy show the library's struggle to provide the resources that each user group needs for their study, teaching and research needs.

- UAA and APU – Core Questions Areas of Inadequacy 2008 and 2011

2011

ID	Statement	User Group
IC1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	APU Faculty, APU Staff

ID	Statement	User Group
IC2	A library website enabling me to locate information on my own	[*UAA Faculty and Staff], APU Staff
IC8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	UAA Faculty, [*UAA Grad Students], APU Faculty

*The scores in brackets were rated one or two tenths of a point above zero but for our purposes of analysis and improvement they are included with scores at or below zero.

2008

ID	Statement	User Group
IC2	A library website enabling me to locate information on my own	APU Graduate Students
IC3	Printed material I need for my work	APU Faculty
IC4	Electronic information resources I need	APU Graduate Students
IC7	Making information accessible for independent use	APU Faculty
IC8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	APU Graduate Students, APU Faculty, UAA Graduate Students, UAA Faculty
AS3	Employees who are consistently courteous	Library Staff

While undergraduates rate the library's resources as adequate, faculty, staff and researchers rate the resources as below their expectations. The library Dean believes this is one of the greatest challenges the library has to overcome and has increased the library's collection development budget each year to work towards improved satisfaction, and improved scores. While the scores in this area have shown that the library has not met expectations for these user groups, the scores have improved since 2008. Also, when compared to the LibQUAL results for our university peer institutions, our collections (and scores) rate slightly higher.

The library staff has conducted a number of additional studies, including conducting focus groups with faculty in high need areas, to determine what specific resources and/or what disciplines are the most dissatisfied with the resources the library currently provides. What the results of these studies have shown is that the library mostly has the resources patrons want (with some exceptions) but they would like access to volumes and issues not owned by the library. Faculty would like the library to fill in periodical runs, buy back files and purchase current year access where it is not already available. The library maintains an extensive materials 'wish list' that covers nearly all academic disciplines. Librarians work towards the acquisition of materials on that list, and the library staff has made great headway over the last few years as evidenced in improved scores.

In addition to providing better coverage to titles the library owns, as well as purchasing new titles, it is clear that faculty, staff, and graduate students at both institutions want better electronic access to library journals. They want to be able to search across multiple resources with the ease of a Google-like search box. To improve the user experience, the library began offering a document delivery service in 2009 to deliver materials electronically that the library owned in print. In 2011 the library purchased and implemented a 'discovery system' that allows users to search across most library resources from one simple search box. The library will continue to implement new services and new search technologies as they become available in hopes of simplifying and improving the overall user experience.

Local Questions

Each institution was given the opportunity to choose five additional local questions from a list of pre-established questions. The questions that were selected are listed below. Individual scores can be found in the results notebook. These tables only indicate whether a user group rated the service as superior or inadequate.

Question Text	Superior	Inadequate
A secure and safe place		UAA Faculty, UAA Library Staff, UAA Staff, [*APU Graduate Students]
Collections of online full-text articles sufficient to meet my needs		UAA Graduate Student, UAA Faculty, UAA Staff, [*APU Graduate Students], APU Faculty, APU Staff
Ease of use of electronic resources		[*APU Graduate Students], APU Staff
Helpful online guides and tutorials		
The multimedia (CD/DVD/video/audio) collections I need		

*The scores in brackets were rated one or two tenths of a point above zero but for purposes of analysis and improvement they are included with scores at or below zero.

Both UAA and APU selected the same local questions in 2011. The questions were chosen in order to gather additional information in areas that the 2008 LibQUAL results showed below average performance, or to look at other areas that needed some further exploration. For this reason, it was not surprising that three of the five questions were rated as inadequate.

The three areas that were rated as inadequate also generated a number of comments from library users. The statement **'A secure and safe place'** received very different comments when separated by user group. In 2008 most of the comments from students, faculty and staff focused on safety issues outside of the building. These user groups commented on the long, dark walk to the parking lot from the library and several suggested opening a North entrance. APU students commented on the icy, dark path to the library during the winter and the fear of running into animals or people on the path. Many of these same comments were made in the 2011 survey. In addition, the 2011 comments also included a number of comments about safety within the building. These concerns are valid, and the 2011 survey was distributed a few months after an alleged sexual assault took place in the library. Both the alleged perpetrator and the victim were affiliated with UAA.

In 2008, Library staff commented on safety issues within the building, especially with regard to the homeless and/or mentally ill populations that came in to use the library's public computers. This was due in part to the library's close proximity to a homeless shelter as well as its close proximity to the Alaska Psychiatric Institute. In order to help manage this problem, as well as provide better computer access to UAA/APU affiliated users, the majority of the computers were switched to password access for anything beyond searching for library materials. A few 15 minute and several one-hour workstations were set up for public use. These actions decreased the number of problems librarians were seeing at the reference desk, and the librarians received a number of comments from students saying they were glad to see the change; they felt more comfortable in the open computer space and it allowed them more access to library research computers.

The University Police Department agreed to conduct a new safety audit of the building in 2011. They made several minor suggestions to improve safety (install more mirrors allowing patrons to see around blind corners, post emergency numbers and room numbers in each room in the library, etc.). In addition, the audit also found that the closest outside emergency phone was located in front of the Integrated

Science Building. There was agreement that one should be installed in the library's main parking lot, but the process for getting an emergency phone and funding to cover the cost has not yet been worked out. APU offered a shuttle service for a year or so after the 2008 survey, but it got very limited use and was discontinued. A sidewalk is scheduled to be built along the road between APU and UAA, which should improve access, safety, and security. Most notably, the library added a delivery service, allowing APU patrons to request library materials for delivery to the APU campus.

The statement **'collections of online full-text articles sufficient to meet my needs'** characterizes the library's biggest challenge. As programs and enrollment have grown over the last ten years, the library's collection development budget has not kept pace. The greatest area of concern is providing advanced level resources to graduate students, faculty, and researchers. The library has received special allocations through the Chancellor's Planning and Budget Advisory Council and grants, and has realigned its own budget to help meet the collection needs of these advanced researchers. While scores for this statement and other related questions have improved since 2008, the library still has a long way to go to achieve positive scores from all user groups in all disciplines.

The final statement for which the Library received a negative score was **'ease of use of electronic resources.'** While the score was negative there were no comments that would help the library staff determine the specific problems with the website. A small follow up survey was done with APU staff (many of whom are also graduate students) and it was determined that it was not the website itself that was a problem but navigating and finding electronic resources. The library staff realized that while staff is often asked to locate articles for faculty (for research or to be placed on reserve for students) staff has not been offered librarian mediated instruction. One suggestion would be to offer training at the beginning of the fall semester in 2012, and if successful, at the beginning of each subsequent semester.

General Satisfaction Questions
The three general satisfaction questions all received relatively high scores. The scores are again based on a Likert scale of 1-9. UAA users rated their satisfaction with the library and its services slightly higher than APU rated those same services. This may be due in part to the access issues faced by APU users. The scores were comparable to the 2008 survey results.

Satisfaction Question	APU Mean Score	UAA Mean Score
In general, I am satisfied with the way I am treated at the library.	7.29 (SD 1.68)	7.86 (SD 1.46)
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.	7.19 (SD 1.64)	7.46 (SD 1.49)
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?	7.32 (SD 1.37)	7.54 (SD 1.30)

Information Literacy Questions

The five information literacy questions received slightly higher scores in 2011 than they did in the 2008 survey.

Information Literacy Outcomes Questions	APU Mean Score	UAA Mean Score
The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest.	6.26 (SD 1.74)	6.56 (SD 1.73)
The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work.	7.05 (SD 1.65)	7.17 (SD 1.58)
The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work.	7.15 (SD 1.58)	7.27 (SD 1.56)
The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.	6.66 (SD 1.85)	6.79 (SD 1.78)
The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study.	6.86 (SD 1.64)	6.96 (SD 1.65)

Comments

A text box was provided at the end of the survey to solicit comments from survey respondents. 1,832 comments were left by a total of 1,403 survey participants. What follows is an analysis and summary of the comment data. The full comments are available on the library's assessment website.

In order to provide a framework for using the comments, a coding system was devised in 2008 that matched comments to the three survey dimensions (affect of service, information control, library as place). Each dimension was further subdivided in order to facilitate the analysis and use of survey comments. In addition, each comment was rated as positive, negative or as a suggestion. Library staff further refined this coding system in 2011 to include other relevant subdivisions and codes that would help track comments regarding positive and negative staff behavior. The codes are shown in the table below.

Coding and Categories Used for LibQual Comment Analysis					
Service	**Resources**	**Facilities**	**Other**	**Rating**	**Staff**
S1 Circulation	C1 Book collections	P1 General atmosphere (general comments)	O1 General	N Negative	B1 Positive staff behavior
S2 ILL	C2 Journal collections and databases	P2 Parking	O2 Other	P Positive	B2 Negative staff behavior
S3 Library hours	C3 Other Collections	P3 Safety/Security	O3 Survey - comments about the survey	O Neutral	
S4 Policies	C4 General comments	P4 Noise levels			

	about the collection				
S5 Reference services	C5 Access to physical collections	P5 Study space			
S6 Classroom teaching	C6 Access to online collections	P6 Wayfinding – layout and signage			
S7 Online catalog		P7 Temperature levels			
S8 Computer equipment		P8 Other place/env related			
S9 Non-computer equipment					
S10 Other teaching tools (audio tour, tutorials, Libguides,..)					
S11 Website					
S12 Group study rooms and graduate carrels					
S13 Other service					

Comments were coded and sorted, and the top categories were identified for each institution.

What follows is an analysis and summary of the comment data. The full comments are available on the library's assessment website. The lists of positive and negative comments were similar for both UAA and APU.

UAA Positive Comments	UAA Negative Comments
• Staff Behavior	• Study Space (noise, temperature)
• General Atmosphere of the Library	• Group Study Rooms (number of rooms, noise, policies)
	• Journal Collections and Databases

APU Positive Comments	APU Negative Comments
• Staff Behavior	• Parking/Safety and Security
• General Atmosphere of the Library	• Group Study Rooms (number of rooms, noise, policies)
• Study Space	• Journal Collections and Databases

Positive staff behavior was at the top of both institution's lists. The library is certainly meeting user expectations when it comes to providing a positive atmosphere and high quality service. Examples of comments from this category are: "Generally it has been my experience that the employees at the UAA library reference desk are amazing," "The library staff is consistently helpful, attentive and courteous."

The category 'general atmosphere of the library' and the category 'study space' also got high marks from users. Some typical comments from these categories are: "I enjoy the library, it is beautifully designed and sort of has that homey comforting setting. I feel like I'm at my own office at home. I enjoy the variety of study spaces and opportunities," "The library is a place of solace and learning that has made me much more comfortable in the college environment," "I love the plants," "I go to the library to study for each test and it has provided the atmosphere I need to succeed in my scholastic goals. Thank you so much!"

There was some agreement among campuses and users as to what areas the library most needs to improve. There was agreement on group study rooms and journal collections and databases needing work and attention. Some representative comments about the group study rooms are: "Please extend the study room times, 2 hours is really not enough when comes to complicated homework study sessions," "The only downside that I have experienced is the limitation of only being able to reserve a room for one two-hour period per day. It seems there should be more flexibility concerning room reservations, especially at times when the library is nearly empty (e.g. the summer terms)," "If no one is using the group rooms to study or has them reserved -- groups should be allowed to check them out more than once in day. Is it feasible to have a group study room with a computer or two to work on group papers or research?," "I wished that people in the study rooms realized that the rooms are NOT sound proof," "Student study groups need access to library study rooms for four hour blocks."

It is very clear from these comments that the library has a number of issues to deal with when it comes to managing group study rooms. There are issues of policy, space and equipment availability, soundproofing, and the management of the rooms. While students overwhelming like the rooms and feel that they are necessary, they are not happy about the limited number of rooms or the policies that govern the management of the rooms. While a few more group study rooms have been added this will be a big issue for the library to tackle in order to provide equitable service to all patrons. With the amount of group work that is assigned to students, this is an issue that may need to be addressed campus-wide.

Journal collections and databases was another area of shared dissatisfaction. The library has improved its scores slightly in this area since 2008, but with the increasing number of new programs, especially those at the masters or doctoral level, it is difficult to fulfill the needs of UAA and APU patrons at this level. One of the problems is offering students the materials they need for research at this level. Another clear problem is not meeting the resource expectations of faculty recruited to teach at that level. Here is a sample of the comments left in this area: "I have maintained affiliation with the University of California system since arriving at UAA in 2000 because the UC library resources are excellent. The quality of UAA's offerings (particularly electronic journal access) has improved substantially but still lags UC," "My biggest complaint is that the journal articles I need for my research are either not available through our library or they are only available in print. I live in Wasilla so driving to Anchorage for print articles is very frustrating and inefficient. I would greatly appreciate more electronic articles," "In general library services are very good. Inter-library loan is awesome and got me through my PhD and dissertation. It would be lovely, however, if we had more electronic resources and did not need to resort to inter-library loan as much, but I understand the financial constraints of that and again, I really appreciate how well and efficiently inter-library loan works."

Conclusion

The UAA/APU Consortium Library administered the LibQUAL Library Service Quality Survey in the fall of 2008 and again in the fall of 2011. The results of both the 2008 and 2011 LibQUAL surveys were favorable. Based on the 3,500 surveys completed in 2011 by the UAA and APU communities, overall the library is meeting at least the minimum expectations, and with some groups, exceeding expectations in terms of quality library facility and services.

The library got high marks for providing quality service and a pleasant academic environment for study and learning. Not surprisingly, one area of concern defined by both the UAA and APU faculty and by the UAA and APU graduate students is the availability of adequate library resources to support their research and studies. Survey scores in this area have increased since the 2008 survey but the library is still not meeting expectations in this category.

More than 1,400 patrons added comments to their survey results, which netted some very specific suggestions. Patrons would like the library to provide more space for individual and group study, increase its electronic journal and database collections, and address APU parking/access issues.

Thank you all for participating in the survey. Your input will assist us in making improvements to the facility, collections and services that will help us better meet the needs of our library patrons.