LibQUAL 2014 Executive Summary
UAA/APU Consortium Library

Introduction
The UAA/APU Consortium Library administered the LibQUAL Library Service Quality Survey in the fall of 2008, the fall of 2011, and again in the fall of 2014. Overall, the results of all three surveys were favorable but there are some areas that need attention and improvement. The 2014 results are based on 2,319 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). Our second survey was administered electronically over a 13-day period, beginning November 7, 2011 and ending on November 21, 2011 (LibQUAL 2011). An almost identical third survey was administered electronically over the 19-day period of November 3, 2014 to November 21, 2014 (LibQUAL 2014). In 2008, 2011, and 2014 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 a month 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 Us' 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 2014 was 10%, which was a 5% decrease from the 2011 survey, but consistent with the 2008 survey. The number of comments submitted at the end of the survey decreased as well, with a total of 36% of respondents submitting at least one comment. In 2011, 39% of respondents left a comment, and in 2008, 41% commented.

APU response rates also decreased slightly in 2014 for a total response rate of 28%, and the number of comments submitted at the end of the survey decreased, with 31% of respondents submitting at least one comment.

Since this is our third implementation of LibQUAL, it is likely that survey fatigue has become a factor affecting response rates for both the UAA and APU surveys. The decrease may be due to students' overall satisfaction with the library and the response from the library Dean and staff following the 2008 and 2011 surveys. A number of large and small changes were made, including: increasing the number of electronic resources (both books and journals), adding additional seating and new types of seating, increasing the number of group and individual study rooms, introducing self-booking for study rooms, increasing the number of electrical plugs in the building, expanding library hours, opening our Late Night Study Facility, creating more of an APU presence in the library, reviewing library policies, and more.

Below is a comparison of 2008, 2011, and 2014 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

UAA 2014
Respondents by user group

Undergraduate	1,475
Graduate	233
Faculty	152
Library Staff	15
Staff	94
Total	**1,969**

10% response rate in 2014
775 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

APU 2014
Respondents by user group

Undergraduate	75
Graduate	45
Faculty	26
Staff	24
Total	**170**

28% response rate in 2014
58 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 and 2011, with slight increases in the number of daily and quarterly visits, slight decreases in the number of weekly visits, and a slight decrease in users who never visit the library. They also reported an increased use of the library website to access library resources as well as an increased use of other non-library gateways.

- UAA 2014 – Library Use

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	230	674	539	404	106	1,953
	11.78%	34.51%	27.60%	20.69%	5.43%	100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	241	750	499	297	166	1,953
	12.34%	38.40%	25.55%	15.21%	8.50%	100.00%
How often do you use YahooTM, GoogleTM, or non-library gateways for information?	1,384	365	100	53	50	1,952
	70.90%	18.70%	5.12%	2.72%	2.56%	100.00%

The library saw different use patterns for APU respondents, a continuation of the trend begun in 2011. APU respondents reported a 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, which has shown increases in 2011 and 2014. We also know that parking and transportation issues between the two campuses pose some challenges for APU users. APU users did report a 2% increase over 2011 in the daily use of the library website to access library resources, and they reported an increase in the use of other non-library gateways.

- APU 2014 – Library Use

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Never	n/%
How often do you use resources on library premises?	4	30	46	68	22	170
	2.35%	17.65%	27.06%	40.00%	12.94%	100.00%
How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?	29	66	34	34	7	170
	17.06%	38.82%	20.00%	20.00%	4.12%	100.00%
How often do you use YahooTM, GoogleTM, or non-library gateways for information?	112	44	5	6	3	170
	65.88%	25.88%	2.94%	3.53%	1.76%	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 again fared well. There were more areas of superiority and no increase in areas of inadequacy in 2014. 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 notebooks. 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 more than once. One area was found to be superior in all three surveys: Community space for group learning and group study.

- UAA and APU – Core Questions Areas of Superiority 2008, 2011, and 2014

2014

ID	Statement	User Group
LP2	Quiet space for individual activities	APU Faculty
LP3	A comfortable and inviting location	UAA Faculty
LP4	A getaway for study, learning, or research	APU Faculty
LP5	Community space for group learning and group study	APU Faculty
AS2	Giving users individual attention	APU Faculty
AS4	Readiness to respond to users' questions	APU Faculty
AS9	Dependability in handling users- service problems	APU Faculty

2011

ID	Statement	User Group
LP1	Library space that inspires study and learning	APU Faculty
LP4	A getaway for study, learning, or 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 more areas of superiority in the 2014 survey results than in previous years. For the first time, three areas in the LibQUAL dimension 'affect of service' were named superior, in contrast to the 2008 and 2011 surveys, in which all but one area of superiority 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 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. It has been observed that although the nature of negative comments has remained consistent, the actual number of negative comments has decreased, indicating that fewer users are dissatisfied.

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 and in 2014. We included scores slightly above zero for the purposes of analysis and improvement, which brought the areas of inadequacy up to four in 2014. Again, the shaded lines highlight the questions that were rated as inadequate in more than one survey. 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 requires for their study, teaching and research needs.

- UAA and APU – Core Questions Areas of Inadequacy 2008, 2011, and 2014

2014

ID	Statement	User Group
IC2	A library website enabling me to locate information on my own	[*APU Staff]
IC6	Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own	APU Staff
IC8	Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work	[*UAA Faculty, APU Grad Students], APU Staff
LP5	Community space for group learning and group study	APU Staff

*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.

2011

ID	Statement	User Group
IC1	Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office	APU Faculty, APU Staff
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 at or 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. For the first time in 2014, faculty and graduate students at both institutions expressed satisfaction with the journal collections they require for their work, though the margins for UAA were paper-thin. The scores in this area have seen steady improvement since 2008.

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 in recent 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. In 2013 the library implemented *BrowZine*, a tool for organizing and reading electronic journals on tablet computers. 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, or we could supply our own. With feedback and assistance from the Faculty Senate Library Advisory Committee, the Consortium Library Instruction & Research Services department, and the UAA Center for Human Development, the Consortium Library selected the following questions.

Answers were based on a Likert scale of 1-5, ranging from 'Strongly Disagree' (1) to 'Strongly Agree' (5). Individual scores can be found in the results notebooks.

Local Question Text	APU Mean Score	UAA Mean Score
I understand how a librarian can help with my research.	3.96 (SD 1.07)	4.03 (SD 1.03)
My research would be improved if I got help from a librarian.	3.93 (SD 0.96)	3.80 (SD 1.03)
When I am in the library, I know how to get help with my research.	3.76 (SD 1.09)	3.87 (SD 1.11)
When I am not in the library, I know how to get help with my research.	3.75 (SD 1.07)	3.82 (SD 1.10)
I have found the use of the library's online guides (ex. subject guides, how-to guides, course guides) to be useful in helping me succeed in research.	3.71 (SD 0.96)	3.68 (SD 1.10)

Both UAA and APU selected the same local questions in 2014. The questions were chosen to provide data to the Library's Instruction & Research Services department, who are analyzing the library's provision of reference services. Overall, most users strongly agree with the statements, "I understand how a librarian can help with my research" and "When I am in the library, I know how to get help with my research." Responses to the other questions varied. A significant number of respondents from all groups did not strongly agree that "I have found the use of the library's online guides … to be useful in helping me succeed in research." Faculty strongly agreed, but undergraduate students gave a mixed response to the statement, "When I am not in the library, I know how to get help with my research." Graduate students and staff were less likely than the other groups to strongly agree that "My research would be improved if I got help from a librarian." These results, particularly when scrutinized by user group and discipline, will help inform changes to the provision of reference services, including a greater emphasis on preparing and publicizing online guides.

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 and 2011 survey results.

Satisfaction Question	APU Mean Score	UAA Mean Score
In general, I am satisfied with the way I am treated at the library.	7.46 (SD 1.62)	7.67 (SD 1.50)
In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.	7.41 (SD 1.53)	7.51 (SD 1.50)
How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?	7.42 (SD 1.32)	7.61 (SD 1.30)

Information Literacy Questions

The five information literacy questions received slightly higher scores in 2014 than they did in the 2011 survey. The 2011 scores, in turn, were slightly higher than those 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.	6.44 (SD 1.86)	6.59 (SD 1.76)
The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work.	7.06 (SD 1.67)	7.21 (SD 1.57)
The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work.	7.22 (SD 1.63)	7.37 (SD 1.56)
The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.	6.79 (SD 1.78)	6.97 (SD 1.78)
The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study.	6.77 (SD 1.71)	7.03 (SD 1.70)

Comments

A text box was provided at the end of the survey to solicit comments from survey respondents. 1,320 comments were left by a total of 833 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 – which were also used in 2014 – 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 about the collection	P4 Noise levels			

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. Although the topics of negative comments continue to fall into the same categories as in previous years, the total number of negative comments has decreased.

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

APU Positive Comments	APU Negative Comments
• Staff Behavior	• Parking
• General Atmosphere of the Library	• Group Study Rooms (number of rooms, noise, policies)

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: "The first time I ever went to the Consortium Library, the librarians were PHENOMENAL and so knowledgeable," "When I visit the library the staff is always courteous and

helpful," and "Terrific staff--knowledgable and resourceful. The outreach and willingness to support faculty and students is great."

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: "The library is my go to place to get all of my work done. Best environment on campus for productivity," and "Such an amazing place to study in a very well put together building. I just think the whole place is great and wish it was on the APU campus!"

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: "I wish the private study rooms could be rented out for longer periods of time," "I wish study groups could schedule multiple times for a room on non busy days," "It would be awesome if there were more group study areas!," "The number of individual and group study rooms is still not adequate, nor is the two hour limit for using them," "My biggest issue is the private study rooms. The climate control is not good...they're either too hot or cold. And sound bleeds through the walls easily. A loud group next door can be really distracting."

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, as has a self-booking system, this continues to 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 really appreciate the access to journals provided by the library, but wish the collections could be expanded," "The biggest item that would help myself and many other faculty members in my department is having a comprehensive electronic subscription to scientific journals. Very few are available here at UAA, however UAF has an excellent subscription," "I really do wish there was a wider number of electronic journals available, specifically in regards to psychology journals."

Conclusion

The UAA/APU Consortium Library administered the LibQUAL Library Service Quality Survey in the fall of 2008, the fall of 2011, and again in the fall of 2014. The results of all three LibQUAL surveys were favorable. Based on the 2,319 surveys completed in 2014 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 all user groups' expectations in this category.

More than 833 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 open the north entrance.

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.