September 8, 2014

Dear Colleagues,

In November 2013, I charged a working group to prepare and administer the 2014 LibQUAL+ survey.¹ The purpose of the effort was to:

- Gain a better understanding of users’ expectations, desires, and perceptions of library services
- Identify current library services’ strengths and areas that require improvement
- Inform strategic planning for the library as it endeavors to meet and exceed user expectations and expressed needs
- Relate the findings in the 2014 survey to previous LibQUAL+ assessments and other appropriate data

The working group has collected the data and provided a basic analysis of the survey results. This report marks the last and most important part of the assessment process.

Currently, the library staff is seriously reviewing this data, even some of the data that we might find uncomfortable. We are committed that the library will use this information to make improvements to its collections, building and services. We have done this with the LibQUAL+ surveys in 2004 and 2008; we will do this again with the results of the 2014 survey.

The library held a staff retreat on August 14th; we began a discussion about the results of the survey and what the results mean. After the retreat, we are having a series of departmental meetings and general staff meetings to identify actions that we can take in the short term (1 – 2 years) and long term (3 – 6 years) to improve library services to campus. Some of the issues may require further investigation with student, faculty and staff. During the fall semester, we will talk to different campus constituencies about the survey. We look forward to any feedback that you might have.

My thanks go to the chair and members of the LibQUAL+ Working Group. Their hard work and skill is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Pat

Patrick J. Wilkinson
Polk Library Director

¹ The members were Maccabee Levine (chair), Ted Mulvey, Joshua Ranger, Sara Stichert and Craig Thomas.
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Executive Summary

Polk Library conducted the Association of Research Libraries’ LibQUAL+ survey during February 2014 as part of its commitment to continually assess and improve its services to the university community. Overall results were encouraging; the 1003 survey respondents’ scores averaged 7.32 on a 1-9 scale across all core questions, an improvement among all three user groups since the previous (2008) survey. Among their qualitative comments, positive responses outnumbered negatives by a two-to-one margin.

The library’s role as study space remains central to student life, with undergraduates praising the library’s “comfortable and inviting location,” their highest priority. All three respondent groups praised the library’s group study spaces, although they frequently asked for more of them. Quiet space fared worse, with many comments criticizing the noise level or requesting an increase in quiet study spaces -- graduate students noted this as a key priority and an area where the building falls short.

Undergraduates praised the library as a “getaway for study, learning or research”, while faculty disagreed. A frequent request in the comments was to improve older library spaces to be as comfortable as recently updated areas like Polk 101. Many respondents also asked for an expansion of library hours and for an additional entrance to the building. On average, all three participant groups found the library’s space to be improved since the 2008 survey.

The availability of information resources remains a greater priority for those with more advanced research needs. Faculty and graduate students were satisfied with their independent access to the library’s electronic resources from home or office, but they were both more likely than undergraduates to criticize or suggest improvements to these resources. Graduate students similarly noted a deficiency in print resources, although when asked specifically about books, small majorities of all three respondent groups preferred e-books to print.

Faculty and undergraduates both rated poorly the library website, online catalog and online guides & tutorials. Undergraduates praised the technology equipment inside the building while graduate students found it deficient, and commenters frequently asked for more computers to be provided throughout the library. Overall, impressions of the library’s information resources improved since 2008 for faculty and undergraduates, but declined for graduate students.

Opinions differed on the quality of customer service at Polk Library, with faculty rating staff and student employees’ performance much higher than undergraduates. Indeed, although two-thirds of the user comments about customer service were positive, the negative feedback came almost exclusively from undergraduates, who prioritized employee courtesy and found it below their expectations. Commenters frequently had difficulty finding a staff member to help them, yet once they succeed, all three user groups praised staff’s willingness to help users.
Despite that intent, faculty and graduate students rated poorly employees’ understanding of their needs, and both student groups reported a low level of confidence from their staff interactions. Respondents did praise employees’ knowledge in answering user questions, but commenters suggested that student employees were not as well prepared. On average, all three respondent groups reported an improvement in customer service since 2008.

Most user comments were positive on the library’s central responsibility for information literacy instruction, whether in formal classes or one-on-one research consultations. Faculty did report a decline in overall information literacy performance, and none of the respondent groups felt that the library helped them keep current in their fields of interest. Undergraduates and graduate students noted that the library made them more efficient in their academic work, and both student groups (especially undergraduates) noted an overall improvement in the library’s information literacy services.

As the university’s use of Google and other search engines continued to rise, respondents reported using the library’s services just about as frequently as in 2004 and 2008. On a new local question added to measure alignment with the university’s goals, each respondent group rated 7.65 or above “the value of the library’s resources and services to me for my academic success.”

Polk Library encourages all members of the university community to review the findings in this report, and as always, to share your feedback at libraryfeedback@uwosh.edu or via the suggestion box on the bottom of the library website.
Introduction

Polk Library promised in its 2013 strategic goals to “foster a culture of assessment, improvement and innovation” by, among other means, “gather[ing] and analyz[ing] quantitative and qualitative data to continuously evaluate collections and services.” In February 2014, library staff conducted a campus-wide survey in order to hear from students, faculty and staff on where Polk Library meets, exceeds or falls short of their service expectations. The Association of Research Libraries’ LibQUAL+ survey has been used by more than 1,200 libraries over the past 15 years to quantitatively assess many specific aspects of library service, as well as to gather free-form input and suggestions. Polk Library previously conducted the LibQUAL+ survey in 2004 and 2008, using the results to guide service changes including the creation of modern and inviting study and computer workspaces in Polk 101, the designation of quiet study areas, and the increase in quantity and quality of electronic resources. This report summarizes the key findings from the 2014 LibQUAL+ survey.

The survey was approved by the UW Oshkosh Institutional Review Board and conducted online, with recruiting through email and in-library solicitation. An appendix contains additional details on survey methodology. Polk Library’s research personnel were Maccabee Levine (principal investigator), Ted Mulvey, Joshua Ranger, Sara Stichert, Craig Thomas and Patrick Wilkinson.

Perceived, Minimum and Desired Service Levels

A full description of survey methodology is below, but a brief description of the quantitative questions is necessary to understand what conclusions we’ve drawn from that data.

LibQUAL+ asks respondents to provide three separate ratings for most questions: their perception of service quality, as well as their minimum and desired levels, on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 9 (highest). From these three data points on each question, we were able to determine five findings, which we include in this report based on the following criteria:

- **Perception** scores: the raw perceptions of each service. Considering the the lowest and highest perception scores from a participant group over all 22 core questions, we report scores in the top 20% or bottom 20% of that numerical range (irrespective of how the other scores are distributed within the range). As the most basic finding, we refer to perception below as scores or ratings using general language like “high”, “positive”, and their opposites. Note that these findings are always relative to the other 80% of the perception range from that participant group, not a comparison with the other groups, unless otherwise stated.

2 http://www.libqual.org/about/about_lq/history_lq
● **Minimum** and **Desired** scores: the relative importance of each service. We report the highest and lowest minimum and desired scores from each participant group among each of the three core question categories.

● **Adequacy** of the service: the distance between minimum and perception scores. We report the smallest and largest adequacy reported by each participant group among each of the three question categories.

● The **gap** between perceived and desired levels of service. As above, we report the smallest and largest gaps from each participant group among each of the three question categories.

**Aggregate Results & General Satisfaction**

The aggregate results across all quantitative questions reveal a positive perception of library service quality, as well as a positive trend since our 2008 survey. On an answer scale of 1-9, participants’ overall perceptions exceeded 7.25 and improved across two of the three participant groups -- undergraduate (7.29, +0.15), graduate (7.45, -0.06) and faculty (7.63, +0.33) -- since the 2008 survey. This builds on the positive 2004-2008 trend for undergraduate (+0.06) student perceptions, and overcomes the previous decline in faculty (-0.17) perception, to the extent that faculty now report the highest overall service perception.

![Graphs showing average perception over years for Undergraduates, Graduates, and Faculty](image)

Responses to the open-ended qualitative question were generally positive as well, with positive responses outnumbering negatives approximately two-to-one. The following word cloud gives a sense of the topics represented.
While users’ perception of the quality of Polk’s services has increased, the expectations of those services have declined. Averaged across all questions, participants’ desired levels of service decreased slightly among undergraduates (-0.03) and graduates (-0.16) and more significantly among faculty (-0.26).

General Satisfaction

Three standard survey questions asked respondents to rate their general satisfaction with library services. The response to **in general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library** reveals a positive trend for undergraduates, but negative trends for graduate students and faculty.

Respondents from all three user groups increasingly report that **in general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research and/or teaching needs** compared to 2004 or 2008. Undergraduates and faculty report the same improvements on the question **how would you rate the overall quality of service provided by the library?**; graduate students report increased scores (+0.31) since 2004 but a slight decline (-0.03) since 2008.

UW Oshkosh added one local question on general satisfaction, asking respondents for **the value of the library's resources and services to me for my academic success.**
Undergraduates rated this 7.65, graduate students 7.79 and faculty 7.76; as a new question, there is no prior data for comparison.

Library as Place

LibQUAL+’s Library as Place questions ask users to rate how a library’s physical space serves their needs for study, learning and research, in both individual and group settings. Polk Library has made significant changes to the physical space since the previous LibQUAL+ survey, remodeling several areas of the building, most notably turning the old reference room into a modern study space re-named Polk 101. These efforts appear to have had a positive effect, as all three patron groups have generally improved perceptions regarding the Library as Place.

Students are the primary users of Polk Library’s study areas, so it comes as no surprise that they have the highest standards for that space. Undergraduates (6.51) and graduate students (6.02) have higher minimum service levels for that space than faculty (5.66); their desired service level is similarly higher (7.80 & 7.70 vs. 6.82).

On some of the more general questions about Polk Library’s physical space, undergraduates found the library’s comfortable and inviting location to be one of its strongest features. Faculty, however, had the highest service expectations here, and the largest gap with those perceptions, among Library as Place questions.

Undergraduates found the library to be a positive getaway for study, learning or research, and graduate students rated this as closest to desired expectations of all core questions, while faculty rated the getaway factor poorly.

On the other hand, both graduate students’ and faculty’s lowest score among all core questions was for library space that inspires study and learning; undergraduates agreed, finding this the largest gap below expectations for the library’s space. Some of the more specific questions below about aspects of the space may account for this variance.
General Use

Almost 22% of respondents who included written comments in their survey made some mention of the how they use the library. 50 of the 78 comments regarding use were positive. Negative ratings were indicated four times. The balance were neutral statements about how the user makes use of the library. Among the 78 comments, the keyword “study” or variants were used 37 times, “group” 11 times and “research” 4 times. Comments include:

I love going to the library to study. It is a place I can be by myself and get work done. It also give me a place to meet with friends to study and collect information for projects.

I really like the printer, computer and other electronic resources. I visit the library often for these tools and have never had to wait in line.

Polk is a very nice place to go and do group work

The library is uncomfortable at times, and is hard to find a quiet place to study.

I am an Honor's Program student so do a lot of independent research for classes and for investigating my thesis. Additionally I am an assistant to the Archaeology Department and use the scanners very regularly for one of my job assignments. I am very happy with the services here.

Ambiance, Noise & Quiet Space

In coding qualitative responses, [ambiance] refers to the environment and atmosphere in the library and was mentioned in 55 comments. Of these, 22 included positive statements and 23 negative. Ambiance involves many aspects of the library’s environment, but it was often the level of noise that individuals focused on. It is clear that many individuals find the library noisy. Ambiance was mentioned 17 times in comments coded as suggestions. Of these, 11 recommended increased access to quiet study spaces or better enforcement of the quiet rules already in effect. On this last note, no fewer than five individuals expressed the misunderstanding that the library’s floors are designated (by policy) to certain levels of quietness, with the most quiet floor being the 3rd Floor. Comments regarding ambiance include:

The library is a good place to study because it is more quiet than the other buildings on campus.

I love coming to the library. The vibe here makes it easier to study and makes it enjoyable to study.
I don’t like how the library is always so loud. It is hard to concentrate there.

3rd floor is not always an absolutely no talking floor which it should be.

The library staff needs to be aware of the noise level and try to control for the good of all students.

Having a more strict rule when it comes to where groups should be meeting to talk would lower the amount of noise that often make people unable to concentrate on their work, and eventually end up leaving.

Quiet space for individual activities was particularly important to graduate students, for whom it’s the highest priority (both minimum and desired expectations) for the library’s physical space; unfortunately they rated it poorly, both in raw perception and relative to its high priority. Faculty also scored it low, although that perception was still actually above their desired service level.

Group Study Space

Campus responses to the library’s group space present a challenge to interpretation. Among the most common student suggestions in the written comments was an increase in group study spaces; also popular was the sentiment that the library should continue its efforts to make more areas more comfortable as it had done in Polk 101 (and the Leisure Reading room), designed with group study in mind.

On the other hand, among quantitative perceptions of the library’s physical space, all three patron groups reported that community space for group learning and group study had the highest adequacy above their minimum expectations; those minimum (and desired) expectations were among the lowest for all three groups. Library staff may follow-up with particular audience groups to understand their group space needs in more detail. Nursing & Medical Technology majors were often ones reporting using the library to study (29.7% of the total of individuals indicating they study at the library).

Hours

Thirty-three of the comments concerned the operating [hours] of the library building; of these, two were rated positive, ten were negative and 21 contained neutral suggestions. All comments with the exception of the two positive ones suggested some desire for increased hours. Of these 31 comments, 10 came from Nursing Students.
Several comments asked for 24/7 open hours. Others were more specific, suggesting that increased weekend (the words Saturday, Sunday and Weekend were used 18 times) and interim hours (four times) were needed.

Two commenters suggested that the day before a semester begins would be a good time for the library to be open (in one case this was only to print syllabi).

**Security**

One local question asked respondents to rate Polk Library as a secure and safe place. All three user groups rated their perception of security, as well as both minimum and desired expectations for it, higher than for any of the core Library as Place questions.

**Also Noted**

Among the more frequent qualitative findings about the Library as Place, 11 people commented or suggested that they would appreciate another entrance to the library.

Eight individuals commented about the cleanliness of the library. Three of these comments were negative and three were positive. Four of the cleanliness comments included suggestions and all of these wanted the library to clean more, particularly the computers.

Another eight individuals made comments regarding aspects of the building that are not directly in Polk Library’s control. All were suggestions. The majority (five) concerned food service options in the building. All of these comments were forwarded to the appropriate individuals and departments, but a selection includes:

- I like that there is food options there, but it would be convenient if there was a microwave available 24/7
- Wish it had more vending machines available in the upper floors.
- It would be nice to have more available parking for students who don't have a parking pass, more meter
- I know this is not part of the library but there could be more comfy seats in the classrooms in the basement of Polk
Information Control

The survey’s eight questions on Information Control concern the availability of the information resources needed for the respondent’s work and the tools used to access them. Polk Library’s scholarly resources have changed dramatically since the 2004 survey, and even since 2008, as more content is provided electronically. Survey respondents’ perceptions regarding the availability and ease of use of these resources have gradually improved since 2004 and (for all but graduate students) since 2008. Faculty reported the highest overall perception, while undergraduates reported the lowest.

Faculty (8.16) expressed the highest overall desired service levels for information control, followed by graduate students (8.08) and undergraduates (7.71). The groups’ minimum requirements follow the same pattern.

Online Resources

[Online Content] was the issue most discussed in comments in the category of Information Control. 39 times respondents made some comment about electronic records available online. Of these, 8 were rated as negative, 8 positive, and 16 were neutral suggestions. The balance was typically made up of simple observations of the use of online content.

As in the quantitative data, individuals with more advanced needs were more apt to criticize the collection or make suggestions about improving the online collections. Of the 24 negative comments or neutral suggestions made, half were from faculty, staff or graduate students. Comments include:

*The access to online magazines seems to change so much and could be made easier to get the full text PDF. It’s very difficult.*
The "Films on Demand" is also a wonderful recent addition.

Love online resources that can be accessible offsite. Keep up the good work!

I am constantly using lower quality resources to revise these books. What I really need is a "pass" to use the UW Madison library resources. I'd be willing to pay to be a member if it were a modest cost.

Undergraduates were satisfied with the available resources; among information control questions, they rated the electronic information resources I need as their lowest priority (both minimum and desired expectations), as well as smallest gap below that desired level of service.

See below for specific results about e-books vs. print books.

Physical Resources

Comments were coded as relating to the [collection] whenever respondents mentioned physical (non internet-based) collections. Of the 23 comments coded in this way, six were positive, three were negative and nine were neutral suggestions. The balance was neutral declaration of use of these materials. Collection comments included:

I would like more children's/young adult books as I am an education major. Also, more special ed. resources.

Would like to see newer books in my field (leadership) available in print or e-book format.

Need more textbooks required for classes so that we don't have to buy them.

As an RTF major/ German minor, I love being able to find foreign language films.

Many videos are older and dated. I find Youtube has more relevant videos than does the library (Faculty)

Graduate students did have a negative perception of the printed library materials I need for my work, rating this perception lowest (and furthest from their desired expectations) among all core questions. Undergraduates disagreed, rating printed library materials highly, as well as the print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work.
Books: Print vs. e-books

UW System campuses conducting LibQUAL+ this year all included a new, custom question, asking respondents to please indicate your preference: from the library I want more ... electronic or print books, scoring on a scale from 1 (e-books) to 5 (print books). Among those indicating a preference (1, 2, 4 or 5), 61% of all respondents preferred e-books, as did majorities of each user group (although faculty showed the weakest majority with 53% for e-books). Among those indicating a strong preference (1 or 5), overall respondents again preferred e-books (63%), with faculty evenly split.

This preference was echoed in the qualitative suggestions; included among comments involving [Online Content], were seven individuals who specifically requested more ebooks. Three individuals suggested they preferred traditional sources over electronic versions (one commented on electronic journals and two on ebooks). One comment preferring print books stated:

*I love to have a physical copy of a book when I am conducting research. I find research to be easier if I can have all of my sources in front of me at once. With e-copies, you have to open/close tabs all the time.*

A voice for electronic format believed that:

*e-books would be very helpful for dyslexic students with text-to-speech software programs.*

Access to Information

Survey respondents scored highly their ability to independently access required information. Undergraduate perceptions of making information easily accessible for independent use were positive; for faculty, this presented the smallest gap below desired service levels among information control questions. Graduates’ smallest gap was on a similar question, easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own. Both faculty and graduate students both reported the greatest adequacy above minimums for making electronic resources accessible from home or office.

On the other hand, both undergraduates and faculty rated the primary means of this access, a library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own, poorly compared to expectations, with the least adequacy above minimum service levels (and largest gap below desired levels -- for faculty, this was tied as their most desired factor) of any Information Control question.
Two local questions dug further to assess the library’s tools for information access. Undergraduates and faculty both rated their perceptions of an online catalog that is user-friendly for finding materials lower than that of any core Information Control question.

On the second local question, all three respondent groups had lower minimum expectations for helpful online guides and tutorials than for any of the core information control questions; undergraduates and faculty similarly had lower desired expectations, and undergraduates rated their perceptions lower than any of those questions.

Computer Equipment

Undergraduates are the heaviest users of the computers and related digital tools at Polk Library, and among Information Control questions, undergrads had the highest perception of modern equipment that lets me access easily needed information. Graduate students, on the other hand, had a higher minimum expectation for equipment than any other aspect of information control, and the smallest adequacy above that minimum.

17 total comments were provided regarding [computer equipment & services]. Of these, four were positive, five were negative and 8 were suggestions. Among the suggestions, all but two asked for more computers. Three of the five negative comments also indicated the difficulty of finding a computer. Some of the comments include:

- The biggest disadvantage is that the library sometimes gets crowded and it is hard to find an open computer.
- I love that the computer lab ensures an open computer
- More computers situated like Polk 101, instead of normal computer lab setting
- RefWorks (which I find clunky!) esp to add info and have had trouble with it attaching to my paper (starts out OK but then detaches)
- Wifi better than last year, but would be nice if it was much faster.

Frequency of Use

Three LibQUAL+ questions ask respondents how frequently they use the library, online or in person, and how often they use the major internet search engines. Each question asked for a frequency answer ranging from “daily” to “never”.

In response to the question “How often do you use YahooTM, GoogleTM, or non-library gateways for information?”, reports of daily use grew steadily from 60% in 2004, to 66% (2008), to 75% (2014).

When asked how often do you use resources on library premises?, respondents showed a slight increase in use in 2014 vs 2004; 18% visiting daily (vs. 14%) and 44% weekly (was 45%). Respondents reported an equivalent decrease on how often do you access library resources through a library Web page?, with daily use steady at 12% and weekly use at 44% (down from 47%).

Affect of Service

LibQUAL+’s “Affect of Service” questions measure the interactions that library staff have with members of the university community. Overall, the perception of service has increased since past surveys across all three user groups.

Faculty’s overall perception of Affect of Service was far higher (+0.67) than the same opinion of undergraduates, with graduate students falling in between. Faculty similarly had the highest minimum and desired standards for service among the three groups, while undergraduates had
the lowest. All three groups, however, rated their overall Affect of Service perceptions higher than those for Information Control or Library as Place.

**Qualitative Responses**

With 100 comments, attitudes about [customer service] were the most common of all qualitative user feedback. 27% of all respondents mentioned customer service. Of their comments, 67 were rated positive and 26 negative. The balance included neutral suggestions.

All negative comments save two came from undergraduate students from all years. While in some cases it is certain that respondents are able distinguish student workers from staff, it is frequently unclear who they are referring to. Most negative comments refer to either a lack of access to staff (respondents cannot find someone to help them) or the library staff member’s perceived lack of courtesy. Several negative comments suggest that staff are unprepared to answer user questions; these are most often directed toward student workers.

Positive comments include:

*Anytime I have needed help finding materials or sources in the library the staff is always helpful, informed and enthusiastic. I love it!*  
*Everyone is hard at working creating the best environment for the students.*  
*front desk service is good!*  
*Great staff, always exceeding expectations, working to increase our access to information and decrease the time it takes.*  
*I really enjoy the ask librarian app*

Negative Comments Include:

*The only thing I think it could improve on is the staff, I have asks for help multiple times or just did simple tasks such as checking out book and most of the librarians I have encountered have been rude/grumpy towards me.*  
*However I think the staff could be better trained, they are often ignorant.*  
*The staff tend to be on Facebook more than attempting to answer my questions. I have stood at the desk for several minutes before someone takes the time to help me.*
I’ve just never been treated very nicely by any of the librarians. Whether that be at the circulation desk, or during a classroom session. There is a certain air about them, arrogance perhaps, that really pushes me away from using great services offered to their fullest extent.

Often the students at the help desks don’t know how to help.

Wish the student employees were better prepared for problems or questions.

Knowledge & Dependability

All three respondent groups rated highly their perception of employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions; for faculty, it was actually their highest perception among core questions. Graduate students also rated this closest to their their desired level of service of all Affect of Service questions, and similarly praised staff’s readiness to respond to users’ questions.

Faculty rated highly the staff’s dependability in handling users’ service problems, although undergraduates found this performance to be the least adequate in the category.

Undergraduates also had a poor perception of employees who instill confidence in users, with graduate students rating this their largest gap below the desired level of service for any Affect of Service question. Faculty, however, rated that confidence adequacy highest among these questions.

Finally, both faculty and graduate students rated employees who understand the needs of their users closest to their minimum expectations of any question in this category; for graduate students, this was their highest minimum expectation in the category. In contrast, undergraduates rated employees’ understanding of their own needs highly.

Attention & Courtesy

Faculty, graduate students and undergraduates all scored positively staff’s willingness to help users. Undergraduates rated this as their highest minimum expectation for service; they similarly praised employees who deal with users in a caring fashion.

Undergraduates’ highest desired expectation across all Affect of Service questions was for employees who are consistently courteous. Both undergraduates and faculty reported the largest gap here from their desired level of service.
Undergraduates rated library staff *giving users individual attention* lowest across all core questions in the survey. But because it was their lowest priority (minimum and desired expectations) among Affect of Service, it also resulted in the highest adequacy and smallest gap below desired expectations. Graduates similarly rated individual attention poorly, although as their lowest minimum expectation in the category it also had greatest adequacy above that minimum. Faculty reported a low desire for individual attention, with the smallest gap below that low priority.

**Information Literacy Instruction**

LibQUAL+ asks respondents how well the library’s services help them to distinguish trustworthy sources of information and to advance and be more efficient in their academic pursuits. The survey requests only a single score for these information literacy questions, not minimum or desired service levels. All three user groups report an overall improvement in perceptions of information literacy instruction since 2004; undergrads and graduate students also report an increase since 2008.

The highest information literacy rating among undergraduates and graduate students (and second-highest from faculty) is that *the library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work*. Undergraduates and graduates’ lowest score in this category (and faculty’s second-lowest) is that *the library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest*.

Faculty reported that the library most strongly *aids in my advancement in my academic discipline or work*, and scored lowest the perception that *the library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information*. They rated the one local information literacy question, the library’s performance in *teaching me how to access, evaluate, and use information*, higher than any of the standard information literacy questions.
Comments were coded as relating to [training] whenever aspects of Polk’s information literacy activities were mentioned, including formal classroom teaching or less formal training at a service desk. Of the 21 comments with this code 11 were positive, three were negative. Seven were neutral suggestions. Typical comments include:

*I feel like there needs to be a stronger emphasis in learning about finding more reliable sources of information and how to find what your (sic) looking for*

*If you were to offer a class on how to use the library's electronic resources, I would gladly attend*

*The "Library Research" days that we all have required for class work can get repetitive if you end up having more than one per semester. For example, I am a senior, graduating in May and have two sessions this semester (this is my 7th session in all). The same exact information is given to students in all sessions and I think it can lead to disconnect and almost an unwillingness to listen.*

*I was able to meet for a 1:1 on library use when I started my class. The librarian gave me over an hour of her time and met me at a time convenient for me. This was an amazing help!!!*

*I did have a library instruction there recently on finding peer reviewed articles that was very helpful. I also felt she took the time to let us know a library staff member would be more than willing to spend more time with us finding material if we needed it.*

**Appendix: Methodology**

**Surveying the Campus**

The LibQUAL+ survey is managed by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL); additional information is available at [http://www.libqual.org](http://www.libqual.org). The majority of respondents completed the survey online, hosted and secured on that website. The LibQUAL+ Procedures Manual[^1] includes additional information on data confidentiality and security.

Polk Library partnered with a recognized campus student group, the Dr. Julie Henderson Public Relations Student Society of America, to recruit student respondents in exchange for a donation to the group. Recruiters stood inside the lobby of Polk Library and directed volunteers to a

nearby terminal to take the online survey; students recruited this way were offered a candy bar to
take the survey.

Print surveys were offered in Polk Library; two respondents utilized this method.

Participant Groups

Most responses are analyzed separately among three major respondent participant groups, using LibQUAL+’s categorization:

- undergraduate students (n=866)
- graduate students (n=51)
- and faculty (n=55), which includes staff who identified themselves as “lecturer”, “adjunct
  faculty” or “other academic status”.

Non-instructional staff (including professional academic staff and university staff) were surveyed but not analyzed as a separate user group in this report due to the low number of responses. Library staff were asked not to participate in this survey.

Analyzing Results

Polk Library’s analysis of the survey results was informal, with the guidelines for notability described above but without formal measurement of statistical significance. Our primary purpose was to improve service to the campus community, so our analysis is designed to be more practical than scientific: low-frequency input may be useful, and even high-frequency requests may sometimes be intractable. That said, we pursued the IRB approval process in order to share results with larger audiences as appropriate, and further analysis of particular questions or audience subsets may be more robust.

Ted Mulvey and Craig Thomas performed the quantitative analysis using MS Excel and SPSS, reviewing the current data as well as identifying trends since previous LibQUAL+ surveys conducted by Polk Library. An explanation of the format of quantitative questions is above under Perceived, Minimum and Desired Service Levels. As described in that section, our determinations about highest and lowest scores were based on the 22 “core” questions standard to all LibQUAL+ institutions; these do not include “local” or “custom” questions. ChartGo.com was used to illustrate the quantitative data.

Joshua Ranger and Sara Stichert coded the qualitative comments with QDA Miner Lite, using a modified taxonomy originally created by Brown University in 2007 for its own LibQUAL+ survey analysis. They added several codes to this taxonomy to be more relevant to Polk Library. Often a comment is coded twice: once with its subject matter (from the first four categories) and then again with a rating of negative or positive if the comment was critical or positive respectively.
Suggestions were given a rating only if they included a critical or positive expression; a mere suggestion of a change or addition was not considered a negative.

Each team determined its notable findings separately, after which the group collaboratively reviewed the commonalities and differences between the quantitative and qualitative data.
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