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Introduction

The University Libraries Assessment Committee is providing these LibQUAL+ data tables to you as a bibliographer responsible for the art/architecture collection. We hope that this information will be valuable to you in understanding users’ expectations and perceptions of the collection. To put the data in context, we are providing it relative to the entire Libraries collection and the average for the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). This information is for informational purposes only. We do not intend to analyze the data, and will provide only cautionary notes to your own analysis of it.

What this report analyzes

The data represented in this report are the mean desired, perceived and minimum ratings for information control questions, as well as their gaps. Information Control (IC) questions most closely correspond to a users’ expectations and perceptions of a library’s collection, and all the respondents indicating in the following data indicated their discipline was “art/architecture.” Therefore, as close as possible, this data is represents users’ expectations and perceptions of the business collection. If you would like more information on some other notes on analysis please read “Cautionary Notes to Analysis.”

The data in the tables that follows are an aggregate of the following questions:

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

Obviously, not all of these services are directly under a bibliographer’s control. Some of these services have more to do with reference or instruction, and it is not possible to determine what the respondent is rating in many of these statements (e.g. what website is being considered in response to IC-2?). But the Committee feels an overall picture of how users’ perceive the Libraries’ ability to collect, organize, and provide access to a specific collection is a valuable place for a bibliographer to begin analyzing LibQUAL+’s data.

LibQUAL+ Results

LibQUAL+ data allows you to analyze users’ perceptions of service relative to their expectations of it. In three broad areas of library service—information control, library as place, and affect of service—respondents are asked to rate the minimum, perceived, and desired levels of service on a scale of 1-9.
**Minimum** is defined on the survey as “the number that represents the minimum level of service you would find acceptable.” **Perceived** is defined as “the number that represents the level of service that you believe the library currently provides.” **Desired** is defined as “the number of the service that you personally want.”

The “gaps” between the ratings allow you to see how far from adequate users perceive the service, and also how far from desirable. In other words, the difference between minimum
and perceived, the “adequacy gap,” is how adequate or inadequate the service is rated; and the difference between perceived and desired, the “superiority gap,” is how far from optimal levels of service users expect. The larger (on the positive side) the gap number, the better. In other words, a score of .5 is better then a score of -1.5.

Comparison to UCB and ARL Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adequacy Gap</th>
<th>Superiority Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARL (n=29,730)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/Arch (n=13)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB (n=542)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison to UCB and ARL Gaps by User Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>Superiority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB (n=542)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/Architecture (n=13)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL (n=29,730)</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U=125 G=225 F=126</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U=9 G=2 F=2</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U=11,071 G=10,314 F=6,096</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: U is the number of Undergraduates, G is Graduate Students, and F is Faculty.

Here is a non-library example to help you understand these numbers: Imagine you go to a restaurant and order a taco. You expect at the very least to receive a taco (this is your minimum score). Now you would really like to have a good taco, one with all your favorite toppings (this is your desired score). The taco that comes to the table has sour cream; your opinion of the taco before you is the perceived score. Now I like my tacos without sour cream, so I will perceive that my taco is less adequate, whereas you may be fond of sour cream and so view such a taco as superior. This example highlights one of the important features to keep in mind when examining this data: this is an examination of
user’s expectations and those can differ greatly from person to person. See the “Cautionary Notes to Analysis” section for more issues to consider when examining LibQUAL+ data.

The following two charts look simply at question IC-3 “The printed library materials I need for my work.” The variables retain the same definitions used above.

### Printed Library Materials Needed for Work
**By User Group (Scores)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Art/Arch (n=12)</th>
<th>U=8</th>
<th>G=2</th>
<th>F=2</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U=110</th>
<th>G=210</th>
<th>F=176</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U=1015</th>
<th>G=9541</th>
<th>F=5759</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: U is the number of Undergraduates, G is Graduate Students, and F is Faculty. Scale is 1-9.

### Printed Materials Needed for Work
**by User Group (Gaps)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Art/Arch (n=12)</th>
<th>U=8</th>
<th>G=2</th>
<th>F=2</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U=110</th>
<th>G=210</th>
<th>F=176</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U=1015</th>
<th>G=9541</th>
<th>F=5759</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad Gap</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup Gap</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: U is the number of Undergraduates, G is Graduate Students, and F is Faculty.
These are the charts looking simply at question IC-4 “The electronic information resources I need.” As mentioned before, if there are additional questions you would like for analysis, please do not hesitate to contact a member of the assessment committee.

Electronic Resources Needed for Work by User Group (Scores)

Electronic Resources Needed for Work by User Group (Gaps)

Note: U is the number of Undergraduates, G is Graduate Students, and F is Faculty. Scale is 1-9.
Cautionary Notes to Analysis

Please remember that this data is not an evaluation of the art/architecture collection and by no means is it an evaluation of your performance as a bibliographer. It is at best a summary of respondents’ expectations and perceptions of that collection. The Committee feels this is a very important note to LibQUAL+ analysis, especially in regards to IC. In most cases, a comparison of UCB collection to peer collections is very favorable to UCB. This data allows you to see your users’ expectations of the collection, and how well the collection meets those expectations.

A particular note to the Art/Architecture report is that it is the only report we completed with fewer than 20 respondents. The overall data is also influenced by an unusually undergraduate-heavy respondent pool, and one undergraduate’s particularly aberrant responses.

Comments

LibQUAL+ 2006 also provided respondents an opportunity to provide comments. The following are comments from users who indicated their discipline to be “art/architecture.” It is not always possible to determine what service the respondents are commenting on, but some of the following seem relevant to bibliography.

Undergraduates:

Let us access electronic databases from home without CU VPN.

I would like to the employees to be little more friendly. They seems to be either lazy or unsociable. I would like the library to be opened 24 hours ideally but at least later than midnight. I would like the library to provide carts or something like that since there is no close and free parking lots. Books are so heavy to carry. When I tried to use the electronical resourses via the web site, I got confused and lost. It's not easy for me.

a suggestion: better lighting in the study areas, and more comfortable seating in study areas.

More access to library resources online and more rooms for group and individual study would be helpful.

I honestly don't know where to go in Norlin (where are the offices?!!) to find someone to help me other than the checkout desk. Especially if you come in on the West side, there's not really anyone anywhere to help. E-reserve materials are often poorly copied with edges being cut off or background colors too dark to see the text. Not enough places to study, and chairs/couches are old, gross, and uncomfortable.
Graduates:

I never want to go to the library to study. It's terrible because I used to love studying at the library from my old school. I would spend hours there multiple times a week. Here, I hate walking in the building (Norlin). It's cluttered, feels like a maze—it's hard to navigate, smells musty, and the study booths and study area chairs are the dirtiest, most uncomfortable, uninviting things I've ever seen. The people I've conversed with are infomed, but it's often hard to find anyone when I need to ask a question. I don't want to walk all the way back to the reference desk. The web resources are improving and the off-campus access is wonderful, but can we get some more electronic full-text journals (especially for art/art history)?

my biggest complaint would be the hours of the library during class breaks and the cutting of funding for librarians so that it's hard to find someone at the research desk after 3pm.

Faculty:

I am generally impressed with the service and commitment of the staff at the library. Space is obviously the number one problem. Money—lack of it—is obviously the other problem.

Jennifer Parker is _great_. my feeling about staff help relates trouble I have had with routine things like books being checked in after I return them. Also, I have found putting readings online to be a great idea but a pain to carry out.

This survey is unbearable. But Jennifer, librarian in art/architecture, is great.

What can be done with this data?

LibQUAL+ data is best considered as an indicator of what further assessment might be done. If you feel any aspects of the report are problematic, you might consider conducting specific surveys, conversing with constituents, or reviewing some practices that pertain to those aspects. If you feel aspects are particularly positive, you might consider using the data as promotional material. Either way, communicating these results back to the users could create a valuable dialogue. The data may confirm your anecdotal beliefs, or it may lead you to new realizations of your users.

On the other hand, you might do nothing with it. LibQUAL+ data will increase in value over time, and future reports may bring more actionable data to light.

If you have any questions regarding LibQUAL+ whatsoever, please do not hesitate to contact a member of the Assessment Committee.
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Overview of LibQUAL+ Survey

Demographic Questions:

- User Group (also subgroups by year or status)
  Undergraduate, Graduate, Faculty
- Age (by range)
- Sex
- Discipline
- Locally customized discipline

Core Questions:

Affect of Service

- [AS-1] Employees who instill confidence in users
- [AS-2] Giving users individual attention
- [AS-3] Employees who are consistently courteous
- [AS-4] Readiness to respond to users’ questions
- [AS-5] Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions
- [AS-6] Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion
- [AS-7] Employees who understand the needs of their users
- [AS-8] Willingness to help users
- [AS-9] Dependability in handling users’ service problems

Information Control

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

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

Local Questions:

- Teaching me how to access, evaluate, and use information
- Librarians teaching me how to effectively use the electronically available databases, journals, and books
- A library environment that is hospitable and conducive to finding and using information
- Enabling me to find information myself 24 hours a day
- Facilitating self-directed research

General Satisfaction Questions:

- In general, I am satisfied with the way in which I am treated at the library.
- In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.
- How would you rate the overall quality of the service provided by the library?

Information Literacy Questions:

- The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest.
- The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline.
- The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits.
- The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.
- The library provides me with the information skills I need in my work or study.

Library Use Questions:

- How often do you use resources on library premises?
- How often do you access library resources through a library Web page?
- How often do you use Yahoo(TM), Google(TM), or non-library gateways for information?