2006 LibQUAL+ *Point of Service* Report

for

Engineering Library

Assessment Committee
http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/internal/assessment/index.htm
**Introduction**

The University Libraries Assessment Committee is providing these LibQUAL+ data to you as the Department Head of the Engineering Library. We hope that this information will be valuable to you in understanding users’ expectations and perceptions of the service provided by the Library. To put the data in context, we are providing it relative to the entire Libraries data, to average Association of Research Libraries (ARL) scores, and to both data sets by user group (undergraduate, graduate, and faculty). 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. LibQUAL+ data alone is not actionable intelligence; if it is to inform you decisions, it should merely be considered one piece in a larger assessment picture.

**Included LibQUAL+ Data**

The data represented in this report is drawn from Affect of Service (AS) questions. AS questions most closely correspond to a users’ expectations and perceptions of a library’s service in a “customer service” sense, and all the respondents including in the following data indicted their discipline was “engineering / computer science.” Therefore, as close as possible, this data is represents users’ expectations and perceptions of the Engineering Library’s service.

The data is an aggregate of responses to the following statements:

- **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

Obviously, not all of these statements measure your unit's service. There are any factors that contribute to a respondent’s perception of these statements. Some of them may be of more interest to you than others. If you would like response data for a single or several of these questions, please do not hesitate to contact any member of the Assessment Committee.
Results

LibQUAL+ data is unique in that 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, desired, and perceived 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 resulting “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 the service is from the optimal levels of service users desire. The larger (on the positive side) the gap number, the better. Generally, positive adequacy gaps are indicative of adequate service, negative adequacy gaps are indications of perceived inadequacy, and negative superiority gaps are common and can only be sought to be minimized.
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 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.

The following graphs are the same scored disaggregated by “user group” (undergraduate, graduate, and faculty respondents).
Comparison to UCB and ARL Averages by User Group

Note: U is the number of undergraduates, G is graduate students, and F is faculty.

Comparison to UCB and ARL Gaps by User Group

Note: U is the number of undergraduates, G is graduate students, and F is faculty.
Cautionary Notes to Analysis

Please note that there is no definitive way of ascertaining what library, or what service within a library, a respondent is evaluating in this data. Engineering students and faculty routinely use other libraries on campus. The Committee feels this is a very important note to LibQUAL+ analysis, especially in regards to AS. This data does allow you to see self-identified “engineering/computer science” users’ expectations and perceptions of library services, and we hope it is valuable in that regard.

What can be done with this data?

LibQUAL+ data is best considered as an assessment of what further assessment might be done. If you feel any aspects of the report are problematic, you might consider conducting more specific surveys, conversing with constituents, or reviewing internal procedures. If you feel aspects are indicative of positive service, you might consider using the data as promotional material. Either way, communicating these results back to the users could facilitate a valuable dialogue. The data may confirm your anecdotal beliefs, or it may lead you to new realizations of your unit’s service.

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 the Assessment Committee.

User Comments

This is a selection of user comments related to your library branch. The comments were either made by patrons that identified their discipline as “engineering/computer science,” or by patrons who were referring specifically to the Engineering library. However, not all comments may be referring specifically to your library. Portions of comments not relevant to your library have been omitted, and errors have not been corrected:

Faculty:
• I also was treated somewhat rudely by the librarian at the Engineering library. I had put one of my personal textbooks on reserve for my class, and I needed to use it, so I went to the circulation desk and asked for the book by giving her the course number. She remarked rather rudely that she needed the call number because that is how they are shelved and I should look it up online. Well, since it was my personal book, it should not have had a call number and it seemed like the referring to it by course number was the most appropriate thing to do. I guess what it really amounts to is that the libraries operate smoothly for people who
know how they operate, but there really isn't much help for people who are new to the university.

- Everyone needs to lobby hard for increased book and periodical acquisition budgets. What is done with limited resources right now is remarkable, but nowhere near what is needed.
- The staff in the Engineering Library have been extremely helpful and it greatly appreciated.
- The library is generally quite good, particularly because of electronic resources and Prospector & Interlibrary Loan. The library hours are too limited, however.
- The library staff are quite helpful and I believe that they do a lot with limited funds. I think that the libraries should be moving toward more electronic content and education of users in how to access this content.

Graduate Students:

- 1) Library shall provide electronic thesis
- 2) An engineering student/faculty group shall be formed which consists of experts doing research in different fields. These people shall be made to act as consultants for suggesting books to be made available in their respective research field. This would ensure that we have all required state-of the art material for someone pursuing research in any field.
- 3) Many students who do research in the same field are not really communicating with each other because they don’t have contacts. For instance, I was surprised to learn that many of the books I need for my research has been already checked out by other students whom I don’t know. Library shall enable me to know who they are and provide a means of communication among researchers of similar interests.
- 4) Our library is doing great! Thank you very much for the excellent facility. I am very thankful to all those who made this possible.

- The engineering library does not stock sufficient copies of the recommended text for high demand courses leading to very often recalls and short duration of check outs. It would be very helpful and convenient if there were multiple copies (3 or more) of the course textbook available for checkout during a semester. This is especially a problem for graduate level courses were there are multiple text required and only a single copy can be individually purchased.

- At my previous academic institution we had a book request service. So that I could request books from any library on campus to be delivered to any other library on campus. Having this service at CU would greatly speed research since I visit a branch library twice a week, but only go to Norlin when I am picking up books. Having clean restrooms is important. Some of the restrooms at Norlin were unacceptably dirty on nights and weekends. The restroom on Math first floor near the engineering library also needs better cleaning. The walls near the urinals are always stained at this location. Some attention could be paid to chairs in the study areas. Have more relaxing chairs and couches located near study tables to allow casual browsing of material. Many of the study tables have too few, too many, or many different types of chairs. Having a hodge podge of chairs makes for a cluttered study environment. Library staff / custodian should check tables daily to be sure chairs are in the right place. Things that are good and do
not need change: Many study tables with natural lighting or located near windows with beautiful campus/Colorado views. Access to many journals from home via VPN. Good ILL service.

- Library web should be upgraded for user friendly ways
- More flexible access to study rooms.
- The one thing that would improve the library the most for me is if the electronic journals went back farther in time. The ability to grab a pdf off the web and print it or read it on the computer is extremely beneficial. I know that Journals such as the Journal of Aerosol Science goes back farther than the library has access to.
- The engineering library does not stock sufficient copies of the recommended text for high demand courses leading to very often recalls and short duration of check outs. It would be very helpful and convenient if there were multiple copies (3 or more) of the course textbook available for checkout during a semester. This is especially a problem for graduate level courses where there are multiple text required and only a single copy can be individually purchased.
- Please keep up the good online journal subscriptions—I depend on hundreds of publications from various journals, largely in electronic form. Thanks for all your terrific work!
- I wish the library had more access to electronic journals. Most of the important journals I need and most libraries usually have aren't with CU. That's really bad for researchers.
- I LOVE the library!!! My only complaints are—
  1. You don't always have the journal subscriptions & books I need. Because of this, I wish I could keep interlibrary loan items longer.
  2. I wish Norlin was a nicer place to be, especially the main study room - it's dreary & dingy. But, I love the Engineering library and the Norlin Science stacks where I also spend a lot of time studying and working.

**Undergraduates:**

- The Engineering Library is nice but I have no idea how to find additional resources I might need in my studies. I generally turn to the internet since I don't know what's available through the library
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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?