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Introduction

The University Libraries Assessment Committee is providing these LibQUAL+ data to you as the Faculty Director of the Music 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 your 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 “Music.” Therefore, as close as possible, this data is represents users’ expectations and perceptions of the Music 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Point</th>
<th>Average AS Score</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Desired</th>
<th>Perceived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U=1 G=15 F=9</td>
<td>7.67 6.96 7.09</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U=126 G=223 F=186</td>
<td>5.90 5.90 6.26</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U=11,032 G=10,294 F=6,092</td>
<td>6.12 6.38 6.67</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Desired: 8.44 8.32 8.04 7.64 7.49 7.62 7.68 7.83 7.96
- Perceived: 9.00 7.41 7.12 6.69 6.65 6.74 6.90 7.09 7.26

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

### Comparison to UCB and ARL Gaps by User Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Point</th>
<th>Gap</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>Superiority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U=1 G=15 F=9</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U=126 G=223 F=186</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U=11,032 G=10,294 F=6,092</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Students and faculty routinely use several libraries on campus. The Committee feels this is a very important note to LibQUAL+ analysis, especially in regards to AS.

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 made by patrons who were referring specifically to the Music library or by patrons that identified their discipline as “Music.” Portions of comments not relevant to your library have been omitted, and all errors have not been corrected:

Faculty:
- Library staff in the music library are extremely helpful. Student employees generally OK, usually not very knowledgeable. Library environment a bit noisy. The collection itself is OK, not great in terms of holdings or periodicals.
- I generally find the regular Music Library staff extremely helpful and courteous.
- Too many issues/volumes of important journals are being stored off-campus; I believe there needs to be some re-evaluation of the current policy and process. Faculty and student research is being stymied while critical issues/volumes are obtained.
- Please add music to the JSTOR service (invaluable and would save everyone money in the long run)
Graduate Students:

- Overall, the Music Library is very good. The stacks are always neatly organized and the staff are very helpful. They are very good at enforcing the no food or drink policy. However, the amount of noise in the Music Library is completely unacceptable. Often, it is so loud in there that I cannot study and the librarians NEVER control this. The source of distracting noises ranges anywhere from loud patrons, cell phones, and crying babies. I would like to see the Music Library raise its standards regarding noise control to the same level as Norlin. I also think that young children and pets should not be allowed in any of the libraries.
- Since periodicals are nearly all electronic now, my frustration is that many of the online listings are not current. It must take a while (sometimes a long while) for them to get posted, as I can't access articles until they've been out in print for a while. This creates problems in trying to do research that involves recent scholarly work.
- Very efficient, updated and resourceful!
- The music library facilities are not as comfortable as they could (and should) be. There is very little opportunity for group work without disturbing the rest of the students in the library - which is what happens most of the time.
- Sometimes the Music Library isn't very quiet.
- Generally, the library services are very good!
- My particular discipline in music is Jazz Studies. I have found that the Music Library, extensive as it is in some areas, is lacking in the modern scholarly material on jazz music. It has a fairly good collection of jazz pedagogy materials, however, I would love to have access to more books on jazz theory, history, biographies, etc.
- Staff is wonderful, resources are good and always improving. It would be very helpful to have a few keyboards with earphones to be able to play through music without checking it out.
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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?