LibQUAL+® 2013
University of Guelph – McLaughlin Library
Analysis of the ARL standardized satisfaction survey of library services.
Executive Summary

LibQUAL+® is the standardized survey developed and administered by researchers at Texas A&M University in partnership with ARL. The survey is intended to specifically address library service quality and user satisfaction. Guelph utilizes LibQUAL+® as one of a number of measures to assess service quality, and participates as part of a Canadian Consortium of universities and colleges. The LibQUAL+® survey was made available during the month of February 2013 to all University of Guelph undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty and staff. Overall, 2,490 participated in the survey for a response rate of 10%. This level of response is consistent with the 2010 LibQUAL+® survey.

The survey focuses on and assesses three main themes:

- Affect of Service,
- Information Control, and
- Library as a Place.

Affect of Service measures specific elements related to the interpersonal aspect of service quality such as the general helpfulness and competency of staff and user-staff interactions. Information Control measures users’ perceptions regarding the ability to navigate, locate and access required information through the library in their preferred format. Library as a Place assesses user satisfaction with the physical environment of the library including areas for individual study, group work, and the effect of the library as an inspiration to academic achievement. Each specific item within each is rated along three dimensions of service quality using a nine-point subjective rating scale: the minimum expected level of service, the perceived level of service received and the desired level of service. From these scores, two gap scores (difference scores) were calculated: adequacy gap and superiority gap. The adequacy gap score can be interpreted as the extent to which we are meeting or exceeding the minimum expectations of our users. The superiority gap score can be conceptualized as an indicator of the extent to which we are approaching or exceeding the desired expectations of our users.

The results were broken down primarily by role (undergraduate, graduate, faculty). College-differences were examined when important trends are detected. In order to discern the areas of highest dissatisfaction, adequacy gap scores (related to minimum expectations) are ranked to find the top five lowest scoring items (dissatisfaction) and the top two highest scoring items (satisfaction).

In general, undergraduates were most dissatisfied with items within the Library as a Place theme related to study space, whereas graduate students and faculty were most dissatisfied with items within the Information Control theme such as access to electronic collections and the search functionality and interface of the website. The following is a summary of the top dissatisfaction and satisfaction items across roles.

Top 5 Dissatisfaction

Undergraduate Students
1. Library space that inspires study and learning.
2. Quiet space for individual activities.
3. Community space for group learning.
4. A getaway for study learning or research
5. Ability to navigate library web pages.

Graduate Students
1. Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office.
2. Ability to navigate library web pages.
3. Quiet space for individual activities
4. Print and/or electronic collections.
5. A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own.

Faculty
1. Ability to navigate library Web pages easily.
2. A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own
3. Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own
4. Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office
5. Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work

Top 2 Satisfaction

Undergraduate Students
1. Readiness to respond to users questions
2. Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions

Graduate Students
1. Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion
2. Readiness to respond to users questions

Faculty
1. Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion
2. Employees who are consistently courteous

Expectedly, items from the Affect of Service theme appeared in the top two areas of satisfaction for these three roles. This demonstrates recurrent consensus over the years of LibQUAL+® assessments that the interpersonal aspect of help is a recognized strength by Library users. As was found in 2010, the faculty were satisfied with the Library’s group space, yet study space issues were again items of high dissatisfaction for undergraduates. However, it should be noted for faculty, that the provision of group space was afforded low minimum and desired mean scores, indicating a low importance for this dimension of service with faculty, thus inflating their seeming satisfaction with the group space. This was consistent with 2010 scores and patterns.

The survey also addresses levels of general Library satisfaction, outcomes specific to information literacy programming and frequency of use. All roles rated the General Satisfaction items uniformly positive. Satisfaction scores for the overall quality of service of less than the mid-point of five (on the
nine point scale) spanned between 7% for undergrads to 10% for graduate students. Only 8% of faculty suggested they were dissatisfied with library services overall. Dissatisfaction levels were highest for the perceived overall support for learning, research or teaching needs. These levels ranged between 12% for undergraduate and 18% for graduate students, and indicate a very strong feeling of general satisfaction with programming and support.

Outcomes for the information literacy themed questions were also rated generally positively by all roles with strong majorities acknowledging the positive role Library programming has in these outcomes. However, certain attributes, such as the extent to which the Library helps users to distinguish between trustworthy/untrustworthy information, and assisting the user in staying abreast to developments in their respective field of study were rated lower by certain roles. These findings have been a consistent finding across LibQUAL+® surveys over time and location. It is probable that the development of these skills for faculty and many graduate students is well established and internal, likely developed prior to their arrival at Guelph and not attributable to the Library. It is also possible that faculty and graduate students do not view these activities as a responsibility of the Library.

In regards to frequency of use of Library resources, a strong majority (64%) of undergraduates indicated they use Library facilities daily or weekly, whereas graduate students (62%) were most likely to use the Library facilities on a weekly to monthly basis. The highest proportion of faculty indicated use of the physical library on a quarterly basis (39%). Graduate students (42%) and faculty (39%) were more likely to access the library resources through the website daily, whereas undergraduates (51%) reported weekly as their most frequent use of the virtual library. The majority of all roles noted that they used non-library gateways (Google, Yahoo) daily.

Overall, and as has been found in the past two LibQUAL+® iterations, the most persistent themes coming through as needing particular attention were increasing the availability of Library workspaces for students and improving the functionality of the virtual face of the Library. Lastly, and to their considerable credit, Library staff, through the provision of interpersonal services and programming continues to be viewed and valued highly across all roles and colleges.
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Introduction

The role of Library users in providing focused feedback and assisting or guiding efforts in both priority setting and continuing improvement is paramount. Collecting such feedback from users enables the Library to determine the extent to which certain user-centered outcomes are in line with the Library’s service goals and strategic direction. Regular feedback also enables individual programs or initiatives to get a sense of programming efficacy or relative impact of change when compared over time. In addition, since over the past three years the library has experienced a period of change and has adopted to a new service model, it is important to evaluate the impact of these changes on user satisfaction. Most importantly, it is crucial that assessments are based on empirically sound and rigorous research methods in order to minimize potential bias while assessing success. For these reasons, the Library has adopted the use of LibQUAL+® as one of a number of measures to assess service quality.

LibQUAL+® is a standardized survey developed by researchers at Texas A&M University (in partnership with ARL) to specifically address library service quality. The survey addresses three main dimensions or themes for library services: Affect of Service (interpersonal user service), Information Control (related to resources and access tools), and Library as a Place (physical aspects of the library). LibQUAL+® uses a unique combination of subjective rating scales to assess user satisfaction by assessing not only the user’s perceived level of service performance, but also their minimum level of expected service and desired level of service. Using various analytical techniques the survey scales helps to gauge or determine where current service delivery stands in relation to user expectations for service and their priorities or needs.

The following report will outline the method used to collect data and will describe the measures within the LibQUAL+® survey. This is followed by a results section outlining a number of the key findings. Since there are details and analyses not covered in this report, additional data or analyses may be requested from the Evaluation and Analysis office.

Method

Procedure

During the month of February 2013, access to the LibQUAL+® survey was made available through links on the Library home web page to University of Guelph undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty and staff. In total, 2,611 respondents filled out surveys. Notice and invitation to potential respondents was accomplished through a number of methods including mass email, targeted distributed communications to student and staff groups, social media (Twitter and Facebook) and prominent advertising on the Library’s website home page.

Prospective participants linking to the URL provided first reviewed a consent form and if they agreed to the conditions could then proceed to the 45 item LibQUAL+® online survey. The survey site is administered by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) on internet servers located in the United States. Upon completion of the survey, participants were invited to provide an email address to be
entered in a draw for a chance to win a gift card in the amount of either $200 (grand prize) or $50 (4 runners up prizes). A list of 50 randomly selected email addresses was provided by ARL to identify prize winners. The first five email addresses from this list were used to assign the prizes.

This study was reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board at the University of Guelph.

It should be noted that LibQUAL+® currently offers two versions of its survey; 1) the full version containing 22 core questions, and 2) a “lite” version which asks respondents to answer three core questions – one from each dimension, plus one randomly selected question from the remaining core questions. Guelph, due to our use of novel comparisons to explore gaps in service, opted to use the full version only.

**Recruitment**

The method of recruiting for 2013 LibQUAL+® survey was similar to 2010 LibQUAL+®, but differed substantially from the 2007 version. Due to the University policy on mass email only one email could be utilized. In contrast to the 2007 survey that sent invitations to a randomly sampled undergraduate and graduate student cohort, the 2010 and 2013 surveys posted an open invitation to participate to the entire University population on the Library home web page. One mass email was sent to all Guelph campus addresses. The non-random assignment of subjects possibly creates a bias in that Library website users were more likely to view the invitation on the home page than non-users. However, this possible bias may have resulted in a higher proportion of informed users providing more valuable feedback.

**Measures**

LibQUAL+® is as 45-item survey. Twenty-two (22) of these items are mandatory or standard items related to service quality, which means that they cannot be altered. In addition to these mandatory items, sites may also choose up to five additional questions from a list of approximately 100 extra items referred to as local items. The local questions used at Guelph were determined through consultation and discussion with the Evaluation and Assessment Team and Library Management Team and represented either issues of particular interest or the item had been asked in previous iterations of LibQUAL+® and was of interest for longitudinal tracking. All questions in LibQUAL+® have been determined to be valid and reliable according to standard assessment processes.

LibQUAL+® includes three themes or dimensions of service quality: **Affect of Service**, **Information Control**, and **Library as a Place**. LibQUAL+® also includes five other areas of assessment items: **Outcomes**, **Frequency of Use**, **General Satisfaction**, **Demographics** and an optional open field for ad hoc comments.

**Affect of Service.**

Affect of Service is comprised of nine standard and two local items. This dimension relates to the human or interpersonal aspect of service quality such as the general helpfulness and competency of staff and user-staff interactions. An example item is, “Giving users individual attention.” The local items chosen were, “Availability of assistance to improve my research skills” and “Making me aware of library
resources and services.” The first local question had not been used in previous Guelph LibQUAL+® surveys but corresponded closely with the goals of specific Library programming. The second local question had been asked in the 2007 survey and was considered important feedback for communications and outreach activities.

**Information Control.**

Information Control is comprised of eight items and three local items. This dimension relates to users’ ability to independently locate and access required information in the library in their preferred format. These items ask respondents to reflect on the library website, printed and electronic materials and off-campus access. An example item is, “Print and/or electronic journal collections I need for my work.” The chosen local items were: “Ability to navigate library web pages easily,” “Access to rare and historical items,” and “Helpful online guides and tutorials.” These particular local items were considered to be of particular relevance to current and future Library service initiatives or issues. The first two local items on this list had been asked on previous versions and were, therefore, of particular interest for longitudinal tracking. The third item was relevant to a new product initiative for students.

**Library as Place.**

Library as a Place is comprised of 5 items. No local item for this domain was chosen. The Library as Place dimension deals with the physical environment of the library such as a place for individual study, group work, and inspiration. An example item is, “A getaway for study, learning, or research.” The local item, “A secure and safe place,” that had been asked in previous iterations of LibQUAL+® was deemed not to be as high a priority in the 2013 version in view of other areas of need for feedback.

**Outcomes.**

The LibQUAL+® instrument includes five items allocated to assess personal academic outcomes associated with the library. An example item is, “The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s) of interest.”

**Frequency of Use.**

LibQUAL+® also assesses three items that measure users’ general library usage patterns. The questions cover use of the physical library, online services, as well as their usage of non-library search websites to perform search tasks.

**General Satisfaction.**

LibQUAL+® asks three items addressing users’ general satisfaction with the library. An example item is, “In general, I am satisfied with library support for my learning, research, and/or teaching needs.”

**Demographics.**

Demographic items include age, sex, campus, discipline, and role (undergraduate, graduate student, faculty, staff, etc.). In general, the demographics are used to determine whether or not the
respondent profile is similar to the University of Guelph population. The relevance for these data is that the more similar the respondent profile is to the University population the stronger the argument that survey results can be considered generalizable and, therefore, applicable to the entire campus.

Open-ended Comment.

Finally, the survey provides an open-ended comment field that enables participants to enter any additional comments they wish to express about library.

Scoring

Each question in the three core themed areas or dimensions of service sections requires a response to three scales; a minimum, perceived and desired scale and score. In other words, for each question (e.g., “the electronic information I need”) the participant is asked to rate:

a) their minimum expectation for service,
b) their desired expectation for that aspect of service,
c) their perceived level of service for that item.

For each of these scales respondents apply a 9-point Likert-type subjective rating score between 1 and 9 using whole numbers. The only anchors or subjective definitions for the scale values provided are for the poles of the scales, such that 1 is defined as “low” and 9 is “high.” Respondents may also indicate that the question does not apply by checking an “NA” box.

From each respondent’s responses to the minimum, desired and perceived scale scores, two gap scores (difference scores) are calculated: adequacy gap and the superiority gap. These gap scores are whole numbers and can range from -8 through +8. However, since the original scales are based on subjective opinions, it is may be fallacious to view these scales as continuous scale variables. To that end, we have grouped areas within these distributions to define perceived attitudes.

The adequacy gap score is the perceived level of service minus the minimum level of service. Within an adequacy gap distribution we have defined three areas:

1. Perceived is below minimum (Adequacy Gap Score is between -8 and -1)
2. Perceived equals minimum (Adequacy Gap Score equals 0)
3. Perceived is greater than minimum (Adequacy Gap Score is between +1 and +8)

A positive score (≥ 0) indicates that the person’s perceived level of service meets or is greater than their minimum expectation, and a negative score (≤ -1) indicates that the person’s perceived level of service is less than their minimum expectation. The adequacy gap score can be conceptualized and interpreted as the extent to which the Library is meeting the minimum expectations of its users.

The superiority gap score is the value calculated when the respondent’s perceived level of service is subtracted from their desired level of service. We have defined four regions within this distribution:
1. Perceived is well below desired (Superiority Gap Score is between -8 and -2)
2. Perceived is just below desired (Superiority Gap Score equals -1)
3. Perceived equals desired (Superiority Gap Score is between equals 0)
4. Perceived is greater than desired (Superiority Gap Score is between +1 and +8)

The area defined as well below desired (< -2) is considered to be a negative result. The areas and scores where perceived is close to, meets or exceeds desired (≥ -1) are considered a positive result. The superiority gap score can be conceptualized as an indicator of the extent to which we are approaching or exceeding the desired expectations of users.

In the results sections we have provided a number of proportions to characterize areas within each of the gap score distributions. In taking a continuous improvement approach in examining these data, two important proportions examined are the percentage of participants whose perceived score fell below their minimum or desired expectation. For the adequacy measure we contrast the percentage of participants whose perceived level of service was less than their minimum level of service (< -1) versus those that met or exceed minimum expectations. For the superiority measure we contrast the percentage of participants whose perceived level of service was 1 point less than their desired level of service or above versus the percentage of participants whose perceived level of service was 2 or more points below their desired level of service.

Scoring for the Outcome and General Satisfaction areas utilized a single 9-point Likert-type scale. The anchor definitions asked respondents the degree to which they agreed with the statements (strongly disagree → strongly agree). Frequency of Use questions asked respondents to categorize their patterns of use as daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly or never.

The open-ended responses were open-coded to characterize common themes. A number of themes were noted (e.g., library space, website, material access, services, etc.) and the content was then coded within these themes and categorized as having positive, negative affect or as a suggestion for improvement.

**Results & Discussion**

**Participants and Representativeness**

On Guelph’s main campus, 24,276 student and faculty were eligible to participate in the LibQUAL+® survey. In total, 2,611 LibQUAL+® surveys were submitted by Guelph-affiliated students, faculty and staff. Of the surveys submitted, 2,490 were deemed complete or valid and usable. Although this represents only a 10.3% response rate, this value appears to be within the normative range for electronic surveys. The usual effective methods to enhance response rates through reminder messages were not available due to University policies. The respondent breakdown by sex indicated that 1,743 were female and 747 were male, reflecting the larger proportion of females (70%) in the respondent pool than the University population (59%). For age, 89% of respondents were between the ages of 18 and 30, reflecting a high response from undergraduate and graduate student ranks cohorts. Due to
substantially different recruitment methodology and sampling processes, comparisons to the 2007 survey are not appropriate.

By Role
In total, 1,932 undergraduate students responded to LibQUAL+® 2013. This represents 9.4% of the undergraduate population and is consistent with proportions seen in 2010 (also 9.4%) although it represents an increase in respondents by approximately 250. All years of study were well represented and quite evenly distributed. Fourth year and above students respondents are slightly over-represented compared to their proportions in the population. By contrast, third year students are slightly under-represented. First and Second year students had a less than 2% difference between their population and respondent proportions. The undergraduate population did not have any notable size differences, making the responses representative across the range of student experiences.

There were 342 Graduate student respondents, which represents a 13.0% response rate and was an increase compared to the 2010 rate of 12.4%. Unfortunately, we experienced a further decline in faculty participation to 7.0% (88) from 10.3% (117) seen in 2010 and 12.6% (136) in 2007. The proportion between Masters and PhD student respondents was approximately a 60:40 ratio, respectively. For the campus population, the Masters: PhD ratio is 66:34, which suggests a small over-representation of PhD students.

We are unable to track Staff response rates due to difficulties in characterizing the University population from HR records.

College and Discipline
The participation rates for each college were (in order from highest to lowest) 13.6% of CBS participated, 12.1% of OVC, 10.5% of OAC, 9.1% of COA, 8.7% of CSAHS, 8.0% of CPES and 6.4% of CME. This represents a more even rate of participation compared to 2010. COA, CME, CPES and CSAHS all showed higher rated compared to 2010 and the other colleges maintained their rates above 10%, (2010: 14.6% of OVC, 12.3% of OAC, 11.8% of CBS, 7.7% of CPES, 7.4% of CSAHS, 5.5% CME, and 3.3% of COA). Future surveys should continue to examine marketing processes to improve response rates with traditionally low-response rate colleges and thereby improve representativeness.

Table 1 provides the respondent representation by college and discipline. The final column indicates the differences between the population proportion by discipline and LibQUAL+® 2013 respondent population by discipline. A negative value suggests an over-representative sample and a positive value suggests an under-representative sample for the respective discipline.
Table 1. Participant Representation by College and Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
<th>Population %</th>
<th>Respondent (n)</th>
<th>Respondent %</th>
<th>%N - %n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Biological Sciences (except Environ Biol)</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BioMedical Sciences, Toxicol, Biochem</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAC</td>
<td>Environmental Sci, Land Use Sci</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Arch, Rural Development</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food, Agric and Resource Economics</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plant Sci, Animal Sci, Food Sci</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPES</td>
<td>Chemistry, Physics, Math and Stats</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering, Computing Science</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVC</td>
<td>Veterinary Sciences (all)</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CME</td>
<td>Business, Management, Economics</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAHS</td>
<td>Family Relations, Applied Nutrition</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography, Political Science</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psych, Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intl Dev, Crim Justice, Public Mgmt</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>English, Theatre, Lang &amp; Lit</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Art, Music</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History, Philosophy</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor Arts and Sci degree</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24,276</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,490</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: For the “%N - %n” column, a negative difference suggests an over-representation of the respondent population compared to the campus population proportions. A positive difference suggests an under-representation.

When the table 1 values are aggregated by college, (table 2), we see a slight dampening of over-representativeness. In all, given the sampling processes necessitated by the recruitment and reminder contact limitations, the results can be considered largely representative.

1 The designation of these disciplines represents the continuation of an undertaking from the 2007 LibQUAL+® survey to identify, characterize and group the methodological differences within each college with regard to the methods by which they perform research.
Table 2. Participant Representation by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
<th>Population %</th>
<th>Respondents (n)</th>
<th>Respondents %</th>
<th>%N - %n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>4,885</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAC</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPES</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVC</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CME</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAHS</td>
<td>5,642</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>3,509</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,276</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review by Dimension of Service Theme

There are many ways in which the responses to this survey can be dissected and viewed. The view that provides the most insights is likely that of role. The functions and demands of the Library for each role on campus vary according to needs. For the purposes of this report we have limited ourselves to examining the responses according to three groupings: Undergraduate students, Graduate students and Faculty / Staff. Each represents a distinct cohort and corresponds to different areas on the continuum of development and service expectations from novice to expert.

For each cohort, the results will describe the areas of highest relative dissatisfaction from the core questions of LibQUAL+® survey. Theme based results from comments, as appropriate, will be provided that may help to refine the understanding or interpretations. In addition, the Outcome, General Satisfaction and Frequency of Use responses will be reviewed.

At the end of this report is series of appendices chapters. These include a variety of views for each survey response item.

LibQUAL+® Results by Role

As noted earlier, it is our experience that examination of LibQUAL+® results by role has been the most valuable of the analyses. However, the inter-college comparisons often provide some context to the interpretation. The college level of analysis has been provided, and is commented upon where warranted. Added care should be given to interpretations based on small number of responses or respondent groups. The Staff role has been grouped with Faculty for the role analyses since many of library use tasks and skills associated with Faculty, such as literature review and knowledge acquisition at higher levels are similar to Staff needs and uses.
In the following sections, for each role, the dissatisfaction levels as expressed by the proportion of perceived service levels falling below minimum expectations for service (negative adequacy). Only the top 5 aspects are discussed. It should be noted again that the distribution of the respondents by college and discipline was roughly comparable to the actual population breakdown by college, which suggests that the responses will be reasonably representative. However, care should be taken in that larger colleges may mask the recognition of smaller college needs.

Undergraduate Students

Undergraduate students represent the largest population on campus and therefore comprised the largest cohort for the 2013 LibQUAL+® survey.

Of the five aspects of the Library for which undergraduates expressed the highest levels of dissatisfaction, four were related to the Library as Place theme and two were related to Information Control (both tied for fifth). The term dissatisfaction we operationally define as the individual’s perceived level of service falling below that of their minimum acceptable level of service. LibQUAL+® defines the relationship between these two scales and scores as the Adequacy gap.

- 1. Library space that inspires study and learning.
  - Moderate dissatisfaction such that a little more than one third (37%) said Library didn’t meet their minimum expectations for service
  - CME and CSAHS were the most dissatisfied at .44% and 41% respectively
  - Likely related to chronic lack of space
  - Similar relative ranking and levels of dissatisfaction as 2007 (31%, 3rd) and 2010 (34%, 2nd), but increasing levels of undergraduate dissatisfaction over time.

- 2. Quiet space for individual activities
  - Moderate levels of dissatisfaction - clustering at rates of about 35% dissatisfied that are also seen to be increasing over time compared to both 2007 (32%) and 2010 (32%)
  - Differences seen between colleges
    - OVC (41%), CME (39%) and CSAHS (39%) had highest rates,
    - ARTS and OAC had lowest rates of dissatisfaction at 28%
  - Comment included both quality and quantity of quiet space issues
    - Maintenance of the carrels to fix or provide light and power (18 comments)
    - Enforcement of the quiet rules (22 comments)
    - Provide more quiet space (78 comments, 9% of commenters)

- 3. Community space for group learning
  - Moderate dissatisfaction levels at 34%
    - Similar to rates seen in 2010 (35%) and higher than seen in 2007 (25%)
  - CME most dissatisfied with group-work space (44%)
    - Comments suggest CME do more group work and requires more group space
    - Also some dissatisfaction for and CSAHS (39%).
  - An issue for design/configuration.
    - Where have there been curriculum changes that require group-work?
    - NESSE recommends more group-work to mimic workplace demands.
However, the library is meeting the group space needs of the majority (66%) of undergrads.

4. A getaway for study, learning or research
   - While only 25% indicated they were dissatisfied, it has increased marginally compared to previous years (23% in 2007 and 22% in 2010).
   - Highest dissatisfaction in COA and CSAHS (28% each) and lowest in CPES (17%).
   - Signifies a level of general dissatisfaction in the availability of space.

5. The ability to navigate library web pages easily
   - Overall, the level of dissatisfaction was moderate at 24%.
   - Highest in OVC (35%) and COA (31%).
   - Lowest in CME (19%).
   - No discipline specific pattern within or between sciences and humanities or arts.

5. Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for may work
   - Also moderate levels of undergrad dissatisfaction with available resources (24%).
   - Highest in OVC (38%) and COA (31%).
   - Lowest in OAC and CME at 19% each.
   - OVC attitude to information availability may still be affected by the OVC Library closure.

It is important to note that we did not reach a majority of undergraduate respondents indicating dissatisfaction for any item in the list of core questions. Although these items are designated as having the highest levels of dissatisfaction, whether or not they warrant or require intervention or can be improved upon is a question best reviewed and determined by Library management and staff responsible for specific services. It is hoped that all aspects of the LibQUAL+® data will be reviewed and related to specific activities and outcomes from the logic models developed to effect the kind of continuous improvement and evidence-based change processes the library are seeking to develop.

By contrast, we define satisfaction as the individual’s perceived level of service being close to (1 scale score below), equal to or exceeding the respondent’s desired levels of service. The relationship between the perceived and desired levels of service is referred to by LibQUAL+® as the Superiority gap. The areas of highest satisfaction again fall in the Affect of Service domain, that include the services associated with user and Library staff personal interaction. These LibQUAL+® questions are generic in their definitions and cannot be linked specifically to activities. As such, they may likely include the range of programmatic interactions including any Learning Commons initiatives, embedded programming as well as more ad hoc interactions such as the Ask Us desk. Affect of Service items and attributes were also cited as the areas where the Library provides service levels closest to undergraduate students’ desires. The item cited as being in the top two (closest to desired) for this primary Library user group were:

1) Readiness to respond to users questions
   - 82% indicated services close to, meeting or exceeding desired
Stable and low levels of dissatisfaction (not meeting minimum) with this item across time (14%-15%)
- Highest levels of dissatisfaction for OVC (25%)
- Lowest among CPES (7%)

- 2) Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions
  - 81% felt the services were at levels approximating their desires
  - A high mean minimum value of 6.5 signifying a high expectation for service
  - No college-level difference in perception
  - Decreasing levels of dissatisfaction for this variable over time (18% in 2007, 17% in 2010 and 15% in 2013)

- 2) Willingness to help users
  - Overall, 81% also felt that perceived service levels approached desires
  - CPES (9%) noted the lowest levels of dissatisfaction (not meeting minimum) for this item, but there was not much variability between colleges or disciplines
  - Levels of dissatisfaction have declined over time from a high of 16% in 2007 to the present 14%.

All core items are listed with respect to their adequacy categories in the figures below. Please see below for accompanying table comparing the levels of dissatisfaction for LibQUAL+® for the past three surveys. The preferential trend is designated by a decreasing level of dissatisfaction (green arrow).

Table 3. Core question Affect of Service domain undergraduate dissatisfaction trends over time.

( % of population expressing that their perceived level of service delivery was below their minimum expectations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect of Service</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees who instill confidence in users.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving users individual attention.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>↑ ∧</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who are consistently courteous.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>↑ ∧</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to respond to users' questions.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who understand the needs of their users.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>↑ ∧</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to help users.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability in handling users' service problems.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making me aware of library resources and services.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving library-use skills as a by-product of seeking assistance from library staff.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching me how to access evaluate and use information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4. Core question Information Control domain undergraduate dissatisfaction trends over time.

(\% of population expressing that their perceived level of service delivery was below their minimum expectations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>Perceived did not meet minimum (≤ -1)</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office.</td>
<td>23% 28% 20%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own.</td>
<td>31% 26% 21%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The printed library materials I need for my work.</td>
<td>24% 20% 16%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The electronic information resources I need.</td>
<td>21% 23% 20%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information.</td>
<td>24% 16% 19%</td>
<td>↑↓ ↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own.</td>
<td>18% 22% 20%</td>
<td>↑↓ ↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making information easily accessible for independent use.</td>
<td>24% 20% 17%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work.</td>
<td>23% 29% 24%</td>
<td>↑↑ ↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to navigate library Web pages easily.</td>
<td>22% 25% 24%</td>
<td>↑↑ ↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online course support (readings, links, references).</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to rare and historical materials</td>
<td>15% 12%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease and timeliness in getting materials from other libraries</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful online guides and tutorials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Core question Library as Place domain undergraduate dissatisfaction trends over time.

(\% of population expressing that their perceived level of service delivery was below their minimum expectations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>Perceived did not meet minimum (≤ -1)</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library As Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning.</td>
<td>31% 34% 37%</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet space for individual activities.</td>
<td>32% 31% 35%</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comfortable and inviting location.</td>
<td>22% 21% 22%</td>
<td>↓↓↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A getaway for study, learning, or research.</td>
<td>23% 22% 25%</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community space for group learning and group study.</td>
<td>25% 35% 34%</td>
<td>↑↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A secure and safe place.</td>
<td>18% 17%</td>
<td>↑↓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Legend for trend analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction of Trend</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction appears to be declining (likely a good thing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↔</td>
<td>Trend is stable or not immediately apparent (keep watching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction appears to be increasing (and may require action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇧⇧</td>
<td>Not enough data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trends for many of the services and service delivery items are notably stable or trending toward higher levels of satisfaction. Conversely, the provision of space for studying, as noted previously, has been trending toward higher levels of dissatisfaction.

Unlike the theme-based specific core questions above, the General Satisfaction and Outcome (or Information Literacy) sets of questions are rated on a single 9-point scale for either agreement with a statement or perceived level of satisfaction. Subjective scoring of the specific questions assessing “general satisfaction” suggests no particular issues. Both the mean and median scores were in the 7 to 8 range on the 9-point scale. The proportion of undergraduates that gave scores of 5 or below on a 9 point scale (dissatisfaction) ranged between 7% and 12%, suggesting that the vast majority are satisfied with the Library.

Outcomes for Information Literacy (IL) activities are, likewise, viewed in a positive light by undergraduates. The more general IL attributes related to assisting and enabling library related skill development received mean scores in the 7 range, and demonstrated consistent distributions of scores that indicated a positive impression. Particularly, students were in agreement (satisfied) with the statement that the Library enables them to be more efficient in their academic pursuits with less than 14% scoring at 5 or less on the 9 point scale. The more active or specific task of helping the individual stay abreast of developments in their chosen field was scored slightly less positively at 37% rating the Library at 5 or less.

The Library is a central hub for undergraduate activity compared to the other user groups. The majority of undergraduate students indicated that they utilize the Library on either a daily or weekly basis (64%). However, despite the high frequency of use, the use of the Library is severely limited by space constraints, as indicated by the Library as Place core questions and was underscored by space issues constituting the most common theme in the comments as 43% of undergraduate commenters noted some aspect of the Library space.

Graduate Students

Approximately 340 graduate responses were received for the 2013 LibQUAL+® survey. This was a small improvement over both the 2010 and 2007 surveys.

The five areas of greatest graduate student dissatisfaction were among the Information Control themed questions.
1. Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office.
   - 38% indicate the Library did not meet min. expectations; no change from LibQUAL+® 2010 values (38%)
   - 62% indicate Library meets or exceeds minimum services expectations.
   - Slim majority (53%) indicate Library is close to, meets or exceeds desired services.
   - Maintains the considerable increase in the numbers of dissatisfied compared to 2007.
   - COA, OVC, CME and CSAHS suggest their service deficit is the greatest as their dissatisfaction rates ranged between 45% to 58%
2. Ability to navigate library web pages easily.
   - Perceived and adequacy gaps may not be indicative due to high minimum scores.
     - 37% felt the Library did not meet minimum expectations; however, the majority (63%) believe Library meets or exceeded minimum expectations.
     - 57% believe the Library is close to or meet/exceeds desired.
   - Dissatisfied proportions (not meeting min or desired) have decreased compared to 2010 (44%) but still substantially above 2007 (22%).
   - Comments tended to centre on the search functionality and interface.
3. Quiet space for individual activities.
   - Overall, 36% were dissatisfied with the available quiet work space, 64% indicated the library met or exceeded minimum expectations
   - Highest rates of dissatisfaction were from COA (55%) and lowest in CPES and CME (both 21%)
   - 57% indicated that the Library was close to, met or exceeded their desired level of service
   - Comments highlighted the facility issues of a lack of power and light functions
4. Print and/or electronic collections I require for my work
   - 33% felt the Library did not meet min. expectations, however, 67% felt the Library met or exceeded min. expectations.
   - Improved from 2010 (48%) dissatisfaction, but still higher than 2007 (26%)
   - Similarly, slight majority (59%) felt the Library was close to, meeting or exceeding desired levels.
   - Highest dissatisfaction rates in CSAHS (51%) and lowest in CPES (24%)
   - High expectations for service delivery as 46% expressed their minimum level of service expected as either 8 or 9 on the 9 point scale
5. Library website enabling me to locate information on my own.
   - 33% stated the library did not meet their minimum level of service
   - Library is meeting minimum levels for a large majority (67%).
   - Close to, meeting or exceeding desired levels for fair majority (62%)
   - Continued high expectations for functionality.
   - Improved level of dissatisfaction compared to 2010 (39%) and 2007 (36%).
As with the undergraduate students, the graduate students indicated the Affect of Service elements are the areas where they see both the least gaps in service and the performance is closest to their desired levels of service. Compared to both the 2007 and 2010 surveys, the rates of dissatisfaction (not meeting minimum levels of service) have fallen for six of the ten items and remained stable for the remaining four. In particular, the levels of dissatisfaction for their sense that employees understand the needs of users fell to 14% from previous rates of 20+% in 2007 and 2010.

In terms of the items that were rated with the highest proportion citing that the Library came close to, met or exceeded desired levels of service, (the Superiority gap), they were both in the Affect of Service theme. The Library’s employees dealing with users in a caring fashion exhibited the highest proportion at 83%, followed closely by a readiness to respond to user questions at 82%.

It was interesting to note that for graduate students the provision of group space was seen as a relative positive Library service in that 70% indicated the Library was close to, met or exceeded their desire for this service. This contrasts the opinion of the undergraduates at only 56% and suggests different space needs or demands between these two groups. Indeed, only 33% of total comments were about space and of those, only 4 (7%) of the space comments specifically identified a lack of group space.

Please see below for accompanying tables and figures for each item in the dissatisfaction rates and trends for graduates.

Table 7. Core question Affect of Service domain graduate student dissatisfaction trends over time.

(\% of population expressing that their perceived level of service delivery was below their minimum expectations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Affect of Service</th>
<th>Perceived did not meet minimum (≤ 1)</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td>Employees who instill confidence in users.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving users individual attention.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees who are consistently courteous.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness to respond to users' questions.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees who understand the needs of their users.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willingness to help users.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependability in handling users' service problems.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making me aware of library resources and services.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving library-use skills as a by-product of seeking assistance from library staff.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching me how to access evaluate and use information 16%  
Availability of assistance to improve my research skills 17%

Table 8. Core question Information Control domain graduate student dissatisfaction trends over time.  
(\% of population expressing that their perceived level of service delivery was below their minimum expectations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>Perceived did not meet minimum (% -1)</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The printed library materials I need for my work.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The electronic information resources I need.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>⇓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>⇓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making information easily accessible for independent use.</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>⇓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to navigate library Web pages easily.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>⇓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online course support (readings, links, references).</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to rare and historical materials</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>G↑↑ &amp; G↓↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease and timeliness in getting materials from other libraries</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful online guides and tutorials</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Core question Library as Place domain graduate student dissatisfaction trends over time.  
(\% of population expressing that their perceived level of service delivery was below their minimum expectations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>Perceived did not meet minimum (% -1)</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library As Place</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library space that inspires study and learning.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>⇓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet space for individual activities.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>⇓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comfortable and inviting location.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>⇓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A getaway for study, learning, or research.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>G↑↑ &amp; G↓↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community space for group learning and group study.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>G↑↑ &amp; G↓↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A secure and safe place.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table #:

The general satisfaction questions related to their treatment in the library, support service and the quality of service were uniformly positive, although slightly less than the other populations. The largest numbers of scores were in the 7-9 range, with the mean scores all around the 7 mark. Recall that this feedback uses a single 9 point scale for perceived levels of satisfaction. Therefore, mean values in the 7 to 8 range generally suggest positive opinion for the Library’s services. The cumulative proportions of graduate students expressing a positive opinion (scores 6-9) for satisfaction ranged from a low of 82% for support of learning, research and teaching, to a high of 90% for overall quality of the service from the library.

For specific IL-related outcomes, the values were less positive. The items in this area tend to relate to specific programming, training opportunities, or communications that may or may not be actively targeted or appropriate to graduate students’ skill training needs. Whether or not graduates students attribute their acquisition of these skills to the Guelph library may influence their response. This makes scores from this area difficult to interpret, since a neutral or negative score may be a reflection of the respondent assigning low or neutral scores as an indication that the service or skill is not seen as a role of the Library or was previously acquired in training elsewhere rather than a reflection of their impression of the service. An example is the outcome related to the Library’s role assisting in the distinguishing between trustworthy and untrustworthy sources and information. One might reasonably assume that both graduate students and faculty would come to Guelph having acquired training, and experience with making these distinctions. Indeed, only 57% of graduate students indicated that the library rated scores in the positive area (greater than 6). In rating the Library’s role for these populations it may be seen as either minor or non-existent. The more relevant outcomes, such as aiding in academic advancement (83%) and enabling efficiency in academic pursuits (82%) were regarded positively by graduate students.

As in previous years, the use of the Library tended to be more utilitarian or need oriented. The highest frequencies of utilization of the library physical space and its resources tended to be on a weekly to monthly basis, with about 33% - 29% choosing each of those frequencies respectively. The space issues seen by the undergraduate students also impact graduate students. However, with the availability of department-based office space, graduate students need and use of Library space less frequently than undergraduates. This is underscored by the finding that remote access was among the top areas of dissatisfaction for graduate students. On-line utilization was overwhelmingly on a daily or weekly basis, and accounted for over 84% of the use from this cohort. In this same vein, 94% of graduate students indicate they use non-Library information gateways such as Google on a daily or weekly basis.

Faculty and Staff

Guelph’s faculty and staff are critical stakeholders in the defining and evaluating the Library’s mandate and purpose. Through endeavours from a variety of Library teams, the needs of the faculty
population have become an increasing focus for direct programming. With this added attentive focus, faculty and staff feedback can increasingly help the Library define and shape collections and course curricula, identify student needs, highlight partnership opportunities and create increased technical understanding of complex research agendas. Interactions with these groups are critical to enable the Library to respond effectively to demands and needs. The faculty population at Guelph is slightly less than 750, but with only 88 respondents (12%) we are not confident that the respondent pool or their responses are generalizable. The colleges of CME and CPES are substantially underrepresented among faculty responses. The life-science faculties of CBS, OAC and OVC represent 55% of the faculty response and 47% of the staff. This represents a potential bias in any interpretation or application of the results for this group.

The outcomes from the faculty and staff respondents were similar to those of the graduate students in that the most prevalent area of their displeasure was library access related to self-directed navigation and functionality through the website. The five items with the highest levels of dissatisfaction were:

- 1. Ability to navigate library Web pages easily
  - The ability to navigate the library site is a clear issue for the majority of faculty and staff respondents.
  - 43% indicated performance fell beneath their minimum and for 47% it fell well below their desired.
  - All faculty in all colleges and OVC staff expressed a majority of dissatisfaction
  - Improvement compared to 2010 (51%) but still higher levels of dissatisfaction compared to 2007 (23%).
    - This outcome may have been attributable to the incorporation of PRIMO in Fall 2009 (there are similar negative responses at UW and WLU on this item). There may be still some lingering animosity to PRIMO.

- 2. A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own
  - Similar to the navigation item above, but less severe (36% said it fell below minimum expected service compared to 48% in 2010)
  - 47% indicated this service was well below their desired level of service
  - Large proportions of high scores for minimum and desired skews the means and creates high standards
    - 59% of faculty gave a minimum score as either 8 or 9, (the highest scale scores), as their minimum level of expected service
  - CPES (67%) and COA (59%) had the highest proportions of faculty that indicated the Library did not meet their minimum expected level of service

- 3. Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own
  - Majority feel Library meets or exceeds minimum levels (65%), and comes close to, meets or exceeds desired (63%)
  - 35% indicated this item fell well below their minimum expected level of service
    - Some improvement in levels of dissatisfaction compared to 2010 (39%)
Also high levels of expectation for delivery with *minimum* (58%) and *desired* (86%) expecting service levels at 8 or 9 on a 9 point scale

- 86% felt the service level given was at 7 or below
- No apparent patterns based on college or broad discipline

- **4. Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office**
  - 34% stated remote access functionality fell below their minimum expectations
  - 42% indicated the delivered service was well below their desired
  - Also very high levels of *minimum* and *desired* service level expectations.
    - 41% of faculty indicated a minimum expectation of 9
  - COA indicated the highest degree of dissatisfaction (faculty 59% and staff 38%)

- **5. Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work**
  - 30% indicated dissatisfaction, an improvement from 45% in 2010
  - 65% felt that performance was close to, met or exceeded desired level of service
    - Highest proportion (35%) felt the Library met or exceeded desired level
  - Very high performance levels expected
    - *minimum* (63%) stated levels of 8 or 9
    - *desired* (98%) stated levels of 8 or 9
  - Perennial top 5 for dissatisfaction
    - Ranking has dropped from #2 in 2007 to #3 in 2010 to now #5 in 2013

Similar to the undergraduate and graduate students, faculty and staff also expressed their greatest satisfaction within the Affect of Service area. However, unlike students that tended to focus on the quality of the information offered, faculty’s highest areas of satisfaction were more about the quality of the interaction. The items closest to meeting their desires were those aspects of employees a) dealing with users in a caring fashion, and b) being consistently courteous.

In a similar fashion to 2010, the provision of group space was afforded both low *minimum* and *desired* mean scores, indicating a low importance for this with faculty although the level of dissatisfaction with this item seems to be growing over time.

Please see below for accompanying tables for each item for dissatisfaction rates over time for faculty and staff.

Table 10. Core question *Affect of Service* domain faculty and staff dissatisfaction trends over time.

(\% of population expressing that their perceived level of service delivery was below their minimum expectations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty and Staff</th>
<th>Perceived did not meet minimum ((≤ -1))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adequacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect of Service</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who instill confidence in users.</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Giving users individual attention. 15% 23% 15%
Employees who are consistently courteous. 18% 19% 18%
Readiness to respond to users' questions. 12% 21% 17%
Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions. 22% 23% 21%
Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion. 15% 19% 16%
Employees who understand the needs of their users. 18% 21% 22%
Willingness to help users. 12% 22% 14%
Dependability in handling users' service problems. 18% 23% 19%
Making me aware of library resources and services. 22% 22%
Improving library-use skills as a by-product of seeking assistance from library staff. 10%
Teaching me how to access evaluate and use information 19%
Availability of assistance to improve my research skills 18%

Table 11. Core question Information Control domain faculty and staff dissatisfaction trends over time.
(% of population expressing that their perceived level of service delivery was below their minimum expectations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The printed library materials I need for my work.</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The electronic information resources I need.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making information easily accessible for independent use.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to navigate library Web pages easily.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online course support (readings, links, references).</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to rare and historical materials</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease and timeliness in getting materials from other libraries</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful online guides and tutorials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Core question Library as Place domain faculty and staff dissatisfaction trends over time.
General satisfaction levels from faculty suggest all elements from the Library are well reviewed and received. The proportion of faculty and staff that indicated satisfaction (scores between 6 and 9) for research and teaching support reached almost 88%, and for the deportment or treatment by Library staff the rate was 90%. Overall satisfaction with the Library also reached 90% of faculty and staff scoring their overall satisfaction rates between 6 and 9.

As with graduate students, there are some elements for IL Outcomes that may not be seen as being directly linked to Library function by the faculty and staff audience. The distributions and scores for the items of “staying abreast of developments,” “distinguishing between trustworthy/untrustworthy info” or “providing the information skills” may not be seen by faculty as the mandate or responsibility of the Library. These items routinely receive scores that split opinion down the middle as to whether or not faculty agree with these statements. Staff is a little more generous in their attribution for the source as the Library for these outcomes. Conversely, the IL items related to “aiding academic advancement” and “enabling more efficient pursuit of work” are more clearly associated with the roles and tasks of the Library in faculty eyes and the were rated more positively, with approximately ¾ of faculty agreeing with these statements.

The use of the Library showed an interesting pattern for faculty. It was most common for faculty to visit the Library building on a monthly (39%) or weekly (27%) basis. We are seeing a somewhat downward trend from 2010 in daily use; whereas nearly 4% indicated daily use in 2010, only 2% of faculty stated they use the Library on a daily basis in 2013. Also of concern was that 10% stated they never use the Library which is up from 6% in 2010. In a similar contrast to graduate students, use of the Library’s on-line functions happens daily for about 40% of faculty, down from 50% in 2010. The highest use frequency for virtual use is now weekly at 45% of faculty. However, approximately 85% use on-line services at least weekly and that has not changed over time. The use of non-Library search tools remains remarkably consistent across all user groups and across time.
Discussion and Conclusions

In an overall assessment of the administration of the 2013 LibQUAL+® survey, we were pleased with the response rates for undergraduate students and to a degree with graduate students. Both of these populations showed increased numbers of respondents compared to 2010, although not as a proportion of the population for undergraduates, which remained stable.

In contrast, the particularly low response rates from faculty and staff is unfortunate since these groups represent the *expert* end of the user spectrum and feedback on many of these key functions helps in the understanding and revisions. The relevance of the LibQUAL+® tool to the activities and issues for faculty and staff is a concern and may be a factor in their participation.

As in every survey, there are a number of dependent themes that arise from the 2013 LibQUAL+® survey results. For Guelph’s Library these themes are not new and echo similar issues from previous LibQUAL+® surveys. Certain of them reverberate a little more loudly, and some a little less so.

As a recurrent and resounding theme, the Library staff and their provision of interpersonal services continues to be viewed highly by all users. It was interesting to note that there were slightly different recognition, and perhaps expectations, for service. Whereas faculty and staff recognized the manners and empathy of staff, undergraduate students recognized the knowledge and skill transfer aspects of staff. Graduates students blended those traits. Recognition, through this feedback, that Library staff cut a wide swath in positive customer service attributes should be reassuring to management.

Well known, and a current undertaking with a dedicated Library Space Committee, the issues for the physical library and the study space constraints are more complex in their solution. It should be noted that despite the considerable and acknowledged effort and expense that has gone toward improving comfort and technical capacity in the Library in the recent past, it is clearly not enough to meet the needs or demand. Undergraduate students as the primary users of the Library indicated that the available study space within the Library is a principal dissatisfaction. Study spaces are currently limited to about 2,700 seats. Most students recognize that the Library space is a finite resource, but given their descriptions of need, the development and actions toward a solution cannot come too soon. The “love / hate” relationship is best characterized by an undergraduate student who commented, “I love the Library. So much so that you should build another one.” Sadly, a sentiment of undergraduates is a resignation that with the exception of the first three or four weeks of each term, there is a strong likelihood that you will not find space to do your work, and a number indicated that they have ceased trying. Despite this sentiment, building population census data by hour of day suggests that peak hours are routinely between 11 am and 4 pm, but fall to approximately 50% capacity after 5 pm. Communication of this type of information may enable students to plan their time more effectively, especially with respect to group work.

For graduate students the issues around space were centred on the quality and upkeep of the quiet space. Group space was viewed quite positively. Either this is not a pressing need of graduate students, or the Library is mostly fulfilling the needs that graduates students have for group space.
It is less clear how faculty view the space issue. While in the past we have suggested that Library space is not an issue due to their overwhelming use of e-resources, the proportion of faculty being dissatisfied with group space did rise compared to previous years. This may be due to student feedback to faculty regarding the lack of space at the Library. It would be interesting to directly gauge the faculty view or the Library; whether as a student facility or the academic town-square.

As in previous surveys, recurrent issues were expressed about the Library’s website. All roles of Library users cited a moderate to concerning levels of dissatisfaction with many of the finding, navigation and access processes they are routinely using. Unfortunately, the current questions within LibQUAL+® are quite generic and limited in providing specific context to the issues or experiences of users. The numbers of comments voicing dissatisfaction with the discovery layer processes offer some degree of insight. While past iterations of LibQUAL+® have found navigation and access issues to be the basis of the highest level of dissatisfaction, the proportions of each population reporting such dissatisfaction were much higher in the 2010 survey. Certainly, some outcomes may still link to the negativity surrounding changes made with the launch of PRIMO in August 2009. The decrease in proportion of dissatisfaction with print and e-resources function may be due to increased familiarity and functional improvements with PRIMO over the past three years.

The largest proportion of respondents uses the Library’s web-interface weekly or daily. This high frequency of use denotes a clear reliance or dependence on web-based functionality. Given the deliberate movement from print to electronic information resources, and with that the forced reliance on web access, these processes and any changes to function or format need to be well considered. While certain web function issues may be the purview and responsibility of vendors, these issues are also viewed by users as belonging to the Library. Change is rarely easily accepted. Changes to key research tools less accepted. Continued methodical and systematic user testing of web-page operations to determine the best design and function may increase the time required to roll-out change, but are most likely to result in a more functional and accepted user interface. It may be of interest that COA had the highest rate of dissatisfaction for making resources available from home or office. This begs the question as to whether or not instructions are geared to different audiences.

The Information Literacy Outcomes feedback should give an interesting perspective to the Library. Each respondent role rated particular IL Outcome questions in a similar vein that put in question their linking of the specific outcomes with Library activity. It may be that all respondents, including the undergraduate students, view these as activities that the Library currently does not actively facilitate or may be masked or a part of other initiatives. Scores were uniformly lower for specific outreach to assist in staying “abreast of developments in my field(s)” and “helps (the individual) distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.” These are areas where identification or development of specific activities related to this general goal needs to be more explicitly defined to help connect or operationalize this particular aspect for respondents with programming defined to facilitate these outcomes. However, Guelph is not alone in what may be a disconnect between IL programming intent the perceived outcomes. In reviewing a sampling of LibQUAL+® reports from a sampling of other institutions similar to Guelph, their mean scores showed the same patterns.
Many of the efforts to improve the Library over the intervening survey period from 2010 have borne fruit. Students have recognized the efforts to improve the Library space constraints, yet maintain it is a relative band-aid solution for a growing student population issue. Similarly, the strong negative feedback on the 2010 LibQUAL+® survey regarding the adoption of PRIMO as the discovery tool has been muted. While some dislike for PRIMO still exists, it is balanced by those who appreciated the availability and quality of the search engines. The higher profile physical placement for help services, signage and communications efforts are all likely contributors to the increasing satisfaction with interpersonal service and services. In particular, the improvement of many of the graduate student responses likely reflects the maturation in programming mediated by the GSLI initiative and other outreach activities like the Dissertation Boot Camp. These programs were developed to be very specific to the stressors at graduate school. The initiatives and developments from the RESC group will likely produce similar improvements in the coming years with faculty and staff.

The pursuits of user-centred continuous improvement and effectiveness have been active goals throughout the Library based on a variety of feedback mechanisms since the last LibQUAL+® survey in 2010. It is clear that the focus and resources effecting these improvements has been justly rewarded in the user service areas.