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Guiding Subject Liaison Librarians in Understanding and Acting on User Survey Results

A Model LibQUAL+® Consultation from ARL

- Assessment librarians cannot single-handedly implement improvements for users
- Staff throughout the library must be able to understand, interpret and act upon user survey results

Consultation tailored to develop subject librarians’ ability:
- Hear notable findings from the “experts” and understand survey results – gap analyses, longitudinal trends & specific peers
- Mine data by separate user populations & discipline groups
- Develop actionable goals and objectives for the UConn Libraries’ Strategic Plan related to Graduate Education and Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity
- Identify metrics from LibQUAL+® survey items to serve as targets for continuous improvement & measures of impact
Consultation Objective #1: Understand Gap Analysis and “Zones of Tolerance”

Are the Libraries Putting their Efforts into User Priorities?

Interpreting Perceived Scores Against Minimally-Acceptable & Desired Service Levels (i.e., “Zones of Tolerance”)
Consultation Objective #1: Understand Benchmarking Against Self, Longitudinally Are the Libraries Continuously Improving?

“Nobody is more like me than me!”
Anonymous
Consultation Objective #1: Understand Benchmarking Against Peers

Do Target User Groups Receive Library Services as Good as or Better than Peers?

Benchmarking Against Peer Institutions
1,000,000 Users; 1,000 Institutions!
## Consultation Objective #2:
Learn how to “drill down” by User Population

*In 2008, Graduate Students Highest Desired Services are...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Desired Services</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC-1 Making electronic resources accessible from home or office</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-8 Print and/or electronic journal collections that I require for my work</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-2 A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-4 The electronic information resources that I need</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-5 Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-6 Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-7 Making information easily accessible for independent use</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consultation Objective #2:
**Learn how to “drill down” by User Population**

*In 2008, Graduate Students Least Adequate Services are...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Adequate Means</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC-8 Print and/or electronic journal collections that I require for my work</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-2 A library Web site enabling me to locate information on my own</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-4 The electronic information resources that I need</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-5 Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC-1 Making electronic resources accessible from home or office</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultation Objective #2: Learn how to “drill down” by Individual Discipline

How do we identify what’s actionable for target groups, grounded in survey data?

- **#1**
  - MOST DESIRED
  - and
  - LEAST ADEQUATE (highest weakness)

- **#2**
  - LEAST ADEQUATE (highest weakness)
  - and
  - LEAST DESIRED

- **#3**
  - MOST DESIRED
  - and
  - MOST ADEQUATE (lowest weakness/highest strength)

- **#4**
  - MOST ADEQUATE (lowest weakness/highest strength)
  - and
  - LEAST DESIRED
Consultation Objective #2:
Learn how to “drill down” by Individual Discipline

How do we identify what’s actionable for Humanities Disciplines Grad Students?
Consultation Objective #2:
Learn how to “drill down” by Individual Discipline

How do we identify what’s actionable for Science Disciplines Grad Students?

UConn Grad Students -- Sci, Pharm, Nursing
2008

Legend:
- Affect of Service
- Information Control
- Library as Place
Consultation Objective #3:
Facilitate the Writing of “Goals” based on Data

How do we identify what’s actionable for Science Disciplines Grad Students?

Writing S.M.A.R.T. Goals

- **S** Specific
  - the desired outcome or result is clearly defined
- **M** Measurable
  - accomplishment can be charted and/or observed
- **A** Attainable
  - achievable, goal is challenging but realistic
- **R** Relevant
  - results-oriented, in line with institutional goals and library vision
- **T** Timely
  - deadlines are set for accomplishment

Example:
- 60% courses utilizing WebCT include links to library research materials by 9/10

*Versus general goal:*
- Make materials accessible to users where they are
Goal 2: Enhance strategic graduate and professional programs through active library liaison engagement and resource support.

Goal 3: Actively support faculty, student and staff research, scholarship and creative endeavors through quality instruction, liaison collaboration, collections, and information access.
## UConn Libraries’ Strategic Plan
### Examples of Metrics and Targets Using LibQUAL+®

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Metric</th>
<th>Baseline 09</th>
<th>2014 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the perceived level of service quality in ranking of “print or electronic journal collections needed” for All users</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the perceived level of service quality in ranking of “electronic information resources needed” for All users</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase perceived level of service quality in ranking of “easy to use access tools” for All users</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Undergraduates perceived level of service quality ranking of “modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information.”</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Undergraduates perceived level of service quality ranking of library Web site “enabling me to locate information on my own.”</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Undergraduates perceived level of service quality ranking of “quiet space for individual activities.”</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Have We Done So Far for Graduate Students?

- Increased the number of electronic journals across disciplines
- Improved electronic access to a wide variety of collections, resources, and services
- Purchased electronic books, reference materials and historical information as identified by specific disciplines
- Improved interlibrary loan request and tracking
- Identified potential library space dedicated for graduate student use
What Have We Done So Far for Graduate Students?

- Expanded **streamed video and audio collections**
- Revised and expanded **instruction and consultation services customized** for graduate students by discipline
- Established **opportunities for graduate students to present** current/ongoing research
- Established a mechanism to **investigate the impact of new technologies** on graduate student research and learning
What’s Next?

- Conduct LibQual+ during November 2010
- Communicate survey results with staff and discuss findings and plans for additional analysis
- Compare LibQual+ 2008 and 2010 survey results and identify improvements and issues reflected in survey findings
- Review Strategic Plan metrics and update to reflect 2010 survey results. Revise as needed
- Identify strategies to incorporate survey results into departmental, team and individual 2012 goals
- Celebrate successes and plan improvements!!