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Agenda

- Our Challenges/signs of improvement
- LibQUAL+ at Sturgis: past & present
- A few words about marketing
- Results and comparisons
- Comment analysis – methodology & findings
- How are we using the information?
- What next?
Challenges
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>FY ‘12 Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University, ‘12</td>
<td>$2,980,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern, ‘12</td>
<td>$4,494,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta State University, ‘12</td>
<td>$3,462,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Georgia, ‘12</td>
<td>$3,364,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total FTE 12 Month Enrollment

Kennesaw State University, ‘12
20,173

Georgia Southern, ‘12
17,977

Valdosta State University, ‘12
11,210

University of West Georgia, ‘12
9,901
Total Library Expenditures Per FTE Student

Kennesaw State University, ‘12  Georgia Southern, ‘12

$147.77  $250.03

Valdosta State University, ‘12  University of West Georgia, ‘12

$308.88  $339.78

Citation:
Total Library Staff Per 1,000 FTE Students

Kennesaw State University, ‘12  |  Georgia Southern, ‘12
--- | ---
1.96 | 3.78

Valdosta State University, ‘12  |  University of West Georgia, ‘12
--- | ---
5.56 | 6.16
But things are looking up…

• KSU is comprehensive!
• OwlSpace renovated in 2011
• Graduate Library renovated in 2012
• $4.4 million in state bonds issued in 2013
• Football on the way
• Anticipated growth
LibQUAL+ at Sturgis Library

2011

• 5,754 surveys completed by the KSU community
• More than any other US participant for that year
• 1,856 free-text comments received!

2013

• 4,799 surveys completed by the KSU community
• KSU is in 2nd place for US participants
• 1,654 free-text comments received!
Of 129 institutions worldwide that have participated in 2013 so far, 121 received less than 4,000 survey submissions.
Prizes! ....

- iPad 2 to first prize winner
- iPad Mini to 1\textsuperscript{st} runner-up
- $100 GC to 2\textsuperscript{nd} runner-up
....and Marketing!

WIN AN iPAD OR iPAD MINI

TAKE THE LIBRARY SURVEY
www.kennesaw.edu/library/survey

MARCH 11 - APRIL 12

Give us your opinion to be eligible to win!
Sturgis Library Marketing Campaign
Branding

- Diverse messaging formats
- Be consistent with narrative and visuals
- Be strategic: Actions should support each other.
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Results and Comparisons
Transforming Facilities

• Library as Place dimension shows gains across the board
• Gains made in spite of rising expectations
• Expectations of facilities differ among user groups
Library as Place Dimension: All Respondents

All Respondents, 2011 = 6.59; 0.30

All Respondents, 2013 = 6.88; 0.44

Takeaway: Significant, positive change was observed.
Library as Place Dimension: Undergraduates

Undergraduates, 2011 = 6.64; 0.32

Undergraduates, 2013 = 6.95; 0.47

Takeaway: Significant, positive change was observed.
Library as Place Dimension: Graduates

Graduates, 2011 = 6.45; 0.17
Graduates, 2013 = 6.65; 0.33

Takeaway: Significant, positive change was observed.
Takeaway: Significant, positive change was observed.
Another View of the same pattern...

2011

2013
Transforming Collections

- User groups disagree about quality of collections
- Electronic resources appear to be favored over print
- Area of greatest weakness (among grads and faculty)
Takeaway: All Respondents appear satisfied with resources, but…
Library Collections Dimension: Undergraduates

Takeaway: Undergrads are satisfied with resources.
Library Collections Dimension: Graduates

Takeaway: Graduates are displeased with resources.
Takeaway: Faculty are very displeased with resources.
Comment Analysis

2011 vs. 2013
## Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identified basic codes/keywords</td>
<td>• Identified areas to analyze.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• From literature review</td>
<td>• Used Antconc concordance software to determine word frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Added codes/keywords as necessary</td>
<td>• Downloaded comments as Excel file and searched for comments related to areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used software (Concordance 3) to assist with adding codes/keywords</td>
<td>• Created mini reports (summary of comments) under areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analyzed every comment and collated the information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comments were in Word document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2011 Output

- Document with codes ordered by frequency.
- Included the number of total comments and discrete statements.
- Selected comments pulled by Stiles & Sharpe.
2011 Output

Total Number of Comments: 1856
Total Number of Discreet Statement: 3135

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE/KEYWORDS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library--general—positive</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees-positive</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study space-group (need more)-negative</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers-negative (need more)</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library building-aesthetics-negative</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service-positive</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study space-individual (need more)-negative</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books – print collection (not large enough) – negative</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture-negative (Need more/ need more comfortable)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Top Ten Negative Comments, By Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Library building</td>
<td>Aesthetics (uninviting, dull, drab, lifeless, etc.)</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library, amount of space, general comment, negative</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library, outdated</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library, compared to other universities, negative</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library, cleanliness, negative</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library, should be center of campus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>Need more</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need better tech support, updates, etc.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need more/better laptops</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need Macs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non research use (playing video games, etc.), negative</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scanners</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011 Output

Top Ten Lists

6/30/11
2011 Output

Sample of comments

Compliment: “The Library has several shining stars on the staff who are everything you would want - helpful, courteous, conscientious and knowledgeable, with a love for books and learning...” 1700-S

Criticism: “I simply don't go to the library because it is [grim], uninviting and extremely uncomfortable...The computers in there are awful too. Slow, old and dirty...” 1756-U

Suggestion: “Facebook should be blocked in the library.” 1568-U

Collection Suggestion: “I would like to see more recent materials on conflict resolution, peace, social movements, and social justice.” 40-S
## 2013 Output

- 12 mini-reports based around LibQUAL areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library as Place</th>
<th>Affect of Service</th>
<th>Collection &amp; Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Library</td>
<td>Circulation/Reserves</td>
<td>Electronic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl Space (study area)</td>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor</td>
<td>Instruction/Research Clinic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report on Chat Services
Based upon comments received from the 2013 LibQUAL+ survey

Michael Luther
4/30/2013

Comment Analysis
Table 1: Quantitative Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Investigated</th>
<th># of Relevant Occurrences</th>
<th># of Unique Comments/Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chat</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27/1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM tool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Comments about the chat service at Sturgis Library are overwhelmingly positive. Only two out of 33 comments were negative, one referring to the chat service as “a dead end” (#27) and another describing it as “the worst” (#6). The service is otherwise described as “convenient” (#11, 23), “invaluable” (#1, 2), “extremely helpful” (#19), and “handy” (#20). Commenters used the word “love” to describe their feelings about the chat service on ten separate occasions.
## 2011 vs. 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Analyzed every comment</td>
<td>Analyzed comments under specific categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td>List of # of comments by codes/keywords &amp; list of positive, negative, &amp; suggestion comments</td>
<td>Mini summary reports on specific areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
<td>Every comment was read, analyzed, &amp; represented</td>
<td>Focused on main themes, produced detailed analysis, &amp; easy to review reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td>Very time consuming &amp; not very detailed.</td>
<td>May have missed some trends in overall comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Uses

• Being used to highlight needs and document evidence.

• Communicating with the Development and President’s office.

• Departments are using mini reports as a learning tool and to inform decision making.
Specific Uses

• Annual Report 2013

• LibQUAL+ Survey Full Report 2013

• LibQUAL+ Survey Results Brochure
Going Forward

• Three years till next LibQUAL survey.

• Keep building a body of evidence.

• USG and KSU priorities will influence the type of data that we collect as well as our method.
Feel Free to Contact Us

Michael E. Luther

• Assessment Librarian
• Office # - (678) 797-2521
• mluther1@kennesaw.edu

Chris Sharpe

• Government Documents Librarian
• Office # - (770) 423-6190
• csharpe@kennesaw.edu