



Fall 2007

---

## I. Brief Summary of Assessment Plan

### A. For each component of the outcome(s) assessed in 2006-2007, indicate the goal(s), student learning outcome(s), associated components of the outcome(s) (if applicable) and the performance characteristics or criteria.

The Library used the LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup> survey to assess its facility, staff practices, and resources. The LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup> survey utilizes gap scores to determine if a library is meeting the level of service expectations of its users. The survey asks participants to rate, on a scale of 1-9 (1 being the lowest and 9 the highest score,) the minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service that the library provides.

#### Goals:

##### I. Facility

#### Outcome:

- A. Students and faculty will demonstrate that they use the Library as a space conducive to learning.

##### II. Staff Practices

#### Outcome:

- A. Students and faculty will demonstrate that staff practices support student learning.

##### III. Resources

#### Outcome:

- A. Students and faculty will demonstrate that the Library provides the appropriate resources to enhance student learning.

### B. Indicate a benchmark, that is, what percentage of students should successfully achieve the outcome in order for you to say the program is successful in helping students achieve this outcome.

The Library will center on the minimum Service Adequacy gap score of 0 as a benchmark on each outcome addressed by each question asked on the survey. Scores that are less than 0 will indicate areas of concern.

### C. Note any changes made since the plan was submitted, with some indication of why such changes were made.

No changes were made in the LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup> survey plan since the assessment plan was submitted.

## II. Assessment Methods

### A. For each outcome assessed, identify approximately when, where (e.g., in which courses), and how (i.e., through what activity) students demonstrated their achievement of the outcome.

The Web-based LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup> survey was distributed by e-mail to all students, faculty, and staff between February 12 and March 2, 2007. The Library also placed a link to the survey on the Library home Web page. The library sent two reminders by e-mail to all students, faculty, and staff. The Library heavily promoted the survey prior to its distribution.

146 undergraduate students and 11 graduate students responded. Although the Library would have preferred to see a higher return, these ratios are consistent with those witnessed by other institutions conducting the LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup> survey, across the country, in the spring of 2007.

24 faculty responded to the survey.

8 staff responded to the survey.

In all, there were 189 responses to the survey which was consistent with the national averages.

### B. Describe who assessed the students' work and the methods and procedures used to compare the students' work to the performance characteristics/criteria.

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) created the LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup> survey and provided the URL to the survey. The ARL gathered and compiled the statistics which were then sent to the Library.

### C. If you changed the assessment methods since your plan was submitted, describe the change, including a brief explanation of why the change was made.

No change in assessment methods was made since the plan was submitted.

## III. Description of Assessment Results

### A. Describe how the students performed on each outcome. Compare the level of students' performance to the benchmark for that outcome. Were expectations reached, exceeded, not reached?

As mentioned earlier in this report, the LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup> survey utilizes gap scores to determine if a library is meeting the level of service expectations of its users. The survey asks participants to rate, on a scale of 1-9, (1 being the lowest and 9 the highest score,) the minimum, desired, and perceived levels of service that the library provides.

The Library will be focusing on Service Adequacy which is calculated by subtracting the minimum score from the perceived score on any given question,

for each user. In general, Service Adequacy is an indicator of the extent to which the Library is meeting the minimum expectations of our users. The Association of Research Libraries, the creators of LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup>, set the gap scores which have a mean of 0 and may be positive or negative. The higher the service adequacy scores, the better the Library's performance. Conversely, negative score indicates that user's perceived level of service quality is below their minimum expectations.

The Library has set the minimum Service Adequacy gap score of 0 as a benchmark on each outcome addressed by each question asked on the survey. Scores that are less than 0 will indicate areas of concern.

The following chart indicates the Service Adequacy scores for each question and group responding.

	Undergraduate	Faculty	Graduate Student	Staff	All
Facility Library as Place	0.03	0.51	-0.23	1.09	0.11
Staff Practices Affect of Services	-0.08	0.26	0.39	0.19	0.00
Resources Information Control	0.05	-0.21	0.05	0.03	0.02
Overall	-0.02	0.14	0.11	0.34	0.02

**B. Describe how the faculty interpret these results. What do they mean?**

**Section One: Facility - Library as Place.** Overall, the Library scored well in the section of library as place. People do like to use the facility.

- The Service Adequacy score in this section for undergraduates was 0.03 and for graduates was -0.23. The issue of noise was the most telling problem that occurs in this section and predominately in the undergraduate and graduate student results, our largest group of patrons. This is not surprising and is consistent with other academic libraries throughout the county. In fact, the noise issue appears to have been the number one problem reported in this category for all academic libraries participating in the LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup> survey in 2007. Over recent years, a number of new services such as an Information

Commons have doubled the foot traffic in the Library. Change of this nature in libraries has moved the Library from a sterile environment to an organic environment.

- Students also commented about the lack of study rooms and problems with scheduling their use. On the positive side, one student made an illuminating comment in that they had used a number of libraries in the IU system and said that we were quite good compared to the others. Yes, there is room for improvement, but pretty good nonetheless.
- Students also commented on the need for additional hours and for IT staff on weekends.
- Faculty and staff give the Library the highest ratings in the category of library as place, Service Adequacy scores of 0.51 and 1.09 respectively.

**Section Two: Staff Practices - Affect of Service.** This section contained the most negative comments.

- Undergraduate students had more negative comments than the other groups. 17% had negative comments mostly centering on their impressions of an unfriendly staff. The Service Adequacy score for Undergraduates was -0.08 while it was 0.26 for faculty, 0.39 for Graduate Students, and 0.19 for staff. The comments sections generally mention that the student workers do not appear “friendly” or “helpful.” These scores appear to mirror similar comments recorded in similar studies at other institutions. It also mirrors comments made about IU Kokomo staff by students in most recent National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) survey. A greater study of the comments section reveals that numerous student comments are made about not being able to use group studies. It is possible that a negative response to being able to use a particular service may generate a negative reaction on the part of the students.
- Graduate students and faculty had the best experience working with Library staff, with Service Adequacy scores of 0.39 and 0.26 respectively, though some negative comments are made regarding staff.
- IU Kokomo staff Service Adequacy scores were 0.19.

**Section Three: Resources – Information Control.** This section was overall positive with noticeable concerns regarding lack of resources. This is not surprising given the lack of budget increases and several budget freezes over the years. Ability to access resources electronically and the Web page appeared to do well.

- Undergraduate and graduate students gave the Library the highest ratings of those surveyed regarding access to resources. The Service Adequacy ratios were 0.05 for both groups. This is not surprising as the Library collection development plan centers on student needs.
- Staff also appeared satisfied, but to a lesser degree than undergraduates. Their Service Adequacy ratio was 0.03
- Faculty had the most negative ratings, saying that the Library did not have the resources they need. The Service Adequacy ratio was -0.21.

**C. If necessary to clarify your narrative, you may attach your data summary (not raw data) in an appendix (5 pages maximum).**

A summary of Service Adequacy scores is included in a chart found above in section III. A.

Although considerably more than 5 pages, the Library is attaching a link to the [LibQUAL+® 2007 Survey Results – IU Kokomo](#). This is the full report from the Association of Research Libraries and the LibQUAL+® evaluators working with the Indiana University Kokomo Library data.

**IV. Using Assessment for Program Improvement**

**A. Explain the implications of the assessment results for the program. Are changes in the program indicated? If so, what kinds of changes? Are changes in the assessment plan indicated? If so, what kinds of changes?**

The initial glance at the data appears to show that we have some concerns; however, a deeper analysis of the data indicates that major services are perceived to be fine and that the areas of concerns can be easily fixed, or are indicative of a newer trends being faced by all libraries. Overall, 38% of those responding had good comments about the Library and staff. Undergraduate students had the highest expectations, which is not uncommon in an institution of our type. It should also be noted that students taking the survey had consistently higher levels in the both the desired and minimum categories than the averages for all colleges and universities taking this survey. In other words, the expectations of IU Kokomo students were higher than those of the national norm. On the 1-9 scale, the IU Kokomo undergraduate minimum average was 7.01 and the desired average was 8.16 compared to the national averages of 6.49 for the minimum and 7.89 for the desired. In all, 177 academic institutions conducted the LibQUAL+® survey in the spring of 2007.

**Section One: Facility**

- An outcome of the greater foot traffic is noise. Additionally, a large percentage of our students are non-traditional which means we have students of all ages, with varying degrees of tolerance towards noise, responding to the survey. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that there are no doors closing the Library off from Alumni Hall, hence noise bleeds through the entrance and permeates the facility flowing up the open stairwells. Another factor that contributes to the noise problem is the Kresge Auditorium which is heavily used for large classes. Currently, several large classrooms are being renovated across campus which should cause a decrease in the use of the Kresge Auditorium during peak library use times. The Library will monitor this change in usage of Kresge Auditorium for large classes to determine if noise levels decrease. If not, then the recommendation is to create a permanent wall and entranceway to the Library to keep the external noise out. Closure of the stairwells on the second floor may also be warranted to decrease noise bleeding through to the second floor. If this is our worst problem, then we are in good shape. Other libraries that have also witnessed

noise concerns on their surveys have successfully experimented with making available soft earplugs for those who might want them. The Library will experiment with ear plugs as a short term solution.

- Scheduling of study rooms is being reviewed to determine ways to make their use more efficient. Those changes should be placed into effect in the fall of 2007. Future renovations of the Library should include the addition of new study rooms and other areas better suited for group study.
- The survey also pointed out a need for IT help in the Library in the evenings and on weekends. The IT department, seeing similar results on their survey, will be using students to staff the IT Help Desk all hours that the Library is open. This enhancement of IT service will address student concerns regarding IT assistance.

### **Section Two: Staff Practices**

- Given the Service Adequacy scores and comments regarding student workers, the Library has placed greater emphasis on training students to work with the public. With the incorporation of the Writing Center into the Library in the fall of 2007, the staffs of the Library, IT and the Writing Center coordinated a training workshop to highlight the need for good communications among the three departments. It was decided that this would be an excellent opportunity to address the student worker issues brought up in the survey. As part of that training, Dean Sue Sciame-Giesecke held a workshop on customer service. This workshop will help to ensure that all student workers, regardless of the department for which they work, will have common public services training.

### **Section Three: Resources**

- The Library has in recent years moved in a strong direction of purchasing additional electronic resources. These resources included the full text products *JSTOR*, *Project MUSE*, and *NetLibrary*. The Library has also enhanced its collection of electronic indexes by adding *America: History & Life* and the *ISI Web of Knowledge*. The office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, in conjunction with the IU Kokomo Library, was also instrumental in establishing the IU Resident Scholar program which allows our faculty to use select electronic resources of another IU campus on a short term basis. It is clear that greater communication is needed on the part of the library staff in explaining the resources of the Library to faculty as they may not be aware of the richness of the IU Kokomo collection. Some of the avenues of greater communication may include the creation of liaisons to academic department and workshops for departments or at least one-on-one instruction.
- Although the Resources and Information Control Service Adequacy score for undergraduates and graduates was 0.05, the comments section revealed that students wished they knew more about the resources the Library has to offer. The Library will continue to enhance its Information Literacy program. The program for the elementary composition classes has already undergone significant alterations to bring it more in line with the access to the greater

number of electronic resources. The instructional design of all four of the W131 and W132 library presentations have been reworked to include more active learning exercises and to further student interaction with the Library's expanding electronic resources. The four sessions form the foundation of the information literacy program at IU Kokomo. Additionally, the librarian for information literacy/library instruction has created a link that can be used by all faculty on their Oncourse pages. This presence will highlight the instructional services of the Library to all students.

## **V. Dissemination of Results**

### **A. Describe how these results are being disseminated to faculty, staff, and students.**

Results of the LibQUAL+<sup>®</sup> survey assessment were reported to Library faculty and staff in a department meeting.

It is anticipated that the Library will continue to publish its assessment findings in the Library newsletter and on the Web site. The November 2005 issue of the Library newsletter, *Check It Out!* which is disseminated to all faculty and staff contained an article on information literacy which used some of the Library's earlier assessment data, and the Fall 2006 issue contained a brief article with a hyperlink to the Library's full assessment report from the 2005-06 academic year which is housed on the Library Web page. Continued publication on the Web site will make this information available to students along with faculty, staff, and others who would like to view it.

Additionally, this information will be shared with the Library Advisory Board; and presented by the Library Director at faculty and department meetings for each school on campus. The Library would further like to see these results published as an article in the campus school newspaper.

The Library's assessment results will be a part of the campus report and appear wherever that information is published.

### **B. Describe any relevant responses of groups receiving this information.**

Since the assessment report is only being turned in, it has not yet had wide distribution. The survey data has been shared with the Library Advisory Committee and several academic schools and departments. Initial responses of library faculty and staff have been reported in sections III. & IV. of this document.

Report prepared by:  
John Stachacz,  
Director of Library Services  
Fall 2007