Library User Survey

2017 Results
Why do we conduct a User Survey?

- Gauge users’ value of existing services
- Gather information to plan for future needs
- Identify unmet needs/problem areas
Continuous Improvement Cycle

From SACS:
• Includes all programs, constituencies, and services
• Is strongly linked to the decision-making process
• Provides a sound basis for budget decisions, resource allocation, and plans for institutional improvement.
Virgo Satisfaction

![Satisfaction with Virgo: Trend](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Virgo Satisfaction

• All user groups have increased satisfaction with Virgo, both this year and over the previous 5 years.

• Changes to Virgo have stemmed from previous surveys and usability. Examples include interface changes and new features, including enhanced availability indicators and changes to enhance known item searching.

• Next Steps: Continued research and testing to drive the continuous improvement cycle.
Cost of Course Materials

Faculty: Course Material Assembly Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of all materials for a semester</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>30.28%</td>
<td>31.19%</td>
<td>20.18%</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of individual materials for a course</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>31.19%</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
<td>17.43%</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time needed to gather a list of course materials</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
<td>31.19%</td>
<td>33.94%</td>
<td>12.84%</td>
<td>10.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line availability</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
<td>18.35%</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
<td>29.36%</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print availability</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>28.70%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>20.37%</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access materials</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
<td>27.52%</td>
<td>27.52%</td>
<td>20.18%</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library access</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>17.59%</td>
<td>31.48%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost of Course Materials

Undergrad: Considerations when Registering for a Course

- Total cost of all materials for a semester: 17.69% (Not at all important), 23.01% (Slightly important), 26.06% (Moderately important), 15.03% (Very important), 15.29% (Extremely important), 2.93% (Does not apply)
- Cost of individual materials for a course: 17.47% (Not at all important), 23.07% (Slightly important), 25.87% (Moderately important), 16.13% (Very important), 14.80% (Extremely important), 2.67% (Does not apply)
- On-line availability: 23.14% (Not at all important), 18.75% (Slightly important), 22.47% (Moderately important), 18.35% (Very important), 12.90% (Extremely important), 4.39% (Does not apply)
- Print availability: 20.53% (Not at all important), 17.73% (Slightly important), 23.47% (Moderately important), 20.00% (Very important), 14.00% (Extremely important), 4.27% (Does not apply)
- Availability of other editions: 29.24% (Not at all important), 21.23% (Slightly important), 22.96% (Moderately important), 14.55% (Very important), 6.68% (Extremely important), 5.34% (Does not apply)
- Ability to share course materials: 23.40% (Not at all important), 18.45% (Slightly important), 22.19% (Moderately important), 19.79% (Very important), 10.70% (Extremely important), 5.48% (Does not apply)
- Library access: 20.81% (Not at all important), 15.03% (Slightly important), 20.67% (Moderately important), 19.46% (Very important), 18.39% (Extremely important), 5.64% (Does not apply)
Please rate the importance of the following when you are registering for a course:
Access to Collections in Ivy

Requested materials from LEO/ILL

- Undergrad: 10.00%
- Grad: 40.00%
- Faculty: 70.00%
Access to Collections in Ivy

- Based on the survey, we project that 64% of Undergrads (~9,500) may need access to physical materials in any given year.

- Currently, according to survey, 12% of Undergrads (~1900) indicate that they have used LEO/ILL.

- These means that there will likely be an increased demand for resources to support Ivy requests—both for staffing and user training.
Total Checkouts Ivy and Ald

70,484

3,234

Ald

Ivy
Grad-Primary Library

- Alderman: 40%
- Browne SEL: 10%
- Clemons: 6%
- LDCC: 8%
- Fine Arts: 9%
- Health Sciences: 5%
- Music: 2%
- Physics: 2%
- Law: 1%
- Math: 1%
- No primary: 7%
- Primarily online: 9%

Plot Area
Faculty-Primary Library

- Alderman: 47%
- Primarily online: 11%
- No Primary: 6%
- Physics: 3%
- Math: 5%
- Fine Arts: 6%
- LDCC: 8%
- Clemons: 4%
- Brown SEL: 10%
Undergrad-Space Enhancement

Undergrad: Your ability to study, create, or to do research would be enhanced with more:

- Varied seating options: 562
- Places for charging your device: 551
- Natural light: 520
- Individual study space: 496
- Collaborative spaces: 465
- Write-able surfaces: 420
- Resting/napping areas: 418
- Quiet spaces: 417
- Conversational spaces: 365
Grad-Space Enhancement

Grad: Your ability to study, create, or to do research would be enhanced with more:

- Access to physical content...
  - 98
- Natural light
  - 33
- Quiet spaces (designated...)
  - 29
- Varied seating options (e.g.)
  - 24
- Individual study space (e.g.)
  - 24
- Places for charging your...
  - 22
- Places for office hours
  - 21
- Collaborative spaces (group)
  - 20
- Presentation practice space
  - 20
- Resting/napping areas
  - 20
Grad Students Left Behind

Overall Satisfaction 2016-2017

- Grad: 2016: 4.1, 2017: 4.3
- Faculty: 2016: 4.15, 2017: 4.3
## Grad Students Left Behind

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>10.67%</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>7.93%</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>38.33%</td>
<td>38.67%</td>
<td>20.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>49.78%</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>61.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grad Students Left Behind

• Strong dissatisfaction is not reflected in measured satisfaction with individual services. Need to find the source(s) of discontent.

• While intense users of library services, they do not share the high satisfaction with the library that faculty do. Need to find the disconnect between use and satisfaction.

• Next steps: Begin treating grad students as a separate constituency, not simply as an extension of faculty or undergrads. Research how graduate students are different and modify next year’s survey and user research efforts accordingly.
Professional Research Staff

- Have not been surveyed before.
- Includes Research Associates (Postdocs), and Senior Professional Research Staff (Research Scientists, Senior Scientists and Principal Scientists).
- Respondents primarily in School of Medicine, Arts & Sciences (in the science departments), and Engineering (but with a handful in Curry).
- We only used the non-SOM responses (52) for this analysis.
## PRS similar to Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>PRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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PRS - Primary Library

- Alderman: 34%
- Astronomy: 2%
- Brown: 23%
- Clemons: 14%
- LDCC: 5%
- Physics: 5%
- HSL: 4%
- Darden: 2%
- on-line: 2%
- No primary: 5%

University of Virginia Library