

## SECTION I: UNIT INFORMATION

---

<b>Annual Report Year</b>	2023-24	<b>Contact Person</b>	Julene Jones
<b>Unit</b>	Libraries	<b>Email Address</b>	<a href="mailto:julene.jones@uky.edu">julene.jones@uky.edu</a>
<b>Reports To</b>	Dean Doug E. Way, Libraries		
<b>Mission</b>	The mission of the University of Kentucky Libraries is to ignite the human drive to discover, create, and connect by facilitating access to information, empowering learners, and collaborating with our communities to advance knowledge, enhance scholarship, and preserve the history and culture of the Commonwealth. Discover. Create. Connect. (2021)		
<b>Description of Services Provided</b>	Online and print collections and resources, reference and research consultation assistance, information literacy on-off classes and trainings, interlibrary loan, individual and group study spaces.		
<b>Populations Served</b> (e.g., Online, Off-campus, Faculty)	All campus, including online and off-campus UK affiliates, students, staff, and faculty. Also includes community patrons.		
<b>Last updated</b>	5/20/23 jlj		

## SECTION II: OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

Complete the table for each outcome the unit will assess during the current cycle. At least 1 outcome should align with the 2021 University Strategic Plan; the Strategic Plan objective(s) to which a given outcome aligns should be specified in the space provided below the field containing the outcome statement. The University Strategic Plan goals and objectives are provided in Appendix I. During the planning phase, the unit should specify the measure(s) that will be used to assess each outcome, a target for each measure, and the year(s) for which data will be (or have been) collected and reported as part of the current cycle. During the reporting phase, a summary of results, interpretation of results, and any actions planned in response to the results should be provided for each measure. The unit will be asked to provide a reflection on any actions taken as part of the current cycle at the end of the following year.

Outcome #1 Statement:		Students identify the Library as influential in their successful academic performance. (direct and indirect)					
Strategic Plan Objective(s) Aligned with (e.g., 2.1)		UK Strategic Plan Principle SF2					
Measure	Measurement (Measurement should include the process, the tools, and resources planned to measure the outcome/objective)	Target (Target should be directly related to the measurement)	Year(s) Assessed (e.g., AY 2021-22, Calendar Year 2021) Including who is responsible for this assessment	Results (Description of results)	Interpretation of Results (Include whether the target was met or unmet, what this means for the unit, when metrics will be reassessed, and next steps)	Actions Planned (Description of actions planned or enhancements that will occur in response to results. Include any budgetary considerations)	Reflection on Past Action Planned (Evidence that planned actions occurred. Descriptions of effectiveness of actions at improving operations and efficiencies)
1.1	LibQUAL+ (General Satisfaction Question 2 (GS-2): "In general, I am <b>satisfied with library support</b> for my learning, research and/or teaching needs"), responses from on- and off-campus undergraduate and graduate students	LibQUAL+: GS-2 scores $\geq$ previous instrument implementation(s)	FY24 (Julene Jones, Director of Library Assessment))			LibQUAL+ will be run again in FY24.	
1.2	LibQUAL+ (UK Selected Question 5, (UK-5): "The <b>library assists me in achieving academic success,</b> " responses from on- and off-campus undergraduate and graduate students	LibQUAL+: UK-5 service adequacy gap mean scores $\geq$ previous instrument implementation(s)	FY24 (Julene Jones)			LibQUAL+ will be run again in FY24.	
1.3	Library Satisfaction Survey (LSS) question (Q14) " <b>How important have UK Libraries been in your academic success?</b> ", relevant on- and	Combined "very important" and "somewhat important" responses from students on this question $\geq$ previous implementations	Survey ran fall 2022 (Julene Jones)	This question was not asked in previous Library Satisfaction Surveys. In 2022 89.4% of total student respondents (n=339) perceive the library to be "very important" or	The non-statistically significant results from this survey indicate that both undergraduate and graduate students	The Library Satisfaction Survey will be run again in FY26 to continue	Continue to strive for improvement in student satisfaction with Libraries by assessing and meeting

off-campus undergraduate and graduate student mean responses		(LibQUAL+ instrument does not ask a similar question about the <u>importance</u> of libraries in users' academic success)	"somewhat important" to their academic success; 88.4% of undergraduate respondents (n=301) rated the importance of UKL in their academic success as "very important" (67.4%) or "somewhat important" (20.9%); 97.4% of graduate students (n=38); (76.3% v. impt; 21% somewhat impt.)	<u>strongly</u> correlate their use of UKL with their academic success.  More data is needed for comparison; the next Library Satisfaction Survey will be run in FY26.	to monitor this perception.	student needs for resources, spaces, services.
--------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------------------------

<b>Outcome #2 Statement:</b>		Students will identify, locate, evaluate, and use appropriate information in their research. (indirect, <i>direct to be determined</i> )					
<b>Strategic Plan Objective(s) Aligned with</b> (e.g., 2.1)							
Measure	Measurement	Target	Year(s) Assessed	Results	Interpretation of Results	Actions Planned	Reflection on Past Action Planned
2.1	LibQUAL+: each of the five information literacy outcomes (ILO) questions, on- and off-campus undergraduate and graduate student mean scores  ILO-1: <b>The library helps me stay abreast of developments in my field(s)</b> of interest.  ILO-2: <b>The library aids my advancement in my academic discipline or work.</b>  ILO-3: <b>The library enables me to be more efficient in my academic pursuits or work.</b>  ILO-4: <b>The library helps me distinguish between trustworthy and untrustworthy information.</b>  ILO-5: <b>The library provides me with the information</b>	LibQUAL+ ILO scores $\geq$ scores in previous implementation(s)	FY24 (Julene Jones)			Increase outreach to LibQUAL+ will be run again in FY24	

	skills I need in my work or study.						
2.2	Students will learn information literacy and research skills and about using library resources through online and/or in-person instruction, workshops, and consultations	Increase number of participants by 2% annually (using counts from ARL, IPEDS #65, Canvas Information Literacy course participation and mean score on skills assessment)	Annually monitored by Library Educational Services Unit (Stacey Greenwell, Coordinator) and by incoming Liaison Coordinator; data collected in LibInsight by Julene Jones				

<b>Outcome #3 Statement:</b>		Library users can easily identify and access information resources provided by the Library for their educational and research needs. (indirect)					
<b>Strategic Plan Objective(s) Aligned with (e.g., 2.1)</b>							
Measure	Measurement	Target	Year(s) Assessed	Results	Interpretation of Results	Actions Planned	Reflection on Past Action Planned
3.1	LibQUAL+: questions IC-2, IC-6, IC-7, aggregated and disaggregated service adequacy gap mean scores by user type  IC-2 A <b>library website</b> enabling me to locate information on my own  IC-6 Easy-to-use <b>access tools</b> that allow me to find things on my own  IC-7 Making <b>information easily accessible</b> for independent use	UKL LibQUAL+ IC-2, IC-6 and IC-7 ≥ previous instrument implementation(s) and IC-2, IC-6 and IC-7 perceived scores ≥ minimum scores (i.e., positive service adequacy gap mean scores)  That is, a negative service adequacy gap mean score indicates that the perceived value is less than the minimum acceptable value; that UKL is not meeting the minimum expectations held by that respondent group.	FY24 (Julene Jones)			LibQUAL+ will be run again in FY24.	

3.2	Library Satisfaction Survey (LSS) question "How easy is it for you to access the Libraries' information resources (print or online)? (1 star = very difficult; 5=very easy)", mean responses from overall respondents and all respondent groups	Mean scores on Q17a (the relevant LSS measure) ≥ previous implementations, where applicable	Survey ran fall 2022 (Julene Jones)	This question was not asked in previous Library Satisfaction Surveys. In 2022 (Q17a) overall respondents rated their access ease on a 5-point scale at a 4.17 (disaggregated data: undergraduates: 4.17; graduate students: 4.23; faculty: 3.93)	The non-statistically significant results from this survey indicate that all respondent groups report an overall access ease score of 83% (or 4.17 out of 5); undergraduates report the same value; graduates an 84.6% and faculty members a 78.6%.	Open Athens will replace EZProxy in summer 2023, allowing additional patrons electronic resource access.  The Library Satisfaction Survey will be run again in FY26.	Continue to seek out and implement improvements for accessing library resources.
3.3	Continuous improvements in library discovery systems, Library website / UX	Announced / documented enhancement(s) to the Library website, or to access or discovery systems via WAG, ILS committee and/or systems librarian as well as ILS & WAG annual reports	Annually (Web Administration Group (WAG) Town Hall reports / Dean's update emails, Integrated Library Systems (ILS) committee annual report & emails from Systems Librarian or Library Discovery Systems Coordinator)				

<b>Outcome #4 Statement:</b>		Library personnel provide sufficient and courteous research support throughout the research lifecycle for all users. (direct and indirect)					
<b>Strategic Plan Objective(s) Aligned with (e.g., 2.1)</b>		UK Strategic Plan Principle I13					
Measure	Measurement	Target	Year(s) Assessed	Results	Interpretation of Results	Actions Planned	Reflection on Past Action Planned
4.1	LibQUAL+: overall <i>Affect of Service</i> dimension scores, aggregated and disaggregated service adequacy gap mean by user type AS-1 Employees who instill confidence in users	Overall UKL LibQUAL+ <i>Affect of Service</i> service adequacy gap mean scores ≥ previous instrument implementation(s) and/or ≥ previous adequacy gap percentile from ARL normative scores; UKL	FY24 (Julene Jones)			LibQUAL+ will be run again in FY24.	

	<p>AS-2 Giving users individual attention</p> <p>AS-3 Employees who are consistently courteous</p> <p>AS-4 Readiness to respond to users' questions</p> <p>AS-5 Employees who have the knowledge to answer user questions</p> <p>AS-6 Employees who deal with users in a caring fashion</p> <p>AS-7 Employees who understand the needs of their users</p> <p>AS-8 Willingness to help users</p> <p>AS-9 Dependability in handling users' service problems</p>	<p>LibQUAL+ perceived scores <math>\geq</math> minimum scores (i.e., positive service adequacy gap mean scores)</p> <p>That is, a negative service adequacy gap mean score indicates that the perceived value is less than the minimum acceptable value; that UKL is not meeting the minimum expectations held by that respondent group.</p>					
4.2	<p>Library Satisfaction Survey (LSS) relevant results regarding research support. In FY23 these questions were:</p> <p>Q15 How easy has it been for you to obtain library research assistance when you needed it? (with option to add comments in Q16);</p> <p>Q19 Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the following items or library services? (with option to add comments in Q20)</p>	<p>Notable aggregated and disaggregated mean scores on Q15, Q19 a, b, c, e, j, &amp; Q22 (the relevant LSS measures with FY23 numbering) <math>\geq</math> previous implementations, where applicable, as well as comments from Q16 and Q20</p> <p>{FY23 questions mapping of 2022 instrument vs 2013 instrument:</p> <p>15 vs 24c</p> <p>19a vs 14a</p> <p>19b vs 24a, 24b</p> <p>19c vs 14e</p>	Instrument ran fall 2022 (Julene Jones)	<p>The 2013 Library Satisfaction Survey asked these two similar questions to the 2022 survey:</p> <p>(Q14) Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with... each of the following resources, facilities, or services that the library provides (scale of 1-5)</p> <p>(a) Information Services/Reference</p> <p>(b) Library instruction / information sessions</p> <p>(e) Subject or branch librarian for your department or college</p> <p>(Q24) "Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with... the service you receive from library employees (scale of 1-5):</p> <p>(a) Competence / knowledge of library employees</p>	<p>The non-statistically significant results from this survey indicate that respondents to the survey that did use the Libraries in any way are highly satisfied with the support they receive from the Libraries.</p> <p>However, little is known about specific services that they, that other users who did not respond to the survey much less what non-users of the Libraries would like us to add.</p> <p>See 2022 Library Satisfaction Survey report for additional information</p>	<p>Suggested library-related topics for instructional sessions or trainings were sent to the Libraries' Educational Outreach Coordinator.</p> <p>The librarians who host the Research Workshop Series are considering conducting a needs assessment per a meeting they had with the Director of Library Assessment in May 2023.</p>	<p>The Library Satisfaction Survey will be run again in 2026 to continue to obtain input from additional library users as well as non-users.</p>

	<p>(a) Assistance from library employees at a library service desk</p> <p>(b) Assistance from Reference personnel (via chat, email and/or face to face)</p> <p>(c) Assistance from the librarian for your subject or department</p> <p>(e) Library instruction session (in a course or on a topic)</p> <p>(j) Research Guides or Course Guides (aka LibGuides or library webpages for specific subjects or courses)</p> <p>Q22 Are there any library-related topics about which you would like the Libraries to provide training and/or support?</p>	<p>19e vs 14b</p> <p>19j n/a</p> <p>22 n/a}</p>		<p>(b) Courtesy of library employees</p> <p>(c) Speed of service</p> <p>Comparing the results on similar questions between the 2022 and 2013 instruments (see note at left for mapping):</p> <p>Speed of service, competency, and knowledge of library employees including those in information services / reference scored as being <u>highly satisfactory</u> for undergraduate, graduate and faculty member respondent groups in the 2013 and 2022 surveys, with the 2022 respondents indicating between 98 and 99% “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with assistance from Reference personnel, assistance at any service point and assistance from their academic liaison across all disaggregated respondent groups!</p> <p>The questions regarding subject / branch librarians and information or instruction sessions did not receive high response rates in 2013, but in 2022 between 97 and 98% “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with library instruction sessions across all disaggregated respondent groups!</p>			
<p><b>4.3</b></p>	<p>Track counts of reference transactions and consults by UKL employees in Association for Research Libraries (ARL) annual data</p>	<p>Trends in ARL index data for reference transactions are comparable to the level of University Review benchmark institutions</p>	<p>Annual data reported to ARL and ACRL/IPEDS data via LibInsight and quarterly reports (Julene Jones)</p>				

4.4	Digital Scholarship Lab construction in M. I. King Library	Digital Scholarship Unit is planned, constructed and functioning in FY24	Annual (Digital Scholarship Director, Jennifer Hootman)				
-----	------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Outcome #5 Statement:		Library users are satisfied with the collections provided by the Libraries for their educational, business, and research needs. (direct and indirect)					
Strategic Plan Objective(s) Aligned with (e.g., 2.1)		UK Strategic Plan Principles SF2 and II3					
Measure	Measurement	Target	Year(s) Assessed	Results	Interpretation of Results	Actions Planned	Reflection on Past Action Planned
5.1	<p>LibQUAL+: IC-1, IC-3, IC-4, IC-8, overall and disaggregated by user types, service adequacy gap mean scores</p> <p>IC-1 Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office</p> <p>IC-3 The printed library materials I need for my work</p> <p>IC-4 The electronic information resources I need</p> <p>IC-8 Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work</p>	<p>Select UKL IC LibQUAL+ service adequacy gap mean scores <math>\geq</math> previous instrument implementation(s); UKL LibQUAL+ perceived scores <math>\geq</math> minimum scores (i.e., positive service adequacy gap mean scores)</p> <p>That is, a negative service adequacy gap mean score indicates that the perceived value is less than the minimum acceptable value; that UKL is not meeting the minimum expectations held by that respondent group.</p>	FY24 (Julene Jones)		and print or e-journal collection).	LibQUAL+ will be run again in FY24.	
5.2	<p>Library Satisfaction Survey (LSS) relevant results</p> <p>In 2022 implementation, the relevant questions were numbered Q17 &amp; Q23:</p> <p>Q17 Please rate the following items (1-5): (a) How easy is it for you to access the Libraries'</p>	<p>Scores on Q17 a,b,c and Q23 (the relevant LSS items in 2022) <math>\geq</math> previous implementations, where applicable</p> <p>{FY23 questions mapping of 2022 instrument vs 2013 instrument: 17a n/a 17b vs 18b</p>	Fall 2022 (Julene Jones)	<p>The 2013 Library Satisfaction Survey asked these two similar questions to the 2022 survey: (Q18) Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with... each of the following resources, facilities, or services that the library provides (scale of 1-5)</p> <p>(a) <b>Online resources</b> (electronic books, e-journals, databases such as Academic Search</p>	The non-statistically significant results from this survey indicate that satisfaction with print and online resources <b>fell for overall respondents and for all disaggregated users groups</b> with the exception of a negligible increase in satisfaction for online resources by faculty members, which is easily explained by the difference in sample sizes.	The Collections Advisory Committee will review the suggested titles and research areas received from Q23 to consider additional purchases; the academic liaisons are being re-tasked with coordinated priorities. The impact on	These Library Satisfaction Survey questions were selected to obtain user perspectives on ease of access to collections, satisfaction with print and electronic resources and sought input on specific resources for purchase consideration.



	<p>information resources (print or online)? (1 = very difficult; 5=very easy);</p> <p>(b) How satisfied are you with the Libraries' <b>print resources</b>? (1 = very dissatisfied; 5=very satisfied);</p> <p>(c) How satisfied are you with the Libraries' <b>online or electronic resources</b> (e-books, journal articles, library databases)? (1 = very dissatisfied; 5=very satisfied)</p> <p>Q23 What are the titles of key resource(s) in your field(s) of study or area(s) of research that you suggest that the Libraries <i>consider</i> purchasing? If you would prefer these items in a specific format (i.e. print or electronic), please indicate that as well.</p>	<p>17c vs 18a 23 n/a}</p>		<p>Premier, JSTOR, ARTstor, Web of Science, etc.)</p> <p>(b) <b>Physical collections</b> (books, journals, microforms, DVDs, newspapers, etc.)</p> <p>There were no comparable questions asked in 2013 for 2022 questions 17a and 23.</p> <p>Comparing the results on similar questions between the 2022 and 2013 instruments (see note at left for mapping):</p> <p><b>Satisfaction with print collections</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2013 (n)</td> <td>2022 (n)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Overall</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.21 (2,146)</td> <td>3.89 (373)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Undergraduate</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.36 (812)</td> <td>3.92 (301)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Graduate students</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.17 (979)</td> <td>3.67 (43)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Faculty</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.97 (355)</td> <td>4.00 (16)</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Satisfaction with online resources</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2013 (n)</td> <td>2022 (n)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Overall</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.36 (2,775)</td> <td>4.26 (373)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Undergraduate</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.44 (1,041)</td> <td>4.32 (301)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Graduate students</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.36 (1,297)</td> <td>4.13 (43)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Faculty</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.20 (437)</td> <td>3.67 (16)</td> </tr> </table>	2013 (n)	2022 (n)	<u>Overall</u>		4.21 (2,146)	3.89 (373)	<u>Undergraduate</u>		4.36 (812)	3.92 (301)	<u>Graduate students</u>		4.17 (979)	3.67 (43)	<u>Faculty</u>		3.97 (355)	4.00 (16)	2013 (n)	2022 (n)	<u>Overall</u>		4.36 (2,775)	4.26 (373)	<u>Undergraduate</u>		4.44 (1,041)	4.32 (301)	<u>Graduate students</u>		4.36 (1,297)	4.13 (43)	<u>Faculty</u>		4.20 (437)	3.67 (16)	<p>For the questions that were not asked in 2013, the ease of access to the Libraries' information resources (17a), the data is displayed below. It appears that respondents overall found access for information resources relatively easy, though faculty member respondents experienced the most difficulty.</p> <p>Research collection areas and specific titles that were suggested by respondents to question 23 were forwarded to the Collections Advisory Committee.</p> <p><b>Satisfaction with ease of access</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><u>Overall</u></td> <td>4.17 (373)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Undergraduate</u></td> <td>4.17 (301)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Graduate students</u></td> <td>4.23 (43)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Faculty</u></td> <td>3.93 (16)</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Overall</u>	4.17 (373)	<u>Undergraduate</u>	4.17 (301)	<u>Graduate students</u>	4.23 (43)	<u>Faculty</u>	3.93 (16)	<p>satisfaction with print and online collections and access to them will continue to be monitored.</p> <p>The Library Satisfaction Survey will be run again in FY26.</p>	
2013 (n)	2022 (n)																																																		
<u>Overall</u>																																																			
4.21 (2,146)	3.89 (373)																																																		
<u>Undergraduate</u>																																																			
4.36 (812)	3.92 (301)																																																		
<u>Graduate students</u>																																																			
4.17 (979)	3.67 (43)																																																		
<u>Faculty</u>																																																			
3.97 (355)	4.00 (16)																																																		
2013 (n)	2022 (n)																																																		
<u>Overall</u>																																																			
4.36 (2,775)	4.26 (373)																																																		
<u>Undergraduate</u>																																																			
4.44 (1,041)	4.32 (301)																																																		
<u>Graduate students</u>																																																			
4.36 (1,297)	4.13 (43)																																																		
<u>Faculty</u>																																																			
4.20 (437)	3.67 (16)																																																		
<u>Overall</u>	4.17 (373)																																																		
<u>Undergraduate</u>	4.17 (301)																																																		
<u>Graduate students</u>	4.23 (43)																																																		
<u>Faculty</u>	3.93 (16)																																																		
<p>5.3</p>	<p>Track ILL usage, collection circulation and collection materials expenditures (ARL index data)</p>	<p>ARL index data indicates that collection circulation and collection materials expenditure trends are comparable to the level of University Review benchmark institutions</p>	<p>Annual (Julene Jones)</p>																																																

5.4	Library collections budget re-allocations made by AD or Collections Advisory Committee (CAC)	Collection budget allocations are revised relative to University departmental or curricular changes	Annual (Chair of Collections Advisory Committee in conjunction with AD for Education, Outreach and Research)				
-----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

<b>Outcome #6 Statement:</b>		The Library provides clean, inviting, and adequate space, conducive to study and research, with suitable environmental conditions and convenient hours for its services, personnel, resources, and collections. (direct and indirect)					
<b>Strategic Plan Objective(s) Aligned with (e.g., 2.1)</b>		UK Strategic Plan Principles II3 and MPOC3					
Measure	Measurement	Target	Year(s) Assessed	Results	Interpretation of Results	Actions Planned	Reflection on Past Action Planned
6.1	<p>LibQUAL+: <i>Library as Place</i> dimension service adequacy gap mean scores, aggregated and disaggregated by user types:</p> <p>LP-1 Library space that inspires study and learning</p> <p>LP-2 Quiet space for individual activities</p> <p>LP-3 A comfortable and inviting location</p> <p>LP-4 A getaway for study, learning, or research</p> <p>LP-5 Community space for group learning and group study</p>	Overall and disaggregated user group UKL LibQUAL+ Library as Place service adequacy gap mean scores $\geq$ previous instrument implementation(s) and/or $\geq$ previous service adequacy gap percentile from ARL normative scores; UKL LibQUAL+ perceived scores $\geq$ minimum scores (i.e., positive service adequacy gap scores)	FY24 (Julene Jones)			LibQUAL+ will be run again in FY24.	

<p><b>6.2</b></p>	<p>Library Satisfaction Survey (LSS) relevant results. In the 2022 implementation, this questions were numbered Q17:</p> <p>Please rate the following items (1-5):</p> <p>(d) How satisfied are you with the Libraries' facilities and/or study spaces? (1=very dissatisfied; 5=very satisfied)</p> <p>(e) How safe do you feel in the Libraries? (1=very unsafe; 5=very safe)</p> <p>(f) How welcome do you feel in the Libraries? (1=very unwelcome; 5=very welcome)</p>	<p>Scores on Q17 d, e, and f (the relevant 2022 LSS measures) ≥ previous implementations, where applicable</p> <p>{FY23 questions mapping of 2022 instrument vs 2013 instrument: 17d vs 22c 17e vs 22b 17f n/a</p>	<p>Fall 2022 (Julene Jones)</p>	<p>The 2013 Library Satisfaction Survey asked these two similar questions to the 2022 survey:</p> <p>(Q22) Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with... each of the following resources, facilities, or services that the library provides (scale of 1-5)</p> <p>(b) <b>Comfort and safety</b> (signage, climate control, lighting, seating, noise in designated quiet areas, security, etc.)</p> <p>(c) <b>Library spaces</b> (group study and collaborative spaces, individual study spaces, classrooms, The Hub, etc.)</p> <p>There were no comparable questions asked for 2022 question 17f regarding sense of welcome in 2013.</p> <p>Comparing the results on similar questions between the 2022 and 2013 instruments (see note at left for mapping):</p> <p><b>Perception of comfort and/or safety</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2013 (n)</td> <td>2022 (n)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Overall</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.28 (2,577)</td> <td>4.73 (373)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Undergraduate</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.34 (1,109)</td> <td>4.74 (301)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Graduate students</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.21 (1,145)</td> <td>4.74 (43)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Faculty</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.31 (323)</td> <td>4.69 (16)</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Satisfaction with library spaces</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2013 (n)</td> <td>2022 (n)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Overall</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.35 (2,442)</td> <td>4.48 (373)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Undergraduate</u></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	2013 (n)	2022 (n)	<u>Overall</u>		4.28 (2,577)	4.73 (373)	<u>Undergraduate</u>		4.34 (1,109)	4.74 (301)	<u>Graduate students</u>		4.21 (1,145)	4.74 (43)	<u>Faculty</u>		4.31 (323)	4.69 (16)	2013 (n)	2022 (n)	<u>Overall</u>		4.35 (2,442)	4.48 (373)	<u>Undergraduate</u>		<p>The non-statistically significant results from this survey indicate that overall respondents and all disaggregated user groups reported increasing satisfaction with library facilities and study spaces in 2020 than in 2013 with the <b>exception of graduate student users</b>. Overall respondents and all user groups, disaggregated, perceived library spaces to be more safe in 2020 than in 2013.</p> <p>For the question regarding sense of welcome (not asked in 2013), the data indicates that all user groups and overall users feel very welcome in library spaces:</p> <p><b>Sense of being welcome</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><u>Overall</u></td> <td>4.70 (373)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Undergraduate</u></td> <td>4.73 (301)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Graduate students</u></td> <td>4.56 (43)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Faculty</u></td> <td>4.56 (16)</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Overall</u>	4.70 (373)	<u>Undergraduate</u>	4.73 (301)	<u>Graduate students</u>	4.56 (43)	<u>Faculty</u>	4.56 (16)	<p>With the relocation of the microform readers in fall 2022 to the first floor of WTYL, this available space on the second floor of WTYL is going to be redeveloped into group study space.</p> <p>Though the security personnel employed in WTYL have been removed, then replaced with a single security officer, the impact on perception of safety has not decreased. (The security desk on the first floor of WTYL has become a Welcome Desk.)</p> <p>The Library Satisfaction Survey will be run again in FY26.</p>	<p>This survey intentionally included the opportunity for respondents to rate Library spaces (safety, atmosphere, resources, and collections).</p>
2013 (n)	2022 (n)																																								
<u>Overall</u>																																									
4.28 (2,577)	4.73 (373)																																								
<u>Undergraduate</u>																																									
4.34 (1,109)	4.74 (301)																																								
<u>Graduate students</u>																																									
4.21 (1,145)	4.74 (43)																																								
<u>Faculty</u>																																									
4.31 (323)	4.69 (16)																																								
2013 (n)	2022 (n)																																								
<u>Overall</u>																																									
4.35 (2,442)	4.48 (373)																																								
<u>Undergraduate</u>																																									
<u>Overall</u>	4.70 (373)																																								
<u>Undergraduate</u>	4.73 (301)																																								
<u>Graduate students</u>	4.56 (43)																																								
<u>Faculty</u>	4.56 (16)																																								

				4.41 (1,090) 4.54 (301) <u>Graduate students</u> 4.29 (1,085) 4.13 (43) <u>Faculty</u> 4.37 (267) 4.38 (16)			
6.3	Library Facilities List	Library Facilities List is maintained, documenting footprint of and renovations to libraries on campus, as well as collections in each location	Annually (Julene Jones)				
6.4	William T. Young Library Space Survey (ran 2/22-4/22) to evaluate library space in this facility	Users of the Young Library report that they are satisfied with WTYL user spaces, and perceive that they are welcome and safe within them.	Spring 2022 (Julene Jones)	Of those who responded to this question, 91% of undergraduates (n=66), 71% of graduate students (n=54) and 42% of faculty (n=16) reported that WTYL spaces currently met their needs.	Undergraduate and graduate student users are satisfied with WTYL spaces; faculty less so. All user groups report needs for building maintenance and prefer the addition of more individual and/or quiet spaces and enforcement of quiet study areas.  User groups prefer that individual study areas be created in existing spaces rather than any additional group study areas.	Results from WTYL space survey were presented to all library employees in April 2023.  PPD is replacing missing lightbulbs and addressing loose or non-functioning outlets. As a way to add additional seating options to WTYL, soft seating has been ordered for the 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor former PNM area (the same seating type as used in former copier alcoves). The Library Development Officer is working to see if donors would fund the furnishing of additional copy rooms into small study alcoves.	Consider additional space assessments in campus library locations.  Space assessment is proposed for Science and Engineering Library 4 floor space for fall 2024 or spring 2025.
6.5	Libraries' FY22 Strategic Initiative 2: Evaluate wayfinding in library spaces	FY22 Strategic Initiative 2 (SI 2): Improve wayfinding in library spaces based on user feedback from LibQUAL+	Calendar years 2022-2024 (possibly beyond); Strategic Initiative 2 Task Force (Shanna Wilbur, chair)				

**Notes**

The objectives upon which this Library Assessment Plan is based were selected from those developed as the ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education, available at <https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/standardslibraries>

LibQUAL+ normative ARL scores are only produced for the overall dimensions of Affect of Service, Library as Place and Information Control, so only apply here to Outcomes 4 & 6.

The Library Satisfaction Survey (LSS) is updated prior to each implementation, so questions may not be identical across implementations.

The LibQUAL+ Action Plan document is available here: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1tdr4Mp9YX2fzXnKP3OinNPFK2ILz1E-EREjrdeui3DE>

## APPENDIX I: UK STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

PUTTING STUDENTS FIRST	
<b>SF1</b>	Enhance & engage in a student-first ethos that inclusively embraces all students (e.g., full-time, part-time, transfer, non-traditional, international, etc.) utilizing an equity mindedness lens.
<b>SF2</b>	Expand on the existing foundation of a focused, intentional, purpose-driven curricular & co/extra-curricular exp. w/ state-wide & global relevance, led & fostered by faculty & staff excellence.
<b>SF3</b>	Further utilize the distinctive attribute of academic medical center & full range of academic colleges & offerings to enhance holistic student well-being as part of a comprehensive approach to support for our community, in connection w/ activities within the principle “Taking Care of Our People.”
<b>SF4</b>	Enhance our smart enrollment plan for econ. growth, workforce & societal devel. of Commonwealth — in alignment w/ CPE’s goals for educational attainment —reflecting diverse, complex world...
TAKING CARE OF OUR PEOPLE	
<b>OP1</b>	Enhance highest levels of holistic wellness for faculty, staff & students by expanding comprehensive, integrated structures to support working & learning environments where all may flourish & thrive.
<b>OP2</b>	Advance our transformational culture & environment where students, faculty & staff are enabled & inspired to flourish & thrive by experiencing meaning & engagement in work & learning.
<b>OP3</b>	Create a healthier Kentucky for a more diverse & better prepared workforce for tomorrow, in coordination w/ “Putting Students First” & “Inspiring Ingenuity” principles.
<b>OP4</b>	Expand & enhance the land-grant mission to entire campus community & leverage community-based resources to accelerate health, workforce, & econ. devel. across the Commonwealth
INSPIRING INGENUITY	
<b>II1</b>	Build upon our strengths in research & creative work to address a broader range of local, national & global challenges, the solutions to which will attract prosperity & well-being to Kentucky.
<b>II2</b>	Advance a culture of innovation in research, teaching & creative work that integrates disciplines &/or fields of study to address local, national & international challenges.
<b>II3</b>	Promote an agile research & creativity ecosystem that supports impactful, self-sustaining, & efficient research addressing present & future challenges facing our local, national & global communities.
ENSURING GREATER TRUST, TRANSPARENCY, & ACCOUNTABILITY	
<b>TTA1</b>	To ensure more responsive institution that can timely adapt when necessary, assess language & application of university policies to better define roles w/ respect to principle of shared governance...
<b>TTA2</b>	Empower effective decision-making at all levels by transparently utilizing resource-based budgeting approaches to support the university’s mission in alignment w/ the Strategic Plan & inst’l. values.
<b>TTA3</b>	Strengthen & expand orientation & training across all levels to promote compliance w/ university standards & processes grounded in UK’s institutional values, goals, & objectives.
<b>TTA4</b>	Develop additional programs & approaches to engaging, resonant communication w/ both internal & external audiences.
BRINGING TOGETHER MANY PEOPLE, ONE COMMUNITY	
<b>MPOC1</b>	Further recruit & retain diverse populations (students, faculty, staff) within all units on campus.
<b>MPOC2</b>	To create greater & direct partnerships between the university & communities throughout the Commonwealth on DEI-related matters.
<b>MPOC3</b>	To model & provide a hospitable, safe & inclusive env. acknowledging our past & creating opportunities for free & open exchange of ideas to all people of the Commonwealth, U.S. & world.
<b>MPOC4</b>	To broadly demonstrate & communicate the value of diversity of the UK campus to the Commonwealth & world to create more interaction & involvement b/t campus & communities on DEI matters.