University Libraries Faculty Scholarship

University Libraries

2015

# Internal Customer Service Assessment of Cataloging, Acquisitions, and Library Systems [Presentation]

Kate Latal
*University at Albany, State University of New York*, klatal@albany.edu

Rebecca L. Mugridge
*University at Albany, State University of New York*, rmugridge@albany.edu

Nancy M. Poehlmann
*University at Albany, State University of New York*, npoehlmann@albany.edu

Wendy L. West
*University at Albany, State University of New York*, wwest@albany.edu

# Internal Customer Service Assessment of Cataloging, Acquisitions, and Library Systems

Kate Latal, Rebecca L. Mugridge, Nancy Poehlmann, and Wendy West

SUNYLA

June 4, 2015

# University at Albany Libraries

* 12,950 undergraduate students
* 4,650 graduate students
* Technical Services and Library Systems supports three libraries on two campuses:
  * University Library (Uptown campus)
  * Science Library (Uptown campus)
  * Dewey Graduate Library (Downtown campus)

# Technical Services and Library Systems Division

* Acquisitions Services
* Catalog Management Services
* Cataloging Services
* Library Systems

# Customer service survey goals

* Gauge overall satisfaction with Division and Department customer service
* Identify areas for process improvement

# Additional benefits

* Learn new information
* Corroborate perceptions
* Improve communication with customers
* Improve ongoing customer relations
* Support change, funding requests, and further assessment efforts
* Identify service gaps

# Who are our customers?

* External:
  * Faculty
  * Staff
  * Students
  * Local residents
* Internal
  * All library employees, *including everyone in the Division: we're all customers of each other*

# Some research on internal customers

* A positive organizational climate correlates with customer perception of service quality (Jia and Reich)

* Superior service organizations survey and track internal customer service (Seibert and Lingle)

* Companies that rate highly in internal customer service are more likely to be industry leaders on key metrics like financial results, productivity, customer satisfaction and quality (Seibert and Schiemann)

# Potential concerns

* Will the survey be anonymous?
* What information will be shared?
* Will the survey be submitted for IRB approval?
* What information will be published?

# Survey design

* Introduction, including goals for conducting survey
* Five pages; one for each department and one general
* Department mission, name of department head
* Likert scale rating department on 12 factors
* Other common questions: communication, comfort in asking questions, suggestions for improvement or other feedback
* Questions pertinent to specific departments

# General questions

* Are you able to find specific staff offices in Technical Services and Library Systems (Rooms B34-B35)?
* If you found any of the questions confusing or unclear, please explain here:
* If there are questions that we should be asking but which are not on the survey please list them here:

# Planning

* May 2014: Discussed at Department Heads meeting
* June 2014: Discussed at Division meeting; shared draft
* July 2014: Shared draft with Library Administration
* August 2014: Submitted IRB application
* September 5, 2014: Received IRB approval
* September 12, 2014: Survey deployed
* October 6, 2014: Survey closed with 52 completed

# Results

* 50% response rate
* In most cases, responses indicated 80% or higher satisfaction with our services (Likert scale)
* Department heads will be working with the survey results to identify areas that need attention or further investigation

# New information

* People don't always know who we are
* Our documentation is sometimes hard to find
* Sometimes people aren't comfortable asking for help
* Sometimes we're perceived as unapproachable
* Not everyone was aware that we had significantly shrunk the cataloging backlog

# Corroboration of anecdotal reports

* People are happy that we're now batchloading cataloging records into Minerva (both ad hoc and for e-journals)
* No one likes paper forms
* Our processes are perceived by some as inefficient
* Many don't understand the difference between Cataloging Services and Catalog Management Services
* Our help ticketing system (Footprints) needs work

# Improve communication with customers

* We received a lot of positive feedback about doing the survey
* Many thought such a survey could be useful to other library departments
* By conducting the survey and following up on the feedback received, we hope that our customers understand that we are open to feedback and we will address issues and concerns

# Customer relations

* Sharing results with each Division of the library
* Departments are continuing to mine the survey for process improvement suggestions and other feedback
* May follow up with further assessment efforts (e.g., focus groups on a specific topic)
* Future customer service surveys (perhaps biannual?)
* We are always open to feedback or suggestions

# Support change, funding requests, or further assessment efforts

* Look at how we can streamline procedures
* Seek funding to purchase MARC records for electronic or microform collections
* Focus groups to assess specific areas (Footprints?)

# Identify service gaps

* Improve our reporting on Division activities
* Identify un- or under-cataloged collections
* Create maps for our Division offices

# Additional feedback

* Our area is a maze to some staff outside the Division
* It would have been good to have a "somewhat satisfied" option
* Some organizational climate issues were raised

# Themes

* We could do a little better on:
  * Efficiency
  * Communication
  * Procedures and documentation
  * Follow through

# Reactions from division staff

* Enthusiasm about doing the survey
* Surprise about some of the results
* Determination to address issues that were raised

# Actions taken in response to the survey

* Work within the department to identify actions to be taken; record ideas
* Develop a plan; set priorities
* Review of workflows, e.g., electronic resources workflow
* Implementation of online order form for e-resources
* Developing maps for Division offices
* Moving most of our web content to public sites

# Next steps

* Departments will continue to work with survey results to identify areas for improvement
* Department Heads will prioritize areas for improvement, consulting with appropriate stakeholders
* Identify areas that need further assessment
* Improve communication (e.g., Division newsletter with project and other updates)
* Consider hosting a Division Open House

# Conclusion

* Customer service assessment was worthwhile for us, met our goals, and provided numerous benefits
* We plan to repeat the survey every 2-3 years
* Survey instrument is available at: http://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/ulib_fac_scholar/35/ . Feel free to use or modify!
* Share your experiences through publication or presentation

# Questions?

* Kate Latal: klatal@albany.edu
* Rebecca Mugridge: rmugridge@albany.edu
* Nancy Poehlmann: npoehlmann@albany.edu
* Mike Sweeney: msweeney2@albany.edu
* Wendy West: wwest@albany.edu

# Citations

* Ronnie Jia and Blaize Horner Reich, "IT Service Climate: An Essential Managerial Tool to Improve Client Satisfaction with IT Service Quality," *Information Systems Management* 28:2 (2011): 174-179.

* Jerry Seibert and John Lingle, "Internal Customer Service: Has It Improved?" *Quality Progress* 40:3 (2007): 35-40.

* Jerry H. Seibert and William A. Schiemann, "Power to the People," *Quality Progress* 43:4 (2010):24-30.