SHALL National Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

1. **Introduction**

The SHALL Library Services Development Group (LSDG) initially recommended that there should be 6 national KPIs, which are listed below (with the option for services to choose either KPI 4 or KPI 5). The SHALL LSDG then undertook an extensive consultation process via an online questionnaire. 98 responses were recorded and the main comments are listed in section 2 under each individual KPI. 54% of respondents were happy with the KPIs.

As a result of the comments the KPIs have been re-considered and a list of new recommendations on each KPI has been developed. In addition users were asked about any additional KPIs that they would like to see (listed in section 2). The conclusion lists the new proposed KPI.

2. **Feedback on the 6 national KPIs and recommendations**

**KPI1. Percentage of the organisation’s workforce (headcount) which are “active* library users.**
(Indicates penetration of library service).

**KPI1 - COMMENTS:**

- I don't think the definition for "active" users will work as you would need to combine various usage reports on individual name basis for a variety of services (book circulation, literature searching, article requests, training etc). You can't isolate the one but to combine them all you would need some way of recording one individual’s usage of them all or agree to count multiple usage by the same person for a variety of services which wouldn't give a true picture of penetration as one user could use all of the services and others just the one.
- I think this is fair to include, but very hard to record. How do we capture people who are not library members and therefore don't borrow books, but who download a lot of full-text articles with their Athens account?
- immeasurable without a huge amount of work
- “Active user" is difficult to assess. Using our library management system, we can get figures for users who have borrowed books, but not figures for those who haven't borrowed books but placed ILLS, attended training, made an enquiry etc.
- Active users - how will this be assessed in most people’s LMS? I can see how many people I have registered and are still currently in membership, but not how many of them have borrowed a book in the last year. Anyway, printed book use is only one indicator when many use e-journals and library space to work in. Public library studies have shown that 33% of people visiting a library never actually do anything that registers their use of service such as making an enquiry or borrowing a book.
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- definition of "active", many users do not borrow books but still use other physical and virtual services, not possible to record these very effectively.
- almost impossible to do as we do not have one system that records all library activity, see comments re this on statistics consultation wiki.
- definition of active is required as does this refer to a "registered user" (who may never loan any material or interact with the service but has been "encouraged to register at induction) or someone who may use the library's study facilities but is unregistered. My concern is that there are too many differing definitions of active for this to be a worthwhile KPI. Also does not take into account the highly mobile student populations in our organisations.
- Active is going to be a nightmare to track. It is easy (for most) to say who borrowed. It gets more complicated when you need to factor in CAS. It gets impossible when you consider library as space or interaction beyond the walls of the library. Will need to be closely defined or we will not be comparing like with like. Complicated also by student access - we have large numbers of students on placement - how do we assess headcount?
- The first KPI is not reasonable for the geographically larger trusts - for example we have 4500 staff scattered over seven boroughs- this is a different set up to a hospital with 2000 staff within walking distance of the library. Also, this would require that we have a consistent way of deleting people (how long do they have to remain inactive?)
- What is a definition of an 'active' user? Libraries are used for place to study, use of pc's, browse journals , ILLs and may not want to borrow books. How can this be counted?

KPI1 -RECOMMENDATIONS:

A - Change KPI1 to the following statement:  
KPI1. Percentage of the organisation’s workforce (headcount) which are registered library members.  
(Indicates penetration / awareness of the library service).  
- Using “Registered Member” is a simple and clear measurement. This can be completed by the national statistical returns.

B - It is proposed the following additional KPI is also included:  
Percentage of the organisation’s workforce (headcount) which have registered as a library member in the last year.  
(Indicates level of penetration / awareness of the service in the last year)  
- Using “Registered Member” is a simple and clear measurement. Although new members are not asked for in the Annual statistics it should be easy to collect.
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KPI2. Percentage of the organisation’s workforce (headcount) which are registered ATHENS users.
(Indicates use of e-resources)
(E.g., 1000 Athens users in an organisation of 10,000 staff = 10% )

KPI2 - COMMENTS:

- I don't think percentage registrations of Athens actually reflect awareness of e-resources - some organisations automatically register all staff (or all staff from certain grades/groups). Usage of Athens by workforce might be better?
- I would like to see clarification on this one because registered could also include current, expired and non-activated accounts. These figures could also be manipulated for example if a library automatically registers users on induction.
- I don't want to exclude No 2 but modify it to read 'active' Athens users. It's no good just being aware of the e-resources they need to be users too.
- How would this work for organisations whose ATHENS registered users aren't necessarily employed by them (e.g. GPs)? Also, can be easily manipulated by automatic ATHENS registration of all new library members (which doesn't necessarily lead to better ATHENS usage, but does lead to a lot more admin work).
- Needs further definition - of information consultancy and is difficult to measure unless it is a sample - is that what is being proposed here?
- why are only registrations counted rather than usage? Should the usage of the resources be measured as with 1?
- Targeting Athens registration is too easily gamed. I can register everyone if I can be bothered. Needs to be an element around use. Student issue again - if you register students on placement they appear as "your" users - what does this do to headcount for some?
- registered Athens users doesn't mean anything, certainly not awareness of e resources. Many are registered automatically at induction. They would need to be "active" to be meaningful.
- The second one is vulnerable to gaming as it assumes that people are self registered - they don't have to be (and the Hall report called for everyone to be registered)
- what level of activity is there, registration isn't always followed by usage.

KPI2 - RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. Change KPI2 to the following statement:

KPI2. Percentage of the organisation’s workforce (headcount) which have used ATHENS in the last year.

Athens administrators suggest this is reasonably easy, and SHALL can issue instructions. This can also be provided by ATHENS administrator or individual organisations.
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KPI3. Re-current expenditure commitment on library services based on the organisation's workforce (WTE).
(Indicates Trust commitment to Library Services).
(E.g., £100,000 spent on Library services in a Trust of 10,000 staff = £10 is spent on library services per WTE)

KPI 3 - COMMENTS:

- KPI 3 is not a performance indicator. It is an input measure, not a measure of how the library is performing.
- Is this something that duplicates effort with the National Statistical Return as we are asked to provide number of registered user, income and expenditure - we could just all organisations workforce wte to that? I would also like to have more clarification on what is defined as the user base.
- As a significant proportion of NHS library funding is derived by educational levies and is thus "targeted" I feel this figure may not be an accurate measure.
- The third one is unsuitable because it assumes that only one library service works for each Trust - we have three different library suppliers.
- Some very successful services have low levels of funding, alternatively small trusts can be keen users of knowledge and have higher funding. What does this really tell us about performance in either case?

KPI3 - PROPOSED CHANGES:

A. Retain KPI3 as an indicator of Trust commitment to Library services.

This can be completed by the national statistical returns.

KPI4. Number of information consultancy enquiries per member of staff based on the organisation's workforce (WTE).
(Indicates penetration level of Library enquiries on the organisation).
(E.g., 400 enquiries in an organisation with 1,000 staff = a penetration level of 0.4)

KPI 3 - COMMENTS:

- Enquiries - what is definition of 'information consultancy enquiries'? would need a tight definition for this to be meaningful in terms of benchmarking.
- Please define "information consultancy". We collect statistics on literature searching but not every information type enquiry, most enquiries are from a small percentage of the workforce and often from regular users so I’m not sure how this would then prove penetration as the figures could be skewed.
- What are the definitions “information consultancy enquiries” mean? Must it be a request for literature search, or simply ‘how much is the photocopy charge’?
- I’m not sure that this indicates penetration as queries may arise for a variety of reasons. The term information consultancy needs definition.
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- I have concerns over stats collection in this area. Looking at the figures in SHALL returns they vary so wildly that it cannot be the case that people are comparing like with like.
- The fourth one is unsuitable because it assumes that the different types of care (primary, hospital and mental health) all have the same rate of needing library services. This is not an accurate assumption.
- Depends on what you mean by information consultancy - should literature searches be separated from general information enquires at the counter?
- Do you mean information consultancy (literature searches) work AND enquiries (which are reported separately on NHS Stats returns, or just what was formally known as literature searches?

KPI 3 - RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Change KPI3 to the following statement:
   KPI4. Number of information Mediated searches per member of staff based on the organisation's workforce (WTE).
   (Indicates penetration level of Library enquiries on the organisation).
   (E.g., 400 enquiries in an organisation with 1,000 staff = a penetration level of 0.4)

B. Use the Definitions for Mediated and assisted searches used in the Costings and Statistics work

- A mediated searching service is defined as a service where library staff undertake literature searches on behalf of users.
- A search is a distinct question or information need for which any number of databases or other resources may be consulted.
- If you search multiple databases consecutively to answer the question then count as 1 search; count a supplementary or follow up search requested by the user as a new search.

KPI5. Percentage of the organisation's workforce (headcount) that subscribe to current awareness services.
(Indicates penetration level of current awareness services on the organisation).

KPI5 - COMMENTS:

- KPI5 There are many different forms, methods and sources of current awareness services. It would be difficult to get accurate figures which truly reflect activities. Additional skills like personal IT competence would need to be factored in.
- Problem with interpretation around number 5 - we have a subscription list for our current awareness bulletin but we also send the bulletin out in a Trust newsletter that goes to all staff. Our "subscriber" numbers are relatively low but our "penetration" is high.
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- number 5 would be difficult to count as when users sign up they are signing to web based services not necessarily done by library staff
- I do think KPI5 perhaps needs more definition – does this mean library current awareness services only or external CA services that the library service has signposted people to? (Also, if services are (for example) blogging their CA service it may not be possible to measure uptake, but I guess this is why it’s optional.)
- Current awareness - what does this included? zetoc etc or just library produced? if zetoc - how measure?
- I’m really unsure on how this would work. Does the current awareness include the national resource alerts such as ZeTOC and database search alerts? We automatically subscribe new users to the library blog, but that doesn’t mean we’ve penetrated the organisation well as they may just delete them!
- How could you measure this? If a member of staff signs up for a newsfeed from an online service that the Library contributes to the Library Service itself is unaware. Our "paper" bulletins are uploaded onto our Intranet site and although we can measure page hits, we would not know who has accessed them. I'm sure other libraries will disseminate their CA in similar ways.
- There is no real way to know what current awareness services our users are subscribed to. For example, users might use services such as Netvibes and read a number of RSS feeds from medical journals, perhaps by copying modules from the library Netvibes pages, but we would have no way of knowing this. Alternatively, we could encourage users in setting up their 'My Library' pages on the NHS Health Information Resources site with a range of RSS feeds, but there is no way of recording the actual usage.
- Can’t agree with KPI 5. Users don’t necessarily request for libraries’ CA service, or can by-pass libraries easily (e.g. setting up an auto search alerts from a databases paid for by libraries).
- My only quibble is that with the advent of RSS feeds and other technology, users don't subscribe to CAS in the old way, so percentages won't really work
- current awareness services are more relevant to libraries for managers than for Acute Trust libraries
- We are looking at setting up complex web-based CAS which will make it difficult to identify users as belonging to our catchment area or to count as individuals.
- I think we should exclude indicator 5. Not all library services may offer current awareness as a stand alone 'product' or 'service' that can be measured and indentified as such.
- I think it would be better to measure percentage of the workforce that have received information skills training. If trained well many people will retain the skills and do not require annual training. By taking the percentage of overall staff who have attended training it will be easier to see how many staff remain untrained/aware of information literacy skills. There is a danger in measuring only one years activity that you either over estimate the impact due to the same keen core users repeating training yearly, or that you under
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estimate those organisations who have successfully up-skilled their staff to the point where they are able to perform without additional training.

KPI5 – RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Do not use this KPI

KPI6. Percentage of organisation's workforce (headcount) which have received information skills training in one year.
(Indicates penetration of information skills/information literacy training on organisation).

KPI 6 - COMMENTS:

- 6 may be a little meaningless as cumulative training activity is important too?
- Training - positive evaluations would also be helpful - in terms of quality rather than quantity. [Too difficult to define, measure].
- This would be easy for us to provide statistics for planned training, as long as we could count the same person on different training courses. My only concern is that releasing staff for training (not just library) is a major issue and you can't force people to come for training so is this KPI a bit dangerous in that we could provide lots of training but we just can't get people through the door to it. Also we provide alternative training through leaflets/guides, phone/ad-hoc advice so would this be included or only the formal sessions?
- Information skills is becoming less relevant and will undermine library services performance statistics if quantified. Re-current expenditure is important but funding could be reviewed based on WTE figures and undermine investment to meet LQAF standards
- I would query 6, since some staff may choose to use e-learning instead (such as the North East's Pillars VLE: www.pillarsvle.net)
- 6 surely this figure would vary widely depending on whether the staff turnover is high (e.g. a high turnover organisation would be constantly training thus having much higher figures)
- What counts as IS training - showing a new user how to use the catalogue? Some of our most active new users are students on placement where it is the university's responsibility to provide IS training. Libraries who can have a slot on the corporate induction programme will get decent percentages, the rest of us will have embarrassingly low results.
- the variability in information skills and how it meets organisational needs means that this is an unreliable KPI as a significant group of NHS staff may not require information skills training, however a smaller group may need all or many elements of an information skills training programme.
- A better measurement would be how many literature searches are conducted by members of the organisation, as this measures the effect of training. Further- do staff who receive training at Universities (as they do EBM courses) count towards the KPI?
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- Numbers attending training is in sharp decline as external factors (cost of releasing staff, reduction in staff undertaking further study etc) are influencing this. The library service can only do a small amount to influence this so it might prove detrimental to the perception of the value of library services which I don’t think we want to do.

KPI6 – RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Change KPI3 to the following statement:

KPI6. Number of user education sessions offered per member of staff based on the organisation's workforce (WTE).
(30 sessions offered in a trust of 1,000 staff =

KPI7. Percentage compliance with the Library Quality Assurance Framework (LQAF).
(Indicates level of quality).

KP17 - COMMENTS:

- KPI7 – does this mean percentage fully compliant? And will it exclude “not applicable” criteria?
- LQAF compliance - is overall percentage meaningful? Are LQAf figures not already being maintained centrally? [Yes – wouldn’t require any work for Trust staff]
- I thought that the LQAF was an improvement tool and not an accreditation tool so I’m not sure whether this would be a good KPI.
- LQAF - If the KPI regime is to be understood by stakeholders with no library background then it must be simple an easily understandable, The LQAF is not a concept that can be grasped easily by non librarians. In addition LQAF has 274 criteria - effectively this would mean adding another 274 KPIs to the other 6. A bureaucrat's dream - at last we would spend more time completing forms about achieving KPIs than we would delivering services that would produce the performance by which we will actually be judged by our peers. The concept of the LQAF is fine as an internal benchmarking exercise for libraries but it is far to complicated and is in danger of being a make work for people who don’t want to get on with the real job.
- Is this compliance with applicable standards or all standards?
- Why is the LQAF included here again - these KPIs feel like they are about SHALL measuring library services rather than linking back to organisational goals. If only 7 out of 10 SHA's have chosen to submit the LQAF is Question 7 a universal question.
- LQAF. Bearing in mind previous national initiatives such as NSF, LQAF might not be around for long enough for multi year comparison
- What is meant by compliance of LQAF? does this refer to 100% compliance? Won't SHA Library leads be monitoring this as part of LDA process?
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KPI7 - RECOMMENDATIONS

KPI7 - Percentage increase in compliance with the Library Quality Assurance Framework (LQAF) compared with the previous year.
(Indicates level of improving quality).

3. Additional KPIS

The following were all suggested as additional KPIs:

- study spaces per active user
- Skill mix of library staff - minimum proportion professional/paraprofessional staffing levels
- collection development
- As cuts are being made, regardless of what the press says about protection of the NHS, it would be useful to know staffing ratios in comparison to organisations workforce as well
- Number of new library registrations per annum [where membership is not automatic]
- Is it worth including something on services provided, whether or not percentage figures for users are available, eg, clinical or outreach librarians and knowledge/content management work for websites, joint strategic need assessments etc or involvement in Map of Medicine, care pathways and so on.
- None
- Total number of library work stations per 100 staff available for use
- Number of library visits per 100 staff
- Number of visits to a library’s website per 100 staff
- Number of physical visits per member of staff
- Number of physical visits per library member
- % of users successful in gaining (or reserving) a specific book by title, subject or author
- % of users successful in gaining information as a result of a search
- % of library users who found the book/information they wanted, or reserved it, and were satisfied with the outcome.
- % of success in provision of accurate, timely, appropriate and unbiased information to users
- % of users rating the knowledge of staff as “good” or “very good”
- % of users rating the helpfulness of staff as “good” or “very good”
- % of staff by targeted group satisfied with the library’s activities
- Fund for books and other materials per 100 staff
- Minimum replacement rate for all stock
- Items added through purchase per 100 staff
- Total number of library work stations per 100 staff available for use
- Number of library visits per 100 staff
- Number of visits to a library’s website per 100 staff
- Number of physical visits per member of staff
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- Number of physical visits per library member
- % of users successful in gaining (or reserving) a specific book by title, subject or author
- % of users successful in gaining information as a result of a search
- % of library users who found the book/information they wanted, or reserved it, and were satisfied with the outcome.
- % of success in provision of accurate, timely, appropriate and unbiased information to users
- % of users rating the knowledge of staff as “good” or “very good”
- % of users rating the helpfulness of staff as “good” or “very good”
- % of staff by targeted group satisfied with the library’s activities
- Fund for books and other materials per 100 staff
- Minimum replacement rate for all stock
- Items added through purchase per 100
- does information consultancy enquiries include mediated searching delivered in NHS?
- I can’t see the point of them, so I won’t suggest adding even more.
- During library opening hours there will be access to a professional Librarian 95% of the time
- There will be a Finding the Evidence Workshop at least once a month
- 90% of literature searches will be completed within 2 working days
- Percentage of articles/books ordered via Document Delivery Services within a standard time frame.
- Patient use?
- Unique users of Athens resources? IE in a year - how many people registered with you actually logged in to an Athens resource (those using IP access to assist users will potentially be penalised by this) eJournal COUNTER outbound link stats - indicative of literature usage / of take up of resources?
- Its not that I think that these are bad KPI, they just need a lot of nuancing as I think that the different types of trust are much more different than the KPI assume
- I would like to see either 1) some sort of qualitative satisfaction indicator based upon a systematic survey of responses from library clients or 2) a measure of ultimate impact upon patient care similarly measured
- Number of Trust staff given a library induction in the last year as a proportion of all Trust staff who joined last year (or similar)
- Something about percentage of organisation’s workforce who use the library's own electronic resources (e.g. intranet pages)
- User satisfaction / Impact : Expenditure on information resources (books, journals, etc) as % of total library expenditure 48.10% 47.88% 49.56%
- Expenditure on electronic resources (e-journals, databases, etc) as % of total library expenditure
- Rather than expenditure on headcount how about: Expenditure on information resources (books, journals, etc) as % of total library expenditure
- Expenditure on electronic resources (e-journals, databases, etc) as % of total library expenditure
SHALL National Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

- Do we need any measure of impact? Was impact measured (Y/N) - not too sure how to measure the results in a KPI, but feel this is an important measure we should be recording in some way.
- I would like to see something on innovation and service development
- None
- Number of decisions made by the organisation which can demonstrate being 'evidence based'. Or some similar "is your organisation evidence based" type measure.
- Use by Staff group - is the library meeting the needs of all potential users, or is it failing to supply services to certain staff in the organisation
- Visits
- something about facilities - eg age of pcs/ no of pcs per workforce fte
- something about Ills - no. per fte
- These KPIs are already collected on the annual submitted returns except the percentages per WTE are not worked out. How are these KPI's going to be used?
- None
- Searching and document supply - 2 very key services which are very important to our customers
- I think all 7 are useful indicators and should be included
- All seven (see first answer)
- These look fine although I think you will have to give careful guidance on what constitutes an information enquiry, how it is to be counted and if they need some subdivision or weighting. I think there are potential problems with CAS as many institutions might encourage people to self register for alerts. Again how do you define current awareness?
- I think these are enough

4. **Conclusion**

The following KPIs are proposed:

**KPI1.** Percentage of the organisation’s workforce (headcount) which are registered library members.
(Indicates penetration / awareness of the library service).

**KPI 2.** Percentage of the organisation’s workforce (headcount) which have registered as a library member in the last year.
(Indicates level of penetration / awareness of the service in the last year)

**KPI 3.** Percentage of the organisation’s workforce (headcount) which are registered ATHENS users. (Indicates use of e-resources)
(E.g., 1000 Athens users in an organisation of 10,000 staff = 10% )

**KPI4.** Re-current expenditure commitment on library services based on the organisation's workforce (WTE).
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(Indicates Trust commitment to Library Services).
(E.g., £100,000 spent on Library services in a Trust of 10,000 staff = £10 is spent on
library services per WTE)

**KPI 5.** Number of information Mediated searches per member of staff based on the
organisation's workforce (WTE).
(Indicates penetration level of Library enquiries on the organisation).
(E.g., 400 enquiries in an organisation with 1,000 staff = a penetration level of 0.4)

**KPI6.** Number of user education sessions offered per member of staff based on the
organisation's workforce (WTE).
(30 sessions offered in a trust of 1,000 staff = a penetration level of 0.03)

**KPI7.** Percentage increase in compliance with the Library Quality Assurance
Framework (LQAF) compared with the previous year.
(Indicates level of improving quality).