NCA (PSQG)

PSQG Performance Indicators Working Party

Towards generic and universal PIs for archives

Phase 1: Performance Indicators for Access and Usage

Draft measures piloted in August 2003

Background: Due to difficulties in identifying what access and usage
outcomes we need to measure (and complications in translating them into
meaningful indicators applicable across all sectors), the working party has
decided to step back and look first at measures that could applied across the
whole spectrum of archives services. This links directly with the need for
common measures highlighted in the LUCAS snapshot diagnostics report and
in responses to PSQG's 2003 survey. It will also contribute towards the
development of archival measures for Resource's statistical digest – for which
reliable figures across the domain are urgently needed.

Format: These measures are set out in more detail than is required for the
Audit Commission (AC) template, but some of the information will be
transferable to the ACPI Library format when the measures are developed
into indicators

June 2003

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED MEASURES

Notes:
1)   Measures marked with an asterisk (*) cover data required for the Resource Annual Digest
2)   Specifications are provided for all the measures listed in plain type
3)   Measures listed in *italics* are noted for possible future development only – and are not included in this version of the draft measures
4)   The measures are numbered, but they have not (yet) been cross-referenced internally

Phase 1: Access and Usage (front of house)

1. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND SERVICE PROVISION
    1.1. Stated access aims / policies
        1.1.1.   Service aims
    1.2. Facilities provided for on-site access
        1.2.1.   *Accessibility of site and premises*
    1.3. Range of services provided
    1.4. Capacity
        1.4.1.   Opening hours
        1.4.2.   On-site seating accommodation
        1.4.3.   *Accommodation for exhibitions, group visits and lectures etc*

2. COST / EFFICIENCY [*mainly Phase 3 – or to be added once measure have been agreed*]

3. SERVICE DELIVERY OUTCOMES
    3.1. Usage – Visits (individual)
        3.1.1.   Visitor numbers *
        3.1.2.   Purpose of visit
        3.1.3.   Subject of enquiry
        3.1.4.   User familiarity with services
        3.1.5.   Length of visit / dwell time *
        3.1.6.   Services / facilities used *
        3.1.7.   *Material consulted*
    3.2. Usage – Visitors in groups
        3.2.1.   On-site activities
        3.2.2.   Off-site activities
        3.2.3.   Exhibitions
        3.2.4.   Educational
        3.2.5.   *Targeted outreach activities (eg social inclusion)*
    3.3. Usage – Remote visits
        3.3.1.   Post
        3.3.2.   E-mail *
        3.3.3.   Telephone *
    3.4. Usage – Virtual visits *
        3.4.1.   Patterns of use
        3.4.2.   Nature of use
        3.4.3.   Gateways
        3.4.4.   Partnership resources
    3.5. Activities – Enquiries satisfied *
        3.5.1.   Dedicated time
        3.5.2.   *Response times*
        3.5.3.   *Purpose and subject of enquiry* [not included, but see models at 3.3.1-3]
    3.6. Activities - Document productions *
        3.6.1.   *Use of surrogates*
    3.7. Outreach activities
        3.7.1.   On-site activities
        3.7.2.   Off-site activities
        3.7.3.   Exhibitions
        3.7.4.   Educational involvement *
        3.7.5.   *Targeted activities (eg social inclusion)*

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

4. QUALITY
    4.1. Overall satisfaction ratings of service users *
        4.1.1.   Service satisfaction ratings of service users
        4.1.2.   Value of archives services as perceived by users *

5. FAIR ACCESS
    5.1. User profiles *
        5.1.1.   Gender *
        5.1.2.   Age *
        5.1.3.   Social class / socio-economic *
        5.1.4.   Education *
        5.1.5.   Ethnicity *
        5.1.6.   Disability *
        5.1.7.   *Geographical (including visitors to UK)*
        5.1.8.   *Employment status*

6. *OTHERS [suggested, but not yet developed]*
    6.1. *Access to information – user evaluation based on experience of finding out about archives, getting information about services*
    6.2. *Access to content – user evaluation on the outcome of their investigations*

Supporting measures (to be developed in Phase 2: Stewardship)
- Holdings
    - Accessions
- Staff
    - Volunteers
- Budgets
- Cataloguing
    - Catalogue automation

Suggestions regarding data collection periods etc

1. Annual figures for recorded numbers: To get round the difficulty of reporting cycles of different organisations and sectors, it is suggested that data be collected on a monthly basis – with figures for the whole year being reported on the standard basis of the year ending 31 March. This does not preclude annual reporting at other dates where this is required – i.e. an organisation can use the same set of monthly figures to give a total for the year ending 31 December if required.

2. Financial figures: These will be presented on the basis of a full financial year (with different year-end dates), and they will need to be taken as they are rather than adjusted to suit a standard reporting period. As above, it is suggested that the most common year-end of 31 March be taken as the standard reporting period. Organisations with other cycles should submit figures for the last complete year ending before 31 March, stating the reporting period with the figures.

The key thing pilots were asked to consider were
"How can we collect the data to provide the required information?"
(**NOT** "how can we fit the data we currently collect into this framework")

And in doing so, to provide feedback on
Are the suggested categories / groupings watertight and mutually exclusive?
Can the lists be improved?
Will the figures be reliable and meaningful?
Report any inconsistencies in these guidelines

The search is for measures that are:
GENERIC, UNIVERSAL, PRACTICAL, MEANINGFUL, ROBUST and HELPFUL

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 1.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Strategic objectives and service provision   **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: STATED ACCESS AIMS / POLICY

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The extent to which a repository has a clear policy on access and demonstrates commitment to providing services for people wishing to use the archives
 Clarification: This deals with the level of engagement of the repository with access issues and measures degrees of compliance with the *Standard for Access to Archives*

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – <u>see</u> separate notes on each element)*:
- Service aims

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: This measure is needed as the baseline for evaluation and benchmarking. It provides the context and framework for evaluating specific services and for measuring service delivery outcomes. It adds meaning to the numerical statistics on usage. It can also be used – when results are collected at national level – to give an indication of the overall state of provision for access to the Nation's (in the broadest sense) archival resources.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: A tick-box checklist – applicable to repositories of all types and sizes – showing the key elements of access policy and service provision. The following elements are suggested:
1.   Does the archive make provision (subject to necessary restrictions) for public access to its holdings? [yes/no]
2.   Are reading room and other access facilities provided? [yes/no (detail in later measure 2)]
3.   Does the archive have a written policy statement on access? [yes/no]
4.   Is the access policy publicly accessible? [yes/no]
5.   Is access open to all? [yes/no]
6.   Is a charge made for access? [yes/no]
7.   Has the archive formally adopted the *Standard for Access to Archives*? [yes/no]
8.   Has an audit been undertaken to measure compliance with the *Standard*? [yes/no]
9.   Have improvements been identified and are steps being taken to implement changes? [yes/no]
10.   Do users have opportunities for involvement in planning for improvements? [yes/no]
11.   Have any access-related improvements been completed in the past twelve months? [yes/no – and please list any]
Repositories answering 'no' to no.7 may find it helpful to use the checklist – based on the *Standard* and intended to be included in the revised version (due for publication in 2004) – which can be obtained from the working party convenor

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: It is standard to include policies and strategic objectives in the Audit Commission Library of Performance Indicators. The checklist given here is drawn from the main clauses in the PSQG (draft) *Standard for Access to Archives* (2000) with additions suggested by pilot institutions.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: For a national picture of the level of provision in the context of overall policy and practice. As the basis for evaluating specific service elements and reviewing performance – *eg* relating to usage (3), aims (1.1.1), costs and balances between access and other service priorities. As the basis for comparison between similar services.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Small risk of bias due to self-assessment (like the mapping projects), and also likely to represent an individual's view of the repository and its aims, rather than a consensus view of policy and practice. Some elements (e.g. discrete policy statements) may not be appropriate where archives form an integral part of a larger service.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Could be used by inspectors from The National Archives (TNA) as a standard model for baseline monitoring. A sample template is available.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 1.1.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Strategic objectives and service provision   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: SERVICE AIMS

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: What types of service and levels of access the repository aims to provide for users
>   *Clarification*: This covers intentions rather than actual provision – defining what the archives service sees as falling within its overall remit

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: Not all archives services – especially private and business archives and some types of specialist repository – are able to provide a comprehensive range of access services, or wish to. This measure is intended to indicate relative priorities within the service aims of each repository in terms of access, primarily to clarify internal policy but also to give a national overview. It allows repositories to place a different level of importance on common activities, as a baseline against which levels of usage should be viewed.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: A tick-box checklist, enabling the chief archivist or senior professional responsible for the service to indicate which elements of access the repository aims to provide using a 1-3 scale – 1 for low importance, 2 for medium and 3 for high priority – to show the level of priority accorded to each aspect:
a)   Internal access (to staff of parent organisation etc)
b)   Public access (to a wider range of external users)
c)   Provision of on-site access
d)   Dealing with remote enquiries (by post, e-mail and telephone etc)
e)   Carrying out research for enquirers
f)   Providing copies of sources for users
g)   Cataloguing material and providing finding aids to facilitate access
h)   Making catalogues available online via the national archive network and other links
i)   Provision of virtual access to digitised sources via own or shared website
j)   Supporting use of archives for formal education
k)   Undertaking outreach and promotional work to encourage use of archives
This list aims to cover the main elements linked to access in a readily identifiable and meaningful
>   way.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Partially drawn from the framework used for the archive mapping projects from 1998-2000, with some additions.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Towards a national overview. Relate to actual provision (1.3) and to available resources (e.g. where high priority aspects cannot be delivered because there are insufficient staff). Link to usage statistics (3) and user satisfaction measures (4).

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: There is some risk of bias due to self-assessment (like the mapping projects) – and there will be difficulties in securing consistent rankings of priorities between repositories. Responses are also likely to represent an individual's view of the repository and its aims, rather than a consensus view of policy and practice.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New recording. A sample template is available.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 1.2   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Strategic objectives and service provision   **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: FACILITIES PROVIDED FOR ON-SITE ACCESS

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The services and facilities for access provided by the repository
  Clarification: This covers physical facilities provided by the repository for access to the archives
  and associated materials (including microfilms, computer terminals, reference materials and
  finding aids) both for individuals and for groups, along with other visitor facilities

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – <u>see</u> separate notes on each element)*:
- *Accessibility of site and premises*

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To define the context for services and activities and
show the scale of provision for access at the repository. It will also be helpful – when linked to levels
of demand and usage – in making the case for space to be provided.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Tick box, indicating whether or not dedicated space is available
for specific activities and functions associated with access. Where possible, the floor area (in square
metres) should be specified – with apportionments of the total floor space in shared areas and multi-
purpose spaces.
a)   Reading room – searchroom facilities for public access to archives and associated materials
b)   An invigilated and secure area for the study of original archives
c)   Catalogue rooms and reference areas (where separate)
d)   Facilities for groups – dedicated space for meetings, lectures etc (i.e. separate, and available
        for use during normal searchroom opening hours)
e)   Exhibition and display space
f)   Reception areas – zones for reader registration and reception etc (i.e. mainly for office
        business)
g)   Visitor facilities – restrooms, toilets, lockers, refreshment areas and space with notice-boards
        and posters etc (i.e. mainly for visitor comfort)
Corridor and circulation space – and areas shared with other departments etc – are omitted from this
list, but may be covered separately in overall analysis of premises and space in phases 2 or 3.
Corridor space may be included if it is regularly used for exhibitions and displays.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: No history

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Towards national picture
based on the provision of facilities and availability of space. Relate to services provided (1.3), service
aims (1.1.1), and levels of use (3). Link to budgets and user satisfaction ratings (4) etc. Link space to
number of reader places available (1.4.2)

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: This will work best for large offices with dedicated
space. Pilots have confirmed the difficulties of measurement and apportionment with shared facilities
(fully integrated and inseparable), where areas are shared (separate archive use of a shared area) or
in multi-purpose use. There is a particular problem with uses of space at different times (*eg*
searchrooms used for school visits when closed to the public). Although the activities are generic,
institutions will deal with them in different ways (e.g. reader registration may be dealt with in
reception or in the reading rooms).

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New recording

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 1.2.1 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Strategic objectives and service provision **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: *FACILITIES: Accessibility of site and premises*

Purpose and scope: *Such a measure would be helpful in encouraging repositories to review the physical barriers to access associated with the location and signposting of public service points, and evidence could be used in monitoring patterns of usage etc. Intellectual and perceptional barriers to access also need to be considered, but separately*

This measure is listed here as one for possible future development

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 1.3   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Strategic objectives and service provision   **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: RANGE OF SERVICES PROVIDED

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The services provided for people wishing to use the archives
Clarification: This identifies the broad categories of services actually provided – as distinct from being seen to be within the repository's remit (*see* 1.1.1). It covers on-site and remote service provision.

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – see separate notes on each element)*:

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To define the context for services and activities and show the scale of provision for access afforded by the repository. It will provide the baseline for evaluating numerical data on usage.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By yes/no tick box, indicating which services are actually provided. While no *maxima* or *minima* are defined, it is expected that the scale of activity will be large enough to justify the keeping of numerical statistics on usage as specified in the measures for service delivery outcomes below.
a)   Provision of advance information for intending users
b)   Services to on-site users
          o   Advice from staff on subject of research
          o   Access to finding aids
          o   Document production service
c)   Services to remote users
          o   Enquiry services (limited to service information and advice on sources)
          o   Enquiry services (full enquiry services, including commissioned research)
d)   Copying services
e)   Website and services for virtual visitors
f)   On-site outreach activities (for group visits, open days etc)
g)   Off-site outreach activities and events
h)   Exhibitions
i)   Educational involvement
This list tallies with the service delivery outcome measures (3), for which further information is given below on the scope and coverage of each element. Measures of capacity (in the following section, 1.4) provide more detail on the scale of activity and available resources.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: New in this form, but based on mapping surveys and inspection checklists

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Link to usage (3) and user satisfaction (4). Relate back to service aims (1.1.1).

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Limited use in assessing scale of activity without supporting data, although usage figures and capacity measures may provide this. Some risk of variation in interpretation of the categories (though these – as stated – are defined more fully in s.3)

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: A sample template is available.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 1.4   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Strategic objectives and service provision   **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: CAPACITY

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The available capacity for access to archives
Clarification: This provides a further measure of the context of the use of archives as defined by limits on available capacity and access to services

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – <u>see</u> separate notes on each element)*:
- Opening hours
- On-site seating accommodation
- *Accommodation for exhibitions, group visits and lectures etc*

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: This information will provide figures against which usage data can be measured (*eg* users per hour the service is open to the public). Also useful towards a national picture of overall capacity

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Through separate measures for each aspect – *see* level 2.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Figures for these elements (noted separately at level 2) have been traditionally recorded in the annual CIPFA statistics

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: By providing figures towards a national overview of provision. For linking to usage etc

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*:

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Changes (see in level 2) to current CIPFA methods

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 1.4.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Strategic objectives and service provision   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: CAPACITY: OPENING HOURS

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The time(s) at which archives services are accessible to users
    Clarification: This covers access to on-site reading room services
    Does cover: Opening hours of reading rooms and searchrooms during which the normal range of services of the archive are open for use by individual users (ignoring variations in availability of specific services during those times). Includes branches (treated separately with opening hours being taken as additional to those of the headquarters or main repository) where unique material is available for use
    Doesn't cover: Opening hours for group visits and special events / activities. Service points providing access to surrogates only. Separate rooms or areas within a single institution

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To provide information on total opening hours as a national headline figure, and for performance measurement at repository level (as below)

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: The number of hours per week that the repository is open to the public – based on a normal week (i.e. ignoring bank holidays and special closures). For archives operating seasonal opening hours, the figure should be based on a *pro rata* average (e.g. 30 weeks @ 40 hours and 22 weeks @ 15 hours = average 29.5 a week). Services with multiple sites (*eg* branches) providing access to unique materials should treat each service point as a separate entity since users will regard them as separate places. For each site, record:
a)   Hours of opening per week (rounded down to the nearest whole hour)
b)   Number of those hours falling outside normal business hours (i.e. 9-5 Monday To Friday)
c)   [*Consider adding a line about Sunday opening as a specific sub-element of b)*]

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Developed for the CIPFA statistics, and last used in 2001-2 as q.38 (hours of opening) and q.39 (hours outside 9-5 during Monday to Friday). Altered to follow the public library model where all branches are regarded as separate entities.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: To give a total national figure for hours of access to archives. To measure provision of services outside normal business hours. For repository management and performance measurement – *eg* linking usage (3) to capacity (users per hour open), relating to dwell time (3.1.5) etc

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Some archives with complex operations may have difficulty in distinguishing what counts as a service point. Problem of "normal business hours" being different in various parts of the country (e.g. London 9.30 to 5.30). Regarding branches as separate entities may be contentious. Some specialist archives may provide access by arrangements rather than operate fixed opening hours. Higher Education archives operate different hours in and out of term-time, creating a difficulty in defining a 'normal' week.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Change required to CIPFA definitions

Other notes: National figures on what times of day are most popular could be useful – as a further measure – for guidance to archives considering extending their opening hours.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 1.4.2   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Strategic objectives and service provision   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: CAPACITY: ON-SITE SEATING ACCOMMODATION

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of reader places available in searchrooms to accommodate users wishing to use the archives service
  Clarification: This covers the available capacity for visitors
  Does cover: Conventional reader accommodation (a seat at a desk), microform reader spaces, computer terminals and special facilities for audio-visual materials. Includes branches where unique material is available for use
  Doesn't cover: Off-site access points (*eg* at branch libraries or community venues) providing access to surrogates only.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To provide information on total capacity as a national headline figure, and for performance measurement at repository level (as below)

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: The number of reader places at all archival service points (headquarters and branches – but *not* remote service points outside the control of the service at which only surrogates are made available), shown for each service point separately but totalled to provide an overall figure for the repository. Record annually at 31 March - the numbers of:
a)   Reader places (including spaces for multiple / large format / flexible use and spaces for laptop users, but excluding b, c and d)
b)   Microform readers for public use
c)   Computer terminals for public use
d)   Audio-visual listening/viewing stations
e)   TOTAL reader places – sum of the above, representing "the maximum number of people who can be accommodated simultaneously according to the normal policy of the service" (CIPFA)

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Developed for the CIPFA statistics, and last used in 2001-2 as q.40 (reader spaces available), q.41 (number of microform readers for public use), and q.42 (number of computers for public use).

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: To give a total national capacity figure for on-site access to archives services. For repository management and performance measurement – *eg* linking usage (3) to capacity (users per reader place), relating to dwell time (3.1.5) and seat occupancy etc, analysing patterns of use (3.4.1), facilities used during visit (3.1.6)

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Some difficulties with multi-use and flexible use of space (e.g. where use of large format items and maps reduces accommodation for other users).

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Change required to CIPFA definitions. A sample template is available.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level:** 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITS: INDIVIDUAL

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Numbers of visits to the archive by individuals in person, and a range of subordinate measures relating to on-site usage
> *Clarification*: Intended to cover on-site use of the archive reading room facility or service point by individuals with archive-related queries – the primary users of on-site services. It's about use of services – not just about use of archival material – by individuals (for detailed clarification, *see* the separate measures)

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – <u>see</u> separate notes on each element)*:
- Visitor numbers *
- Purpose of visit
- Subject of enquiry
- User familiarity with services
- Length of visit / dwell time *
- Services / facilities used
- *Material consulted*

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: These measures will provide a standard means of counting primary use of archives services by on-site visitors and provide information about patterns of use to create indicators and monitor trends

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Through separate measures for each element – *see* level 2.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Established measures used in CIPFA *Archives Services Statistics* and/or developed for the PSQG National Visitor Survey

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: For national totals and for performance monitoring at repository level (*see* separate notes for each element)

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Some difficulty in identifying archive users separately in integrated library and archive services and where functions are separate or co-located. There are also issues as to how far – in the moves towards cross-domain working – it is still necessary or useful to record separate usage figures for archives. [Other issues relating to individual measures are identified separately below]

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New recording systems – using the recommended definitions – will or may be needed.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.1.1 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage **Level:** 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITOR NUMBERS *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Visits to the archive by individuals in person
Clarification: Covers on-site use of the archive reading room facility or service point by individuals with archive-related queries. It's about use of services – not just about use of archival material – by individuals.
Does cover: All visitors consulting original materials and/or surrogate copies, **and** those who only consult material on open shelves, access information on computer, look at finding aids, or talk to staff about their query (i.e. users of the archive service point)
May cover (but <u>see</u> below): Users of associated materials to which access is provided from a combined service point (*eg* archives with local studies, prints and drawings etc)
Doesn't cover: Individuals visiting in groups, guided tours and on open days etc (*see* separate measures in 3.2). Visitors using reception areas and retail outlets only. Exhibition visitors not using reading room facilities. People visiting for reasons other than the use of reading room facilities and archives services. Volunteers.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: This measure will provide a standard means of counting primary use of archives services by on-site visitors. Total visitor figures are useful at national level (*eg* they are required for Resource's Annual Digest of Statistics). At service level the data can be related to other measures to create indicators, and the raw figures can be used to monitor trends. Recording daily usage will be useful at repository level.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Number of visitors over 12 month period (based on monthly figures) in year ending 31 March. Count readers only once in each day. Ideally record actual figures taken from reliable attendance records (*eg* use figures from visitors' signing-in registers or from booking systems). Do not use turnstile figures (which may record multiple movements and comings and goings by non-visitors). Sampling according to the definitions of 'visits' above may be acceptable in joint services where there are difficulties in isolating 'archive service' users on a day-to-day basis – but samples should be based on actuals over a sufficient period to give reliable indicative figures.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Established measure used in CIPFA *Archives Services Statistics* (*e.g.* as 2001-02 Estimates no.43), but with more closely defined coverage

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Visitor numbers in relation to other forms of usage (*eg* productions), capacity (*eg* opening hours (1.4.1), reader places (1.4.2)), and costs. Also to monitor numerical trends and patterns of use (*eg* sectoral seasonal variations based on monthly figures).

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Experience with the CIPFA statistics shows that not all archives have systems in place to record visitor numbers accurately – and others disregard the guidance notes on how figures should be recorded. This measure needs to be consistently applied if it is to provide meaningful results, and this may necessitate changes to current practice. Difficulties (and relevance to the institution) of recording archive-specific visitors where services are integrated with others. The likelihood (as highlighted by one pilot doing dual recording) of variation between figures recorded using different systems.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Archives services which do not have a system for recording visits will need to establish one. Those whose definitions of 'visits' and/or recording procedures do not match the approach identified here will need to adjust their systems accordingly (e.g. where systems only record people consulting original material and ignore other users of the facilities). Combined services will need to work out a satisfactory means of distinguishing 'archive users' (in the broad sense identified above) from other users. No change for CIPFA.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

Other notes: This measure is seen as a pragmatic one, aiming to record the use of service points where archival material is available rather than just the numbers of people consulting archives. User assessment of services is based on this, and professional distinctions between categories of material within a service point are not meaningful to many visitors.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.1.2   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITS: PURPOSE OF VISIT

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The purpose of individual visits to archives services
Clarification: This measure covers the main broad generic categories of use of archives services and facilities for employment, personal or family business, education, and leisure. The users of most archives services should fall within these groups, although the relative proportions will differ between types of repository.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: This measure is needed to provide information on who uses archives – and why. Resource wish to include national figures in their Annual Digest of Statistics. Analysis by purpose of visit will be helpful to repositories in providing evidence of the needs for the service (*eg* showing the relative importance of use for business and learning in comparison with recreational use). Useful in analysing existing users and planning for audience development.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Use sample surveys asking users to identify their **main** purpose for visiting the archive according to **one** of the following categories:
a)   Personal leisure / recreation
b)   Non-leisure personal or family business
c)   Formal education as a student / researcher
d)   Formal education as a teacher / lecturer, or
e) work in connection with voluntary or paid employment.
Survey at intervals – as part of PSQG National Visitor Survey if participating – or at least once every two years.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Developed by PSQG for the National Visitor Survey, this formula eventually being settled on – after extensive exploration of possibilities and options – in the 2002 survey, q.8.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: To provide national, sectoral (*eg* higher education) and regional breakdown of users according to reason for using archives. Relate to total usage (e.g. percentage of users in each category). Link to identified audiences and stated access aims to provide evidence of use.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Visitors may not readily identify with the categories, and there will be some overlaps (*eg* teachers as d) and under e) for work – if they ask, advise them to mark d). Acknowledged difficulties of survey fatigue among users. Reluctance to declare purpose.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Will require special surveys for repositories that have not previously collected data in this form. Some archives record purpose of visit as part of registration process and systems may need to be changed. A sample template is available.

Other notes: The category groupings have were tested in the 2002 National Survey of Visitors to UK archives with satisfactory results, but it would be helpful to see if the approach works across a wider range of repositories

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.1.3　　　　　　　　　　　　**Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage　　　　　**Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITS: SUBJECT OF ENQUIRY

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The subject of enquiry of individual service users
　　Clarification: This is intended to cover very broad subject areas only – and not the levels of specific detail that may be required by specialist repositories or for highly sophisticated analysis of use. Subject interest should not be confused with purpose of visit or with material consulted, for which separate measures are suggested.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To give a broad indication of some of the main subject interests of users of archives, and to show how the use of archives supports institutional or public policy objectives (*eg* the social exclusion and learning agendas). At repository level, monitoring changes in user interests over time can be helpful in service planning (*eg* in prioritising cataloguing work).

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Snapshot samples based on information routinely collected from users (*eg* through the reader registration / admission processes as part of continuous measurement) or obtained by special survey. The suggested categories are:
a)　　　　Family history (own family)
b)　　　　House history (own house)
c)　　　　Other family history or biography (*not* own family)
d)　　　　Village, town and city (own locality or community)
e)　　　　Village, town and city (*not* own locality or community)
f)　　　　Organisations
g)　　　　Specialist topic of research (*eg* military, medical, occult etc)
h)　　　　National or international study (*eg* historical, political, geographical etc)
i)　　　　Regional study (*eg* historical, geographical etc with regional or area focus)
Note: Explanatory notes may be required to assist staff in categorising correctly
The results should be expressed as percentages of sample size, but with figures given too – i.e. Family history 67% (313 in sample of 467 visitors) – and with date(s) of sample period. Samples must be statistically valid, and sampling should take place over one month or 500 unique visitors (whichever is shorter) in each 12-month period. Ideally, individuals should not be counted more than once within the sampled data. If using visitors' books or attendance registers, it may be helpful to keep a checklist of subjects alongside it to show visitors and staff how research topics should be categorised. If using surveys, users must be asked to mark **one** subject only

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Difficulties in identifying broad yet watertight subject categories of research came to light when planning the 1998 National Visitor Survey, and the attempt to include this in the survey was abandoned. The approach suggested here has not been tested before. The list of categories is intended to be broad, generic and (fairly) watertight – and to cover the main popular areas of interest. Repositories can explore sub-levels in more detail if they wish.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: To identify, over time, key trends in the main uses of archives (*eg* increase or decline in the popularity of family history). Relating subject usage to overall use (3).

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Correct interpretation of data requires a high level of understanding among staff undertaking the analysis, and visitors / users may not readily or clearly identify with the suggested categories. Limited scope for close detail may deter more specialist repositories from using this formula. The category list may be too narrow in scope for some repositories and not detailed enough to be useful for others.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: This measure will need to be introduced from scratch – alongside existing data collection methods (where they exist) until a firm national methodology has been agreed. Sample templates for reader registration may be available.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

Other notes: It would be informative and useful to compare results from analysis of existing data and by survey within the same institution in order to test the methodology.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.1.4   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level:** 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: USER FAMILIARITY WITH SERVICES *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The level of familiarity of individual users – from new users of archives services to long-time users
   Clarification: This covers two elements based on the experience of users – a) the length of time people have been using the archive, and b) whether or not they also use other archives services.
   Covers: Visitors (as defined above) using on-site services

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: This measure will provide useful information on the levels of experience of archive visitors – helpful at repository level, and of value in contributing to a national picture of archival usage. It will have a special value in monitoring progress in developing new audiences while also showing how services to existing users are maintained. As well as providing data on patterns of use and familiarity, it will help to identify numbers of first-time visitors.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By snapshot surveys – based on statistically valid samples – of individual users, asking them to indicate:
A.   How long have you been visiting this archive?
      a)   First visit
      b)   Less than a year
      c)   1-4 years
      d)   5-10 years
      e)   More than 10 years
B.   Have you used archives services other than this one? [yes/no]
C.   How often do you visit this archive?
      a)   One-off visit
      b)   Occasionally / infrequently (say 2-5 times a year)
      c)   Frequently (say 5-10 times a year, but not regularly)
      d)   Regularly (weekly, fortnightly or monthly visits)
      e)   Very often (daily visits or visiting for a period of time)**Source / History** *(WHERE it comes from)*: Established measures used in the PSQG National Visitor Surveys – A was used in the 2001 (q.4) and 2002 (q.11) surveys, B in 2001 (q.17) and a question about frequency of visit (C) was used in 1998 (q.3).

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Towards a national overview of archival usage, and to inform local management of services. As evidence of audience development (new users for the service, new users for archives). To quantify the need for induction programmes and to influence improvements designed to make services easier for users. Relate to levels of user satisfaction (4)

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Covers on-site usage only, but the model can also be applied to surveys of remote visitors and virtual users (eg as currently done for users of the A2A website). There are difficulties with frequency of visit (added to original version and not piloted in this form) because not all visits are regular, and users don't always have a clear recollection of the interval between occasional visits.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: No change for archives already participating in the PSQG Visitor Survey (although questions A & B were only included in the same survey in 2001). A sample template is available.

Other notes: The distinction between entirely new users (of archives) and new visitors (to services) is especially important

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.1.5   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITS: LENGTH OF VISIT / DWELL TIME *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The average duration of individual visits to archives
   Clarification: This measures the time spent on site by individual users from the time of arrival to
   the point of departure.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: The time spent on site by visitors (dwell time) is a key
difference between archives, museums and libraries. Anecdotal evidence suggests that archive users
spend longer on site than visitors to libraries and museums – but hard evidence is needed. Resource
wishes to include comparisons across the three domains in the Annual Digest of Statistics and similar
evidence is being gathered from libraries and museums for this purpose. The data collection methods
will also be compared and co-ordinated, although each domain may need to take a different
approach. Useful for planning reading room space and associated facilities.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Snapshot of 'in' and 'out' times over agreed sample period –
based on actual movements of visitors signing visitors' books or attendance sheets. Time to be
recorded in bands (up to a quarter of an hour, up to half an hour, up to an hour, and then in hourly
bands), totalled, and divided by attendance figure (number of visitors) in the selected sample.
Results should be presented with sample period, sample size, and numbers in each band as well as
the average time established from the snapshot. Where automated systems exist for logging visitors
in and out, dwell time could be continuously monitored.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: This is a new measure. Some data are available from
the National Visitor Survey (*eg* 2002 survey q.3) based on the survey question "How long have you
stayed at this archive today?" with spaces for placing a tick in one box in a banded list.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Link to user satisfaction
indicators. Consider alongside use of different elements of on-site services and service outcomes.
Relate to visitor numbers (3) and capacity (1.4.2) to produce management information (*eg* seat
occupancy rates). For comparison with libraries and museums – locally and nationally.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: This may not be practical for some services –
especially those with minimal staffing (for whom it will be difficult to find time to analyse the time
records) and for combined services (where a more 'open' approach to access may limit scope for
detailed recording). Caution is needed over dwell time, as long stays may indicate poor service (*eg*
slow productions, queues for advice) rather than a passion to spend time in the archives. Some
difficulty with policing exit when recording by observation, especially where visitors take time out
(e.g. for lunch break), move between parts of the building or leave for a while during visit span to do
something entirely different. It was found by pilots to be least practical in open access and shared
areas.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New recording systems are very
likely to be necessary. Procedures for analysis may be required too. Signing in – if not routinely done
already – may be required for health and safety purposes, and a small adjustment to the process
may both ensure compliance with 'best practice' and provide measurement data. Procedures for
signing out (as well as signing in) may need to be introduced. Sample methodologies and templates
are available from the pilot studies.

Other notes: Consider reverting to inclusion in National Visitor Survey at intervals if recording at
individual repository level is found to be too burdensome or unproductive.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.1.6   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITS: SERVICES AND FACILITIES USED *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The use of different services and facilities by users
    Clarification: This measures what visitors actually do when they visit the archives, based on a
    generic list of services and facilities.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: An understanding of how services are used is crucial
to service improvements and planning. Some visitors make use of several different service elements,
while others are more focused or limited in their use. Survey data provides evidence to support
observed behaviour, and helps to ensure that resources are appropriately deployed. This measure is
principally for local service management but there is also some value is examining patterns of use
and trends nationally. Resource intend to include information on 'what visitors do when they attend
an institution' in their Annual Digest of Statistics.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By sample survey, asking users to indicate what services they
used. The survey should use the following broad categories – omitting any services or facilities not
provided at the archive. Users should be allowed to mark all the services used during their visit. Staff
observation – using forms to record the services used by visitors – offers another way of gathering
the required information:
a)   Received initial guidance, briefing or induction as a new user
b)   Asked for advice from staff about research
c)   Consulted lists, indexes and catalogue databases (finding aids)
d)   Ordered and viewed material from storage areas
e)   Viewed microfilm or microfiche
f)   Looked at reference books in the reading room
g)   Used digitised material or consulted information sources on computer
h)   Obtained copies of records
i)   Used visitor facilities (*eg* common room, refreshment area)
j)   Visited an on-site exhibition or display
k)   Purchased goods from shop or service counter
Results – giving sample size and dates – should be expressed as numbers against each category, and
also as percentages of sample.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Questions in the PSQG National Visitor Survey have
probed this aspect since the first survey in 1998 with questions about 'what did you do today in the
archive' (*eg* 1999 survey q.3). Because of the overlap with questions about satisfaction levels with
particular service aspects, the 'what did you do?' question has been omitted subsequently – it being
felt that it would be repetitive (or over-complex) to ask both, and of the two the qualitative data has
been seen as more important. Experience from the PSQG surveys suggests that most of the
categories listed here (some are new) – while appearing slightly muddled to the professional and to
the purist! – *are* meaningful to users.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Link levels of use /
demand with data user satisfaction levels. Responses should also be linked to the services provided
by the repository (*i.e.* matching actual usage with available facilities). Changes over time can be
monitored to detect trends.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Length and complexity of survey question. Users
may be not be able to distinguish clearly between consulting on-line finding aids and other
information sources – intended to be covered separately by c) and g) respectively. Risk of survey
fatigue for staff and users. Staff, on the other hand, may not be able to follow users sufficiently
closely and unobtrusively to gain a reliable picture of services used during a visit.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: This may involve fresh data
collection and another survey. For the reasons already stated, this question is unlikely to be included
as a separate item in future PSQG surveys. A sample template is available.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

Other notes: Consider observation instead – the clipboard approach – if sample surveys prove impractical

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.1.7   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITS: MATERIAL CONSULTED

Purpose and scope: *This measure will need careful consideration to establish whether it is possible to identify broad generic categories of material consulted by users. This could be based on provenance (though this would not be very helpful for specialist repositories and institutions whose holdings are principally from one source) or by record type (where there are difficulties in establishing watertight and mutually-exclusive categories).*

The value of such a measure would be in identifying popular categories of material for research, and in drawing attention to under-used material capable of use for popular research topics. It could also show how specific sources are used by different groups of users - eg Inclosure awards – used by lawyers (business use), family historians (recreational use) and for student history projects (educational use)

Such a measure would probably need to be based on staff analysis of material consulted, based on samples of production records, used of web-based materials and use of surrogates etc.

This measure is listed here as one for possible future development

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.2 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITORS IN GROUPS

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Numbers of people visiting the repository in organised groups or to attend events, and also public participation in a range of external events and outreach activities relating to archives.
  Clarification: This indicates the number of people benefiting from the archives services other than as individual visitors – defined broadly as visitors in groups (*see* below)
  Does cover: The full range of events and outreach activities either on the premises or outside the repository, but using separate measures (see level 2) for each of the main types
  Doesn't cover: Use of the services and facilities by visitors as individuals (counted in visitor numbers). Educational group visits (counted separately). Audiences for media appearances. On-site use of shared facilities for non-archival purposes.

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – <u>see</u> separate notes on each element)*:
  • Visitors in groups: On-site activities
  • Visitors in groups: Off-site activities
  • Visitors in groups: Exhibitions
  • Visitors in groups: Educational
  • *Visitors in groups: Targeted outreach activities (eg social inclusion)*

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: Group visitor figures represent a significant element of overall usage of archives services – and this type of usage forms an essential part of the archival contribution to the lifelong learning agenda. The nature of use and engagement in group visits is different from individual self-directed use of reading room facilities and services, and is often more for general interest than for a specific purpose. The input from staff is also different. Group visits and similar activities have a promotional value, and help with audience development work by attracting new users. Measurement helps in assessing the success of events and outreach programmes.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Visitors in groups should be counted individually, but recorded separately from educational groups and other visitors (*see* separate measures). Annual totals should be recorded for the financial year. Double counting should be avoided (*eg* counting one person's visit as an ordinary visit *and* as participation in a group visit). Closer analysis – by event type – may be helpful and informative at repository level, along with detail (where practical) on age and gender. It may also be useful to record duration to give added meaning to the data.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: The activities are covered in Methven *et.al.* (1993) as 'number of talks to non-school/educational groups in repository pa' (9.11) and 'number of displays arranged for group visits pa' (9.25). Numbers attending guided tours and group visits are included in a combined total for attendance at talks/lectures – one-site and at other venues - in the CIPFA data (2002/3 no.50). The new measures aim to clarify and simplify previous methods in a form that will be meaningful outside the domain.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Link to numbers of visits/events, and relate to provision of services/capacity. Use as evidence of audience development work. May also link to activities associated with tackling social exclusion where particular audiences are targeted. Chiefly for management use, but with some potential for national aggregation to illustrate aspects of engagement with the 'community'.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Confusion between education groups and other types of group visits and activities. Comparability with libraries and museums may be difficult. Difficulties of counting and analysis (e.g. age, gender and ethnicity) for larger groups.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: May require separate recording where group visits have been counted within overall visitor figures – and this may result in an apparent drop from previously recorded figures. A change to CIPFA formula will be required, as all

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

group visits are currently counted under a single heading. May also require archives to be more rigorous about recording activities and attendance figures.

Other notes: This is intended as a practical approach, specifically linked to service provision and capacity, and recognising that repositories with limited resources for on-site work may run extensive programmes of external events. Ways of combining figures to create combined totals for visitors in groups will be explored after the pilot stage. Would like to find better term (within umbrella term of visitors) than 'visitors in groups'. The inclusion of data on user profile is a possible future addition.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.2.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITORS IN GROUPS: ON-SITE ACTIVITIES

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of people visiting the archive in person as part of a group – counted as individual visitors in groups
> *Clarification*: This gives the number of people visiting the archives services in groups or attending on-site events rather than as individual visitors (*i.e.* searchroom users)
> *Does cover*: Attendance at visits organised by external groups (*eg* a tour arranged by a local history society) and people attending on-site events or activities arranged by the repository (*eg* open days, adult classes).
> *May cover*: People attending organised induction or familiarisation presentations may be included (here visitors may *also* be counted as ordinary visitors if they use the reading room after attending such a presentation).
> *Doesn't cover*: Use of the services and facilities by visitors as individuals (counted in visitor numbers). Educational group visits (counted separately in 3.2.4). Attendance at off-site events (in 3.2.2)

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To record (as part of a group of measures) the number of people making personal use of the archives other than as searchroom users.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Record the number of people attending each event or activity, totalled monthly and reported for a full year ending 31st March (standard reporting period). Exact numbers should be recorded wherever possible. At repository level, it may be helpful to record separate figures for each of the following categories
a) Internally-organised events / activities – facilitated by archive staff
- Induction / familiarisation training
- Pre-arranged sessions (classes, invitation sessions)
- Open sessions (open days, open evenings etc)
b) Externally organised events / activities – hosted by or involving input from archive staff
- Booked group visit
c) Activities using archive premises but not involving input from staff

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Draws on history of recording attendance at talks and lectures etc, as outlined at level 1

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: As part of national figure for group visits. Link to attendance (3.7.1). Use for evaluation of activities etc. Relate to visitor profile and target audiences.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: As identified generally in 3.2

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New basis for measurement and recording likely to be needed.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.2.2   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITORS IN GROUPS: OFF-SITE ACTIVITIES

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of people attending off-site events and activities in person – counted as individual 'visitors in groups'
   Clarification: This gives the number of people attending or visiting off-site events and activities arranged by the repository or with identifiable archival presence
   Does cover: Talks, lectures, advisory sessions, surgeries etc held outside the record office, including specifically archival events and participation in wider cultural activities (e.g. family history fairs, heritage events)
   Doesn't cover: Attendance at on-site events. Audiences for media presentations

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To record (as part of a group of measures) the number of people making personal use of the archives other than as searchroom users. To measure the wider impact of the repository in the community.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Record the number of people attending each event or activity, totalled monthly and reported for a full year ending 31st March (standard reporting period). Exact numbers should be recorded wherever possible. At fairs and similar events, the numbers of people enquiring at the archive stand should be recorded (rather than total numbers attending the event). At repository level, it may be helpful to record separate figures for each of the following categories for the numbers attending
a) Talks and lectures
b) Advisory sessions and archive surgeries
c) Stalls at fairs etc

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Draws on history of recording attendance at talks and lectures etc, as outlined at level 1

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: As part of national figure for group visits. Link to attendance (3.7.2). Use for evaluation of activities etc. Link to user profile data and audience development targets.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: As identified generally in 3.2. Difficulty in 'counting' visitors at off-site and open venues.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New basis for measurement and recording likely to be required – including estimating numbers at open events. There may be some scope for using figures from admission fees for events where a fee is charged.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.2.3 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITORS IN GROUPS: EXHIBITIONS

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of people attending archival exhibitions and displays
Clarification: This gives the number of people visiting archival exhibitions. A clear archival identity of the display is the key distinguishing feature, rather than location or scale.
Does cover: Archival exhibitions in the repository's own display area, and archive-specific displays at other venues. Mounted displays and facsimiles (rather than original materials)
Doesn't cover: Larger exhibitions for which the repository has only provided exhibits. Displays where archives are a minor element in a larger theme.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To record (as part of a group of measures) the number of people making personal use of the archives other than as searchroom users.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Record or estimate the number of people attending each separate exhibition per month, reported as totals for a full year ending 31st March (standard reporting period). Exact numbers should be recorded wherever possible. Estimates, where unavoidable, should be based on statistically reliable samples taken at different times of the day and on different days of the week. At exhibitions in an area within a larger gallery and alongside other displays, figures should be based on the numbers of people visiting the archival section (rather than total numbers of visitors to the gallery). Where material is loaned for display off-site, host venues should be asked to provide attendance figures on the basis described here.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Draws on history of recording attendance at exhibitions and displays etc, as outlined at level 1

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: As part of national figure for group visits. Link to attendance (3.7.3). Use for evaluation of activities etc.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Risk of unfavourable comparisons with other domains (especially museums), owing to limited facilities for displays. But this does cover off-site exhibitions and partnership working with other organisations. Difficulties in recording visits to areas within gallery space or exhibition areas. Some risk of double counting where exhibitions are in multi-purpose areas.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New basis for measurement and recording likely to be needed. Special arrangements may need to be made for recording visitors at each event.

Other notes: There may be a need for a dwell-time minimum – to avoid counting people who pass through or visit a display area without actually looking at the exhibition

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.2.4 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VISITORS IN GROUPS: EDUCATIONAL

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of visits to the archive by individuals in organised groups in connection with a programme of formal / accredited learning or study
 Clarification: This gives the number of visitors attending activities run by the archive in support of formal education
 Does cover: Attendance at talks, study sessions or familiarisation courses provided by the record office (on-site or at external venues) for school, college and university students
 May cover: Events organised jointly with other providers (e.g. Tutors and teachers), as long as the activity has distinct archival identity and involves some input from repository staff
 Doesn't cover: Use of the reading room services and facilities by educational visitors as individuals (counted in visitor numbers). Educational activities entirely facilitated and led by third parties without direct input from the repository. Adult education and lifelong learning work (may be covered within targeted areas of activity)

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To record (as part of a group of measures) the number of people making personal use of the archives other than as searchroom users and, specifically, to log educational activity and impact. To provide evidence of the educational role of archives.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Record the number of people attending each event or activity, totalled monthly and reported for a full year ending 31st March (standard reporting period). Exact numbers should be recorded wherever possible. Ideally, the figures should be grouped separately to show numbers attending from primary, secondary (GCSE, A level etc) and tertiary (undergraduate and postgraduate) education.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Draws on history of recording attendance at educational talks and lectures etc, as outlined at level 1

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: As part of national figure for group visits. Link to attendance. Use for evaluation of activities etc. Relate to service provision and capacity data.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*:

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New basis for measurement and recording may need to be introduced

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.2.5   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes – usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: *VISITORS IN GROUPS: TARGETED OUTREACH ACTIVITIES*

Purpose and scope: *This measure could be useful for monitoring social inclusion and audience development work, linked to national and local priorities and targets. Provision for people with disabilities is another area where targeted outreach may be appropriate, as is work in the field of lifelong learning and basic skills. Measures can be drafted as required*

This measure is listed here as one for possible future development

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.3   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: REMOTE VISITS *
[*Note*: The Resource digest requirement is expressed as 'Visits - e-mail', with a separate line for 'visits – telephone' and no mention of post or fax. Virtual visits form a separate category]

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of external contacts with the archive from people with an interest in its services and holdings and requiring information
  Clarification: The term remote visits covers a whole range of external contact from interested individuals. It is ***not*** the same as enquiries, but it is linked. Enquiries (which will be measured separately using established measures) represent a sub-set of remote visits. The broader term covers people requiring very simple information (answered by phone or leaflet) as well as those with specific enquiries requiring searches.
  Does / may / doesn't cover: [Resource have clarified that this is intended to give an indication of all external contact as defined above – in line with parallel requirements for libraries and museums]

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – <u>see</u> separate notes on each element)*:
  •   Remote visits: post
  •   Remote visits: e-mail *
  •   Remote visits: telephone *

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: The model proposed by Resource for the Annual Digest suggests a distinction between external contacts made with the organisation (regarded as 'visits' – this measure) and the answering of enquiries (regarded as 'activities' – 3.5). This reflects the nature of library and museum work where there are, perhaps, higher numbers of general contacts / queries. In archives, such a distinction could apply – with a figure for enquiries (as 'activities') representing a sub-set of the total number of 'visits'. Information on demand and traffic-flow for remote contacts will be helpful as evidence for resource allocation and service management.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Through separate measures for each contact medium – *see* level 2. Separate recording for each type of activity is recommended at this stage, but thought needs to be given to see if there are ways in which the figures can be used to provide an all-inclusive measure for remote visits.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Derived from library and museum models, and linked to Resource demand for / interest in figures to illustrate levels of contact with all three domains.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: As a full measure of 'visits' beyond on-site use – for local, regional and national figures. To monitor trends in the relative use and importance of communications media.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Will require significant changes to current recording methods, and may be dependent on automated data (*eg* telephone recording) of uncertain reliability. Manual recording would be very time-consuming. All these measures will require careful application – using clear and applicable guidelines to avoid the risk of misclassification – if they are to produce meaningful results, especially where recording is done by individual staff receiving remote contacts.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: The proposed definitions for Resource Annual Digest need to be widened (to include post and telephone contact). Services may need to introduce enquiry handling systems distinguishing between the different types of requests, *eg* those for repository information (general / impersonal) and enquiries involving advice and research (specific / personal). CIPFA will need to consider whether a new

Other notes: This fits with the thinking of the PIWP in proposing different measures for service information, information about holdings, and access to content. What is unclear at the moment –

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

pending piloting – is whether the definition of remote visits suggested by Resource adequately covers this. It is also unclear if this is realistic and feasible. The alternative approach of regarding the processing of significant enquiries (irrespective of the medium by which they are transmitted) as an activity – generating work for staff and leading to an output for users – is developed separately in 3.5.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.3.1 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: REMOTE VISITS: POST AND FAX

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of items of post and FAX received from outside the organisation and relating to the holdings and services of the archive
> *Clarification*: This includes all enquiries by letter or fax (on or related to documentary holdings and requiring an answer), but also covers a wider range of other postal requests to the service
> *Does cover*: Enquiries, orders for publications, photocopying requests, letters asking for leaflets, simple queries answerable by compliment slip, etc
> *Doesn't cover*: Correspondence on office business (i.e. not relating to holdings or services)

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As a contributory measure to provide evidence of 'remote visits' beyond on-site use – for local, regional and national figures - and to provide data on workload and trends in patterns of contact

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Suggest undertaking a sample analysis of all post received at intervals – one week in every three months - through the year to establish averages from which to estimate annual figures. The following broad categories should be used:
a) Requests for information from the archive's parent body
b) Sources available on subject of research HERE
c) Sources available on subject of research ELSEWHERE
d) Commission research, i.e. paid searches
e) Service/access information, eg opening hours, location of office, group visits
f) Information on facilities, eg lift, location of toilets, coffee bar
g) Technical information, eg assist with fiche/film readers, using finding aids
h) Requesting document production (e.g. ordering in advance)
i) Orders for copies of documents
j) Orders for publication and leaflets
k) Booking a place in the searchrooms
l) Other, such as careers in archives, permission to publish documents

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Parallels the models for remote visits by e-mail and telephone in the Resource Digest - but postal 'visits' are not included there.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: To provide evidence of the total number of remote visits by post/fax to measure external demand for information and advice, and to give an indication of the workload. Link to resources (staffing) and dedicated time. Use to place enquiries (3.5) in the context of total remote visits. National totals will be useful as evidence of community need for the services and information provided by archives – and demonstrating awareness of services among a wider audience than those who visit in person.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Relevance and usefulness for archives of this total recording of incoming post/fax (rather than just enquiries requiring an answer)? Concern over willingness of archives to devote time to "total recording" rather than the more necessary work of recording and monitoring enquiries. Only one of the three pilots did what was suggested – and the others only logged enquiries!

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New systems of recording – or sampling – will be required. Systems will require shared understanding – and full participation – by staff.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.3.2   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: REMOTE VISITS: E-MAIL *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of e-mails received from outside the organisation and relating to the holdings and services of the archive
> *Clarification*: This includes all e-mail enquiries (on or related to documentary holdings and requiring an answer), but also covers a wider range of requests to the service
> *Does cover*: Enquiries, orders for publications, photocopying requests, people asking for leaflets, simple queries (not requiring any more than an immediate reply), etc (as in 3.3.1)
> *Doesn't cover*: E-mails on office business (i.e. not relating to holdings or services)

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As a contributory measure to provide evidence of 'remote visits' beyond on-site use – for local, regional and national figures. Public services will be accountable for e-transactions from 2005.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: It may be possible to use automated systems for recording this – but, if so, checks must be undertaken to establish exactly what is being recorded and to ensure that the figures generated accurately reflect (or can be adjusted to reflect) the required definition of e-mail visits. Alternatively, a sample analysis of all e-mails could be undertaken manually at intervals – (say) one week in every two months - through the year weeks to establish averages from which to estimate annual figures. Where detailed analysis is possible, the following broad categories should be used:
a)   Requests for information from the archive's parent body
b)   Sources available on subject of research HERE
c)   Sources available on subject of research ELSEWHERE
d)   Commission research, i.e. paid searches
e)   Service/access information, eg opening hours, location of office, group visits
f)   Information on facilities, eg lift, location of toilets, coffee bar
g)   Technical information, eg assist with fiche/film readers, using finding aids
h)   Requesting document production (e.g. ordering in advance)
i)   Orders for copies of documents
j)   Orders for publication and leaflets
k)   Booking a place in the searchrooms
l)   Other, such as careers in archives, permission to publish documents **Source / History**
(WHERE it comes from): Remote visits by e-mail is a category suggested in the Resource Digest – along with telephone 'visits' (but not those by post).

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Relate to virtual visits (*i.e.* extent to which website use generates e-mail visits and enquiries). As evidence of compliance with E-targets

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Relevance and usefulness for archives? Difficulty of automated monitoring – unless dedicated addresses are used exclusively (and handle all qualifying messages) for visits as defined here. Volume of e-mail contacts is likely to be too great for detailed analysis by type unless done on a very strict sampling basis. Not all services are able to receive e-mail enquiries (e.g. smaller archives). Problems in getting individual staff to log incoming e-mails and to do so consistently.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New recording systems – or sampling methods – will be required. Systems will require shared understanding – and full participation – by staff.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.3.3   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: REMOTE VISITS: TELEPHONE *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of telephone calls received from outside the organisation and relating to the holdings and services of the archive
> *Clarification*: This includes all telephone enquiries (on or related to documentary holdings and requiring an answer), but also covers a wider range of telephone requests to the service
> *Does cover*: Enquiries, orders for publications, photocopying requests, calls asking for leaflets, simple queries answerable on the spot (without requiring investigation or formal reply), etc
> *Doesn't cover*: Calls on office business (i.e. not relating to holdings or services)

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As a contributory measure to provide evidence of 'remote visits' beyond on-site use – for local, regional and national figures.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: It may be possible to use automated systems for recording calls to dedicated outside lines – but, if so, checks must be undertaken to establish exactly what is being recorded and to ensure that the figures generated accurately reflect (or can be adjusted to reflect) the required definition of telephone visits. Alternatively, a sample analysis of incoming calls mails could be undertaken manually at intervals – one week in every two months - through the year weeks to establish averages from which to estimate annual figures. Where detailed analysis is possible, the following broad categories should be used:
a)   Requests for information from the archive's parent body
b)   Sources available on subject of research HERE
c)   Sources available on subject of research ELSEWHERE
d)   Commission research, i.e. paid searches
e)   Service/access information, eg opening hours, location of office, group visits
f)   Information on facilities, eg lift, location of toilets, coffee bar
g)   Technical information, eg assist with fiche/film readers, using finding aids
h)   Requesting document production (e.g. ordering in advance)
i)   Orders for copies of documents
j)   Orders for publication and leaflets
k)   Booking a place in the searchrooms
l)   Other, such as careers in archives, permission to publish documents
m) Abortive calls (for an individual not present)

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Remote visits by telephone is a category suggested in the Resource Digest – along with e-mail 'visits' (but not those by post).

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Use at local level for monitoring remote use of services and identifying trends in the nature of enquiries. At national level as a measure of public engagement with archives beyond contact from on-site visitors. Relate to staffing levels and time spent on answering telephone visits.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Relevance and usefulness for archives? Problems with automated monitoring systems (risk of inaccuracy) and manual recording (time-consuming and liable to human error). Problems in getting individual staff to log incoming e-mails and to do so consistently. Complexities with direct lines, shared internal and external links, call forwarding and other features of standard telephone systems – and the need for 'rules' to cover a wide range of situations.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: May require new recording systems or extension / development of existing monitoring systems. This will require shared understanding – and full participation – by staff.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

Other notes: The need for this measure is generally accepted, but there are felt to be practical difficulties in gathering consistent and reliable data – and in motivating staff to record calls.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.4   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: VIRTUAL VISITS *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Visits to the repository's own website or web pages
   Clarification: This covers hits to the repository's own website or dedicated pages of a shared site
   – provided use can be monitored at the level of the archive's presence.
   Does cover: Websites directly maintained or controlled by the repository
   May cover (but <u>see</u> below): Websites hosted or maintained on behalf of an archive by another
   body. Repository pages on the website of parent organisation. These are to be included only
   where hits to relevant pages can be identified separately.
   Doesn't cover: Hits on partnership projects (*eg* where the archive has contributed material to a
   joint venture) and national gateway sites (*eg* ARCHON, A2A, AIM25 etc) – covered separately as
   level 2 measures.

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – <u>see</u> separate notes on each element)*:
- Patterns of use
- Nature of use
- Gateways
- Partnership resources

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To demonstrate the impact of automation
programmes and the use of on-line resources alongside traditional on-site access. As evidence of
services to wider (and worldwide) community. Resource wish to use virtual visits as a key figure in
the Annual Digest.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Total visits (hits or page impressions) to the site *per annum* –
based on actual recorded figures for the year ending 31 March annually. By standard definitions, this
is a total figure - including repeat visitors to the site.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Evolving standard measure for logging web activity
using Internet Information Services (IIS) World Wide Web Council standards (W3C format). Windows
based servers record logfiles in W3C format, and the same protocols can also be used with other
operating systems. The hits figure is a key figure required by the Office of the e-Envoy.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: As evidence of wider use
of archives beyond traditional and on-site audiences. For correlating with figures (phase 2) for
automation and creation of on-line resources

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Not all archives have a website / web presence.
There are difficulties regarding precise definitions of what counts as a 'hit' – and also in interpreting
the crude statistical data on visits. Differences between protocols for generating data across
platforms, and difficulties in getting archives (and technical support providers) to amend local
systems to meet required criteria. The tendency for IT departments to produce vast quantities of
automatically generated data with no analysis – and no easy pointers to significant figures.
Repository websites only represent part of the overall coverage of online resources – so this figure is
not meaningful in isolation. The effect of staff use of websites, and how far this distorts the figures
as a genuine reflection of external / public use.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: This will be a new line for the CIPFA
statistics. Introduction may lead to changes in the practices of individual repositories following
consultation with technical staff regarding automated recording methods.

Other notes: Archives service providers must liaise with technical staff to ensure that recorded
figures *only* and accurately record virtual visits to the repository site/pages

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.4.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VIRTUAL VISITS: PATTERNS OF USE

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Numerical data about the use of web-based materials
   Clarification: This provides more detailed – but still high-level – information about the use of websites and online resources, below the 'headline figure' of visits or 'hits'
   Does cover: Selected key elements from standard logging criteria (list below)
   Doesn't cover: Detailed and more specific data collection requirements (possibilities are numerous)

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: There is a need for detail beyond the gross headline figure for visits or 'hits', to identify user preferences for different types of website content, to gather evidence of use and for breakdowns showing the source of visits

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Use logfile data (based on W3C standards) to obtain monthly figures – grossed into annual figures for the year ending 31 March - for:
a)   Source (numbers of "local" / own client community, national and international visitors)
b)   Number of page views
c)   Number of visits
d)Number of unique visitors / number of users
e)   Average duration of a visit / time spent by users
f)   New visitors

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Based on standard IIS World Wide Web Council (W3C) standards, and developed after consultation with archives which have undertaken developmental work in this area.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: As evidence of wider use of archives beyond traditional and on-site audiences. For trend / growth monitoring

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Possible difficulties in extracting consistent and accurate data. Pilots report that identifying new visitors may be difficult with some monitoring software systems. Difficulties in filtering the automatically generated data available. Also, the general problems identified in 3.4 above

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New recording may be needed. For analysis, additional software may be needed to generate consistent reports.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.4.2 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VIRTUAL VISITS: NATURE OF USE

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Use of particular types of archival on-line information
  Clarification: This covers the nature of use of on-line resources under four main categories
  (listed below)

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To indicate the relative popularity of different types of
material and to guide planning for future website developments

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Analysis of page visits – using automated logging systems if
practical – to record numbers of hits on particular types of material, the pages being classified under
the following types:
a) Service information and advice (information pages)
b) Research data – access to information about holdings (catalogues / finding aids)
c) Archival data – access to virtual 'stuff' (content, digitised images, on-line surrogates etc)
d) Interpretative material (schools packs, created information resources etc)
Web pages will need to be coded in order for logging to take place

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: PIWP discussions regarding the need to distinguish
between usage across these key areas – and especially between access to repository information and
access to content

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: To provide an analysis of
headline figures for web hits. To monitor trends. Link to availability of types of online materials. For
detailed recording (e.g. number of downloads)

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Categories not watertight enough / risk of blurring.
Practical difficulties in incorporating coding in standard web activity logging systems.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New / more sophisticated recording
systems will be needed. ICT staff advise that this can be done, but will need additional metadata and
logging and analysis software in order to recognise the additional data.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.4.3   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VIRTUAL VISITS: GATEWAYS

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Use of repository data made accessible through the national archives network and other gateways
> *Clarification*: This covers catalogue information and other data accessed through third party sites (the national archive network and other gateways) rather than via the repository's own website/pages
> *Does cover*: All national gateway sites (*eg* ARCHON, A2A, AIM25 etc)
> *Doesn't cover*: Specific local partnership ventures. Repository's own website/pages

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: Use of archive resources via gateways represents a major element in the spectrum of Internet activity. It is especially significant in providing access to material about repositories without websites of their own. This element needs to be covered in published figures for virtual visits.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Total visits (hits or page impressions) to the repository material on all relevant sites *per annum* – based on actual recorded figures for the year ending 31 March annually. Liaison with gateway managers regarding activity logging and scope for extracting meaningful data on usage of resources of individual contributors. A2A, for instance, provides online statistical data about hits on repository pages.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: PIWP discussions, highlighting the importance of including national archive network resources in any assessment of web-based activity and usage

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Use as a separate but supplementary figure for virtual visits to illustrate the additional use/benefit of material made accessible online through partnerships. Link to user satisfaction measures.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Difficulties of establishing consistent and generally applicable means of measurement. Distortion of usage figures by repositories using gateways for access to data on their own holdings (as distinct from virtual visits by other users) – but this may be counterbalanced by corresponding lack of hits on own sites. Problem that some gateways can provide data while others can't, with the result that figures cannot be complete.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: A new element, although the potential for central monitoring by service providers on behalf of contributors may make this an easy way to obtain sound and consistent data across a range of repositories and projects.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.4.4   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - usage   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VIRTUAL VISITS: PARTNERSHIP RESOURCES

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Visits to websites (other than the repository's own site) to which the archive has contributed material in a partnership venture
   Clarification: This is a very narrow category, limited to projects in which the archive has a specific presence as a contributor or partner
   Does cover: Partnerships with specific institutions (*eg* contribution of content for an educational website), digitised material accessible through a third-party site (*eg* NOF projects), or joint ventures with other archives (*eg* The Tudor Hackney project for The National Archives and Hackney Archives Department)
   Doesn't cover: National gateway sites (*eg* ARCHON, A2A, AIM25 etc), for which there is a separate category. Repository's own website/pages

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: Not all Internet resources are directly accessible through own websites, yet partnership ventures like this represent a significant element of the total on-line resource. This element needs to be made visible by inclusion in published figures for virtual visits.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Total visits (hits or page impressions) to the site *per annum* – based on actual recorded figures for the year ending 31 March annually. Liaison with partners regarding activity logging and scope for extracting meaningful data on usage of resources of individual partners.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: PIWP discussions, highlighting the importance of including partnership resources in any assessment of web-based activity and usage

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Use as a separate but supplementary figure for virtual visits to illustrate the additional use/benefit of material made accessible online through partnerships. Link to user satisfaction measures. As part of (phase 3) wider measurement of partnership working

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Not applicable to all. Difficulties of establishing consistent and generally applicable means of measurement. Fluid nature of partnership ventures (duration etc). May only be relevant and worthwhile when this is a key factor for a much larger number of repositories.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: A new element, requiring individual (and implicitly diverse) recording systems.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.5   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - activities   **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: ENQUIRIES SATISFIED *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of enquiries completed for users requesting information on or related to documentary holdings – received by post, e-mail and telephone and requiring specific action by staff leading to a reply by post or e-mail.
> *Clarification*: This covers all enquiries requiring an individual response and involving work by staff. The contact medium is less important than the outcome for the user and the activity generated for staff.
> *Does cover*: Enquiries recorded in an enquiry registration / management system
> *Doesn't cover*: Post and e-mail contact regarding office business (supplies, services, professional activities, office administration, correspondence with donors and depositors etc). Telephone enquiries dealt with verbally from knowledge or from information available. Frequently asked questions answered by standard replies.

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – see separate notes on each element)*:
- Dedicated time
- *Response times*
- *Purpose and subject of enquiry* [not included, but see models at 3.3.1-3]

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: This is a measure of a key activity, and data will be required for the Resource Digest as part of the national overview. Demonstrates practical outcome of policies on access. Measures for electronic service delivery (enquiries satisfied by e-mail) will be required from public services by 2005. Repositories will find it useful in monitoring demand trends etc

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Numbers of enquiries satisfied (i.e. received and completed as an information transaction) in the year ending 31 March.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Figures for postal enquiries were included in the CIPFA statistics from the outset, and modified over time to cover (2002/3 no.54) "enquiries received by post, e-mail and telephone and replied to be post or e-mail … on or related to documentary holdings, requiring an answer, and originating outside the archive services parent body" – with boxes for numbers by post, e-mail and telephone.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Relate proportionally to 'visits' (*i.e.* all contact by post, e-mail and telephone). Link to income from fee-paying enquiry work. Relate to deployment of staff, use of time and service efficiency aspects.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Tighter definition (based on research and provision of information rather than just service information queries) will impact on smaller services and archives unable to offer detailed enquiry services. Differences between services which charge and those that don't could also create anomalies. A change in the basis for data collection could result in an apparent drop in the number of enquiries handled.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Note the emphasis on enquiries satisfied (rather than just post, e-mail and telephone enquiries received). It focuses more clearly on those enquiries that require an individual or customised response. For repositories where all incoming enquiries are treated in the same way, it may be necessary to set up new systems distinguishing between routine information requests (the 'visits' by post etc, as defined earlier) and enquiries proper.

Other notes: This is a key measure – but we need to be clear how the Resource concept of 'visits' for contact with the repository by post, e-mail and phone etc squares with traditional definitions of 'enquiries' as recorded in the past. Does the distinction work? Can systems be adjusted to reflect the new basis for data collection?

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.5.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - activities   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: ENQUIRIES: DEDICATED TIME

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Staff time spent in answering enquiries
  Clarification: This is the dedicated time spent by staff in locating information and preparing replies to enquiries
  Does cover: Should include all time spent by the member(s) of staff dealing with the enquiry, including background research, locating materials, checking documents, and drafting/typing a reply. Time chargeable to the enquirer where fees are charged
  Doesn't cover: Secretarial time in typing replies (if staff do not type or e-mail their own letters) should be regarded as an overhead – and not included in the dedicated time figures for this purpose. Automated reply systems.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: Enquiries differ in the amount of work involved to answer them, and so data regarding the use of time in dealing with enquiries provides evidence of the scale of activity and requirement for resources. Information on staff time is especially important for repositories undertaking research work for payment.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Record actual time and use enquiry registration / management systems to produce monthly and annual totals, where possible. Dedicated time may be recorded for sample enquiries and – provided statistically reliable averages have been arrived at by sampling – used to estimate total time.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Concern that a simple numerical measure for enquiries satisfied would not accurately reflect the level and nature of the work involved.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: To illustrate volume of activity nationally. Link to enquiry numbers to monitor average times. Efficiency and productivity indicator when related to staff numbers, available time and income from enquiry work.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Time-consuming to administer unless automated as part of an enquiry management system (*eg* with time spent, using bands, being a compulsory field). Problems for multi-tasking staff and recording dedicated time when work is interrupted by other tasks.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: May require new recording systems. Not included in CIPFA at present

Other notes: One pilot repository has been monitoring this for a number of years with consistent averages and now only checks samples occasionally to look for any change in the dedicated time spent on enquiries.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.5.2   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - activities   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: *ENQUIRIES: RESPONSE TIME*

Purpose and scope: *Monitoring of response time – elapsed time between receipt of an enquiry and the dispatch of a substantive reply – is standard practice at repository level, and there may be scope for developing a national measure. The difficulty is that standards – the response time required by the parent body or institution – varies from repository to repository, as may the level of service provided in terms of the enquiries that can and can't be handled.*

This measure is listed here as one for possible future development

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.5.3   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - activities   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: *ENQUIRIES: PURPOSE AND SUBJECT OF ENQUIRY*

Purpose and scope: *The models for categorising visits (3.3.1-3 above) could also be applied to enquiries.*

This measure is listed here as one for possible future development

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.6   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - activities   **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure *(short title)*: DOCUMENT PRODUCTIONS *
[*Note*: Not specifically included in cross-domain areas for the Resource Digest, but falls within category of 'items consulted' alongside domain-specific aspects for museums and libraries]

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of archives (defined as production units) produced from the storage areas in response to requests from users – as *one* measure of 'access to content'
>   *Clarification*: This covers all document productions for visitors to the reading room and for material consulted by staff in connection with enquiries
>   *Does cover*: All reading room productions for visitors and staff. Material produced from strongrooms and storage areas (including non archival holdings)
>   *May cover*: Reserved material (*see* Methven et.al. para 6.5 on p.25)
>   *Doesn't cover*: Movement of material for purposes of repository administration. Use of documents for exhibitions and displays (including selection of exhibits). Loans and withdrawals. Self-service and open access materials. Specifically local studies books and materials

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – <u>see</u> separate notes on each element)*:
*   *Use of surrogates*

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: Although document productions represent only a small part of the overall usage of archives, the figures are nevertheless still worth recording as an indicator of use and activity. Greater use of surrogates means that the general trend in document productions is downward or static – rather than increasing.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Number of document productions as 'production units' per annum – recorded monthly, and reported as annual figures for the year ending 31 March. A production unit is defined as "the individual physical unit of material, such as a volume, bundle etc, produced" and normally the lowest level to which the archive is catalogued. For example:
*   A bundle of 73 letters not individually catalogued counts as 1
*   A volume containing loose papers (listed or identified in the catalogue) still counts as 1
*   Documents produced in a box or bundle count as 1 even if the box/bundle contains several items
*   Letters individually catalogued (eg numbers 1-26) count as 26 if the reader requests them all in order to see every one, but as 1 if reader only wants to see no.18 (3 if the reader wants nos. 3, 7 and 18 etc) – *i.e.* if items are extracted, then the production unit is the individual letter or paper
If in doubt, the smallest (not the largest) number should be logged in the recorded figures

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Used in the CIPFA statistics from the early 1990s, and defined by Methven et.al (1993) p.25. The current definition (CIPFA 2001/2 q.44) allows recording "according to the method usually employed by the service", but this is not robust enough to generate consistent and reliable figures

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: As a national headline figure. Link to visitor numbers and staff deployment. Trend data for service planning – use of reader accommodation, usage (*eg* remote/on-site, originals/surrogates) etc. Relate to satisfaction indicators

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Reluctance of repositories to change current recording systems (and likelihood of drop in production numbers for services who currently count by *maxima* rather than *minima*). This could be a perverse indicator (*i.e.* high levels of productions may indicate poor cataloguing, lack of surrogates and uncontrolled access to originals).

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Recording practices will need to be changed to reflect the tighter definition of a 'production unit' – along with training for staff to ensure adherence and consistency. CIPFA question will need amending

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

Other notes: Distinguishing between productions for on-site users and those connected with remote enquiries (i.e. staff use in answering enquiries, providing copies etc) may be worthwhile in future, especially where web access to finding aids increases demand for remote services.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.6.1 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes – activities **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: *USE OF SURROGATES*

Purpose and scope: *While it is recognised that document productions represent an area of decreasing importance and the pattern of use shifts to the use of surrogates on-site and on-line, there are difficulties in identifying measures for this alternative activity. Many surrogates are available on a self-service basis, and systems for recording use tend to be unreliable, intrusive (for users) and bureaucratic (for staff). Snapshot sampling – to avoid unnecessary intrusion on visitors and adversely affecting customer care - will be the only effective way of doing this.*

Measuring the use of surrogates would be helpful in providing evidence of the emerging patterns of use – and especially the balance between the use of originals, surrogates (eg microfilms on-site) and digitised material (on-site and on-line). There is also some interest in exploring how the use of surrogates affects the use of archive facilities – eg own holdings accessible as surrogates elsewhere, changes in availability of access to acquired material (eg census microfilms and GRO indexes).

This measure will also help to provide evidence of the existence of effective surrogacy programmes in reducing levels of use of unique original materials AND at the same time making them more accessible to users. It will provide a stewardship / preservation measure as well as an access one.

There will also be a direct relationship between the use of surrogates and the availability / allocation of on-site accommodation (1.4.2)

This measure is listed here as one for possible future development

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.7.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes - outreach   **Level**: 1 (main)

Measure (short title):   OUTREACH ACTIVITIES *

Purpose (WHAT it measures): Engagement with the community through activities designed to promote the archives service and make its resources accessible to people other than existing users
  Clarification: This covers activities and not attendance figures (see separate measures).
  Does cover: The full range of events and outreach activities either on the premises or outside the repository, but using separate measures (see level 2) for main types
  Doesn't cover: Exhibitions (see separate measure), media appearances and presence at cultural activities (e.g. taking a stand and displaying promotional material) – generally outreach activities for which precise counting of visitors is impractical

Subordinate measures (level 2):
- Outreach: On-site activities
- Outreach: Off-site activities
- Outreach: Exhibitions
- Outreach: School involvement (links between institutions and schools) *
- *Outreach: Targeted activities (eg social inclusion)*

Rationale (WHY the measure is needed): To demonstrate the effort being made to promote archives and attract new audiences and to show the contribution made by archives services in the wider cultural and social arena – especially for public services. It is particularly important to recognise the activities of private and specialist archives for whom this work may not be a priority, but whose contribution should be recorded and valued.

Definition (HOW to measure it): Through separate measures for each type – *see* level 2. Separate recording for each type of activity is recommended at this stage, but thought needs to be given to see if there are ways in which the figures can be used to provide an all-inclusive measure for outreach activities.

Source / History (WHERE it comes from): CIPFA statistics have included figures for exhibitions, displays, talks and lectures – and for attendances – for some years. The following new measures are intended to replace these.

Potential indicators (how measure might be used in an indicator): For national headline figures. Relate to attendance, link to changes in user profile, use to review effectiveness of outreach programmes.

Limitations and risks (possible problems): Relatively low levels of activity in archives (for reasons of core responsibilities and resource constraints), and risk of unfavourable comparison with museums (especially) and libraries where this work is accorded a higher priority. Difficulties in measuring like with like within an institution and across a range of repositories with any degree of consistency. Ability to attach reliable attendance figures to many events.

Changes (how measure might affect current recording): Changes to CIPFA definitions will be required. Repositories will need to establish new recording systems and/or alter existing practices. A sample template is available.

Other notes: There is an issue about how outreach activities based on the Internet should be handled – to be discussed. The impact of outreach through the media is being explored separately by Resource.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.7.2 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes – outreach **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: OUTREACH: EVENTS OFF-SITE

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The number of one-off outreach events held
   Clarification: This covers a range of events and activities held outside the repository. These should be identifiable as single one-off events for which attendance figures can be recorded
   Does cover: Events such as talks, lectures, surgeries etc held outside the record office, including specifically archival events and participation in wider cultural activities (e.g. family history fairs, heritage events), provided attendance figures are recorded
   Doesn't cover: Group visits (*i.e.* on-site), exhibitions and displays (separate measures), media appearances

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As part of a total measure for outreach activity, and to demonstrate engagement etc

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By counting the total number of events in the standard reporting period (year ending 31 March). Each event / occurrence counts as one (*eg* each repeat of the same talk at a different venue counts as one). Repositories may find it helpful to record and monitor activity on a monthly basis, and to categorise events by type for closer analysis. For local use, attendance figures should be linked to the type of event to assist in evaluation of effectiveness

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Detailed measures specified in Methven *et.al.* (1993) s.9 on "outreach" and used in CIPFA statistics, but a broader generic approach is suggested here

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Contributing to total figure for outreach activities. Link to attendance at events. Monitor effectiveness of activities.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Recording may be in the hands of others, leading to difficulties of control / reliability. Measure does not reflect proportionate size of present at events

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Revision of CIPFA returns and local recording systems will be necessary

Other notes: This is intended as a very broad measure to cover a whole range of external outreach activities for which visitor figures / attendances can be reliably recorded or estimated

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.7.3 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes – outreach **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: OUTREACH: EXHIBITIONS

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Number of archival exhibitions mounted by the repository
 Clarification: This covers archival exhibitions on-site at the repository and at other locations. A clear archival identity of the display is the key distinguishing feature, rather than location or scale
 Does cover: Archival exhibitions in the repository's own display area, and archive-specific displays at other venues. Mounted displays and facsimiles (rather than original materials)
 May cover: Displays in a distinct area of a larger exhibition, provided visitors to that area can be counted (or estimated) separately
 Doesn't cover: Larger exhibitions for which the repository has only provided exhibits. Joint ventures and displays where archives are a minor element in a larger theme.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As part of a total measure for outreach activity, and to demonstrate engagement etc. Will also help to measure cross-domain and partnership working, as many exhibitions are joint ventures

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Exhibitions and displays mounted by the repository in the year ending 31 March (standard reporting period)

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Detailed measures specified in Methven *et.al.* (1993) s.9 on "outreach" and used in CIPFA statistics, but a broader generic approach is suggested here

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Contributing to total figure for outreach activities. Link to attendance at exhibitions – where correlation will reflect the scale of activity. Monitor effectiveness of activities.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: This does not cover all exhibitions, and some archives will feel excluded by limiting this to archive-specific exhibitions if their main display activity is in joint ventures. Extension (at level 3) to cover input to other exhibitions (*eg* loans of exhibits, supply of information, design input etc) could be considered. That this will be impossible to relate to usage (visits) and impact, but could be helpful when examining partnership working (phase 3)

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Revision of CIPFA returns and local recording systems will be necessary

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.7.4   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes – outreach   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: OUTREACH: EDUCATIONAL INVOLVEMENT *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Number of group activities and events run by the archive in support of formal education (stemming from links with educational institutions)
> *Clarification*: This covers specific activities catering for the needs of groups of teachers and students in formal education and (usually) working towards a qualification
> *Does cover*: Talks, study sessions or familiarisation courses provided by the record office (on-site or at external venues) for school, college and university students. Also includes group sessions for teachers as well as work with students.
> *May cover*: Events organised jointly with other providers, as long as the activity has a distinct archival identity and involves direct input from repository staff
> *Doesn't cover*: Adult education and organised non-qualification group activities (treated as group visits). Services for self-directed informal learners (generally treated as individual visitors). Liaison with individual students and teachers. Web-based learning support.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As part of a total measure for outreach activity, and to demonstrate engagement with the education sector / contribution to the learning agenda etc

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Number of group activities and events (as defined above) held by the repository in the year ending 31 March (standard reporting period). At repository level (and possibly nationally) it may be helpful to give a breakdown recording the numbers of events for schools, colleges and universities.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Detailed measures specified in Methven *et.al.* (1993) s.9 on "education" and used in CIPFA statistics (eg 2001-2 estimates q.52), but a broader generic approach is suggested here

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Contributing to total figure for outreach activities. Link to attendance at educational events – where correlation will reflect the scale of activity. Relate to levels of service provision. Monitor effectiveness of activities.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: This does not cover services provided for individual teachers (*eg* selecting and supplying materials for classroom use), which provides a significant element of educational work for archives with dedicated staff and facilities.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Revision of CIPFA returns and local recording systems will be necessary

Other notes: It may be necessary to develop level 3 measures for specific aspects of activities related to education and learning. This measure only aims to cover one specific – but significant – element of Educational involvement.

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 3.7.5   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Service delivery outcomes – outreach   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: *OUTREACH: TARGETED ACTIVITIES*

Purpose and scope: *This measure could be useful for monitoring social inclusion and audience development work, linked to national and local priorities and targets. Provision for people with disabilities is another area where targeted outreach may be appropriate, as is work in the field of lifelong learning and basic skills. Measures can be drafted as required*

This measure is listed here as one for possible future development

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 4.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Quality   **Level**: 1

Measure *(short title)*: OVERALL SATISFACTION RATINGS OF SERVICE USERS *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Levels of overall user satisfaction with services provided by the repository
   Clarification: This is an overall satisfaction measure only, based on survey responses from service users. It only deals with responses from on-site visitors as used until now.

Subordinate measures *(level 2)*:
   • Satisfaction ratings of service users for staff, facilities and services

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: Evidence of levels of user satisfaction is required for the Resource Annual Digest at national level, and provided valuable management information at repository level.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By survey, asking respondents to assess the archive's service overall on a five-point scale – very good, good, adequate, poor and very poor

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Widespread survey practice, but specifically developed for archives – with the detailed user evaluation of staff, facilities and services (at level 2) – for the PSQG National Visitor Survey (eg 2002 survey q.1). It is recommended that repositories carry out users surveys based on overall satisfaction and the detailed evaluation simultaneously. Surveys should be based on reliable statistical samples.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Use for gaining national overview of satisfaction levels, and for benchmarking between archives of similar size and status.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*:

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: No change for archives already participating in the PSQG Visitor Survey. If annual reporting is required, more frequent surveys may be needed (although the problem of survey fatigue suggests that this should be avoided).

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 4.1.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Quality   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: SERVICE SATIFACTION RATINGS OF USERS

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Levels of user satisfaction with specific services and facilities provided by the repository
> *Clarification*: This covers the main elements within the range of services provided by most repositories
> *Does cover*: Physical access, advance information, staff helpfulness, reading room facilities, copying services, website etc – as list below – as experienced by individual service users
> *Doesn't cover*: Use of services by people in groups and remote users.

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To determine levels of satisfaction – and dissatisfaction – with services as currently provided, and to provide guidance on areas for improvement.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By survey, asking respondents to assess the archive's service on a five-point scale – very good, good, adequate, poor and very poor – against each of the following areas:
a)   Advance information
b)   Web-site
c)   Opening hours
d)   Physical access to and in the building
e)   Visitor facilities
f)   Lists, indexes, leaflets, reference books
g)   Document delivery
h)   Microfilm and fiche viewing facilities
i)   Copy services
j)   On-site IT facilities
k)   Quality and appropriateness of the staff's advice
l)   Helpfulness and friendliness of the staff
[m   The archive's service overall]
The results to be presented for the sample period (one month or 500 visitors – whichever is the smaller) and shown for each line by numbers in each rating band, and with percentages of total responses for each line.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Developed since 1998 for the PSQG National Visitor Survey, and last used in this form in the 2002 survey (q.1). The surveys have also included a follow-up question on "In what areas is it most important for the service to improve?" using the same core list, with scope for users to mark any where improvement is required and to add comments.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Individual elements can be related to specific service aims (*eg* on access for people with disabilities). For benchmarking between services.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*:

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: None for PSQG Visitor Survey participants. Others will need to undertake a new survey using the response framework above.

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 4.1.2   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Quality   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: VALUE OF THE SERVICE AS PERCEIVED BY USERS *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: How users see archives services contribute to their own lives and to society in general
Clarification: This uses two sets of questions to elicit views about the personal benefits of using archives and about how archives support society

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: First included in the 2001 PSQG National Visitor Survey, these questions have produced helpful data to support advocacy for the archive domain at various levels.

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Using visitor surveys – asking respondents to comment on the basis of their overall experience of using archives – inviting users to indicate their agreement with a range of statements.

The first set covers personal experience, i.e. whether users consider that using archives has:
a)   It has been a useful and enjoyable learning experience
b)   It has helped generally to increase my abilities, skills and confidence
c)   It has helped to develop my understanding of history or culture
d)   It has helped me to develop my job seeking or workplace skills
e)   It has helped me to use and develop my IT skills

The second set covers broader values of what archives contribute to society, i.e. by
a)   Providing opportunities for learning
b)   Preserving our culture and heritage
c)   Strengthening family and community identity
d)   Supporting administrative and business activity
e)   Underpinning the rights of citizens

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Both questions were first used in the 2001 PSQG National Visitor Survey (q.18-19). The first question was repeated (with very similar results) in the 2002 survey (q.22). The second was not run again.

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: To produce figures – as percentages of respondents - for national, regional and local advocacy for archives. The responses provide evidence of the archival contribution to the wider learning, basic skills and IT literacy agenda

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Limited to service users

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: None for PSQG Visitor Survey participants. Others will need to undertake a new survey using the response framework above.

Other notes: Pilots are asked to use these questions if running a visitor survey, and to consider if the categories and phraseology can be improved

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 5.1 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Fair access **Level**: 1

Measure *(short title)*: USER PROFILES *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The profile of the users of archives services
Clarification: This covers the demographic, social and educational profile of the users of archives services according to standard methods of categorisation

Subordinate measures *(level 2 – <u>see</u> separate notes on each element)*:
- Gender *
- Age *
- Social class / socio-economic *
- Education *
- Ethnicity *
- Disability *
- *Geographical (including visitors to UK)*
- *Employment status*

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: To provide a national, regional and local profiles of archives users, as required for the Resource Annual Digest of Statistics. To assist in monitoring change (*eg* as a result of audience development or targeted social inclusion work). For local management, and for service planning (*eg* in improving services for people with disabilities) and marketing. To demonstrate compliance with legal requirements and local equality targets

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: Through separate measures for each type – *see* level 2.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Standard survey criteria, updated to meet current terms and definitions

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Various – specific to each area, but with the overall potential for monitoring trends and relating to service priorities.

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*:

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: Changes will be required where recording systems are based on old definitions and categories

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 5.1.1   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Fair access   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: USER PROFILE: GENDER *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The gender of visitors to the archives service
   Clarification: Male or female
   Does cover: On-site individual visitors only
   Doesn't cover: Remote visitors

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As part of set of measures for user profile, as required for the Resource Annual Digest of Statistics

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By survey, asking respondents to indicate their gender

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*:

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Towards national profile of users. Scope for use as qualifying element on other measures and indicators (*eg* relative satisfaction levels between males and females on different aspects of the service)

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*:

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*:

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 5.1.2   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Fair access   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: USER PROFILE: AGE *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The age of visitors to the archives service
    Clarification: Based on age at last birthday
    Does cover: On-site individual visitors only
    Doesn't cover: Remote visitors

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As part of set of measures for user profile, as required for the Resource Annual Digest of Statistics

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By survey, asking respondents to indicate their age at last birthday – actual age where possible (*eg* where anonymity is guaranteed, and where responses can be processed automatically). An alternative is to allow respondents to show their age against the list of age ranges from the 2001 census, i.e. at five-year intervals starting with 0-4 and going up to 85-89 with the final range of 90+

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: 2001 census

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Towards national profile of users. Scope for use as qualifying element on other measures and indicators (*eg* relative satisfaction levels between different age groups on different aspects of the service)

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Possible reluctance to disclose age on open survey forms

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*:

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 5.1.3 **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Fair access **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: USER PROFILE: SOCIAL CLASS / SOCIO ECONOMIC *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The socio-economic category of visitors to the archives service
    Clarification: Social class or socio-economic groupings of record office users
    Does cover: On-site individual visitors only
    Doesn't cover: Remote visitors

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As part of set of measures for user profile, as required for the Resource Annual Digest of Statistics

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: To be measured using the A (senior professional), B (senior manager), C1 (manager / teacher), C2 (white collar), D (blue collar), E (unemployed or student) convention. It should be noted that this is not wealth / income dependent (rich people can fall in groups D and E) and people can move between bands (on retirement a senior professional moves from A to E). It is also based on the status of the head of the household. By sampling, using trained interviewers to establish the socio-economic of sample users – using statistically reliable samples. To be undertaken on a snapshot basis at annual intervals.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Based on one of the two main schemes using the standard breakdown, either the one from the Registrar General or the one from the Market Research Society [Resource to advise further].

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Towards national profile of users. Scope for use as qualifying element on other measures and indicators (*eg* relative satisfaction levels between specific groups on different aspects of the service)

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: External help will be needed, and staff will not be familiar with the scheme and users cannot be expected to know their band. Most socio-economic research involves the use of experienced paid researchers, and the A, B etc system is now regarded as very dated – and no longer meaningful – by market researchers. Much more sophisticated – but also more expensive – approaches are now available.

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New recording

Other notes: Alternative affordable approaches to social / socio-economic groupings need to be identified if this measure is required

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 5.1.4   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Fair access   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: USER PROFILE: EDUCATION *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The level of educational attainment of users of archives services
    Clarification: This is intended to ascertain the highest level of qualification gained by users in the course of formal education. Their qualification need not be related in any way to the user's use of archives
    Does cover: All qualifications obtained at school, college and university. Qualifications obtained after leaving school

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As part of set of measures for user profile, as required for the Resource Annual Digest of Statistics

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By survey, asking anonymous users to indicate (one only) their highest level of educational attainment (or equivalent overseas qualification) from the following list:
a)   Secondary (GCSE, O levels)
b)   Further (A levels, AS levels)
c)   First degree (BA, BSc)
d)   Research degree (MA, PhD, PGCE and postgraduate award)
e)   NVQ etc (NVQ level 1-5, HNC, HND)
f)   Other (BTEC, RSA, City & Guilds etc)
g)   None
Results to be set in context of sample size (based on statistically valid sample), with numbers for each category and with percentages

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Used in PSQG National Visitor Survey 2001 (q.10), and based on formula used in other surveys

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Towards national profile of users. Scope for use as qualifying element on other measures and indicators (*eg* relative satisfaction levels between specific groups on different aspects of the service)

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: This has been seen as elitist, reinforcing the view that the archive world is an academic enclave. It is really a fact-finding measure, intended – if anything – to provide evidence to challenge the stereotypical view. Anonymity is important to ensure accurate survey responses

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*: New recording

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 5.1.5   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Fair access   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: USER PROFILE: ETHNICITY *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: The ethnic background of users of archives
    Clarification: Categorisation using current ethnicity groupings

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As part of set of measures for user profile, as required for the Resource Annual Digest of Statistics

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By survey, asking anonymous users to indicate (one only) their ethnicity from the following list:
a)   WHITE
        A1: British [but using recognised alternatives in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland]
        A2: Irish
        A3: Other white
b)   MIXED
        B1: White and Black Caribbean
        B2: White and Black African
        B3: White and Asian
        B4: Other mixed
c)   ASIAN OR ASIAN BRITISH
        C1: Indian
        C2: Pakistani
        C3: Bangladeshi
        C4: Other Asian
d)   BLACK OR BLACK BRITISH
        D1: Black Caribbean
        D2: Black African
        D3: Other Black
e)   CHINESE AND OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS
        E1: Chinese
        E2: Other ethnic groups
Results to be set in context of sample size (based on statistically valid sample), with numbers for each category and with percentages

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: 2001 census, and as used (as an equal opportunities monitoring form) in the PSQG National Visitor Survey 2002 section E

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Towards national profile of users. Scope for use as qualifying element on other measures and indicators (*eg* relative satisfaction levels between specific groups on different aspects of the service). For monitoring trends in use (*eg* linked to social inclusion aims) and providing evidence of progress against local targets

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Some difficulty regarding the census categories in the Home Countries – with associated problems of converting Welsh. Scottish and Northern Ireland data back into UK totals

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*:

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 5.1.6   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Fair access   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: USER PROFILE: DISABILITY *

Purpose *(WHAT it measures)*: Numbers of users with disabilities
   Clarification: Covers main types of disability identified in the 1995 Disability Discrimination Act, which defines a disabled person as someone with "a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his or her ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities"
   Covers: Visual, hearing, physical and learning disabilities – and multiple impairments

Rationale *(WHY the measure is needed)*: As part of set of measures for user profile, as required for the Resource Annual Digest of Statistics

Definition *(HOW to measure it)*: By survey, asking users to indicate by self-categorisation is they have one or more (by marking any that apply) of the following disabilities:
a)   A visual disability
b)   A hearing disability
c)   A physical disability
d)   A learning disability
Results to be set in context of sample size (based on statistically valid sample), with numbers for each category and with percentages against total survey sample.

Source / History *(WHERE it comes from)*: Standard survey approach, as used in the PSQG National Visitor Survey 2002 (q.18-21)

Potential indicators *(how measure might be used in an indicator)*: Towards national profile of users. Scope for use as qualifying element on other measures and indicators (*eg* relative satisfaction levels of disabled users on different aspects of the service). For monitoring trends in use (*eg* linked to social inclusion aims) and providing evidence of progress against local disability targets

Limitations and risks *(possible problems)*: Based on responses of users, who may be unwilling to disclose all impairments (especially learning difficulties)

Changes *(how measure might affect current recording)*:

Other notes:

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 5.1.7　　　　　　　　　　**Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Fair access　　　　　　　　**Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: *USER PROFILE: GEOGRAPHICAL*

Purpose and scope: *This measure would be used to show the travel distance and place of origin for people visiting the archives. It would only cover on-site users. Individual archives already monitor the use of the service by people from their own geographical area or constituency, but the need is for a national means of establishing average travel distances and proportions of overseas visitors etc. This is especially important for archives where (unlike public libraries, for example) many visitors come from some distance to access unique materials.*

The PSQG National Visitor surveys have used automated analysis by postcode (eg 2002 survey q.13) to identify average distances travelled by fixed percentages of users, but this is not particularly easy to interpret or to use for service planning / advocacy. A system using average distances, or % of users travelling over "n" miles would be more meaningful.

This measure is listed here as one for possible future development

Phase 1 – Measures for access and usage of archives

No: 5.1.8   **Group**: Access and Usage

Type: Fair access   **Level**: 2 (subordinate)

Measure *(short title)*: *USER PROFILE: EMPLOYMENT STATUS*

Purpose and scope: *This factor – useful for monitoring social inclusion and audience development work – is not wholly covered by the suggested measure for Social class / Socio-economic grouping. If used discreetly – and anonymously – it may be possible to develop a measure for snapshot sampling based on employment status, referring to categories such as a) in employment, b) unemployed, c) retired, d) full time education.*

This measure is listed here as one for possible future development

[END]