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Abstract

The National University of Singapore Libraries in recent years undertook several approaches to assess its performance. In this paper we share our experiences in formulating the Library's strategic plan, setting out key performance indicators, using the balanced scorecard method to monitor performance and introducing a new staff performance management system. Results from surveys were used to evaluate the outcome.

Introduction

In 2001, the National University of Singapore (NUS) announced to staff the introduction of the Quality Assurance Framework for Universities (QAFU). This framework was developed by the Ministry of Education to encourage continuous self-learning and quality enhancements as well as to seek accountability from the universities for the use of public funds. The institutional self assessment would be set against defined institutional goals and self selected performance indicators covering governance, management, teaching, research and service. Universities were expected to review whether appropriate and adequate systems were in place to attain the desired outcomes, outputs and targets.

To meet the demands of a more structured evaluation process, the NUS Libraries (see Appendix 1 for details on size and collections) started in 2002 to submit to the University administration strategic plans, key performance indicators and balanced scorecards. Today the Library uses a combination of traditional as well as new approaches to assess its performance.

Methods of Measuring Performance used by NUS Libraries

Input Measures

Traditionally the NUS Libraries measured its performance by comparing data on input measures such as the number of projects completed, collection growth, volume of loan transactions, number of queries handled, number of tutorials conducted and volume of work done in cataloguing, indexing, acquisitions, serials processing and binding. In recent years, statistics on database usage and visits to library websites were also added.

Input measures are still utilized by the Library to gauge its performance.
Surveys, Accreditation Reports and Benchmarking

To obtain snapshots of how the library was faring and how users perceived its services, the Library also relied on accreditation reports and surveys such as the Students Perception Survey 2004 conducted jointly by the Offices of Student Affairs and Quality Management, and the NUS Faculties Perception Survey 2004 commissioned by the NUS Corporate Cluster.

In addition, NUS Libraries commenced a survey to gather written feedback directly from users in August 2002. The hardcopy form (Appendix 2) was made available online from the library website from November 2002. It is a simple survey in which users were asked how they rated the resources of the Library, the accessibility of its books, journals and electronic resources, the service level of library staff and the overall rating of the Library. Users were offered rankings ranging from 1-6 where 1 was for a very poor ranking and 6 was for an excellent ranking. If they had ranked the Library poorly (1 or 2), they were invited to tell us why. The results were input into an excel database. Compliments and complaints received via correspondence or email were also added to the database tallies.

In 2003, a benchmarking exercise against members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) was conducted comparing their budget, staffing and workload with that of NUS Libraries.

New Tools Adopted between 2002 -2004

Strategic Planning

As early as 2000, the Library had formed a Committee to work on strategic planning. Progress was slow initially but the momentum picked up in 2002. As staff was not well versed with this tool, a one day workshop on strategic planning was arranged for senior management in March 2002 followed by a 2 day retreat about 10 days later. The workshop and the retreat were facilitated by faculty staff from the NUS School of Business.

After the pre-retreat workshop, senior management met to formulate a draft plan of the Library’s vision and mission and strategic goals for group discussions during the retreat. The strategies that were discussed included:

- Providing timely and user friendly access to relevant information.
- Providing proactive, customer focused and value added services to faculty and students.
- Imparting information seeking skills to students.
- Maintaining an innovative library to provide customer-focused services.
- Adopting best practices in human resources management to recruit, develop and retain staff of high caliber.
- Promoting communication and fostering partnerships with faculty, students and administrative departments.
- Forging alliances with academic and research institutions for mutual benefit.
- Providing a conducive environment that facilitates learning and research.
Following the retreat, work resumed on the Library’s Strategic Plan covering the period 2002-2005. The plan was reviewed annually to confirm the actions to be implemented each year. Work had recently started for the 2006-2008 plan.

**Performance Indicators**

In July 2002, the Library was requested to prepare performance indicators for the QAFU report. The performance indicators were duly submitted by the Director in August. It covered the following:

- availability - of the collection, facilities and automated systems
- service - document delivery, acquisitions, general loans, reference, cataloguing and physical processing, current journals
- resource utilization rate – facilities, loans, electronic resources.

Work on the performance indicators was carried out primarily by the Central Library heads as they were also coordinators of technical and user services functions such as circulation, reference, cataloguing, acquisitions and serials for the whole Library. Heads of special libraries contributed their viewpoints to these coordinators. The participation was not restricted to senior management as heads of all departments held their own meetings with their staff to deliberate and gather feedback on the indicators.

Key documents on which the work was based were the ISO Standard on library performance indicators (1998)\(^1\) and the IFLA publication on *Measuring quality: international guidelines for performance measurement in academic libraries* (1996)\(^2\).

When deciding on the performance indicators it would use, the Library was guided by considerations such as how much impact the chosen indicator would have on the provision of services to users as well as the resources required to gather the data to measure the outcomes.

**Balanced Scorecard**

The concept for the balanced scorecard was introduced in an article in the *Harvard Business Review* by Kaplan and Norton (1992)\(^3\). The scorecard was designed for businesses but is today widely adapted for use by government and non-profit organizations. The balanced scorecard examines an organization from four perspectives – user, finance, internal processes and learning and growth.

The Deputy President in July 2002 introduced the use of the balanced scorecard to examine the performance of all departments reporting to him. Staff started work on the library’s scorecard but as they were not familiar with this new tool, the Library turned once again to the NUS School of Business for assistance. A half day seminar on the balanced scorecard was subsequently conducted by a faculty member for all professional staff in September. The first working meeting after the seminar was held in October, attended by all heads of departments. Several meetings among a smaller group of senior staff members followed to formulate the Library’s scorecard. The NUS Libraries balanced scorecard showing cause and effect linkages was presented to the Deputy President in December 2002.
More meetings and revisions followed. Effort was made to ensure that all the Library’s strategic goals and performance indicators were addressed in the scorecard. A revised scorecard was submitted to the Deputy President in January 2004 (Appendix 3 and 4). In September 2004, the Library reviewed its balanced scorecard for 2005.

**Staff Performance Management System**

2003 also saw the University implementing a new competency based performance management system for administrative and professional staff. It was developed for NUS by a consulting firm. NUS Libraries staff participated actively in the development of this system. The system that eventually emerged consisted of four main components: Key Result Areas (KRA), Knowledge Skills and Expertise (KSE), Core and Managerial competencies (Appendix 5).

The core and managerial competencies were common for both administrative and professional staff while the KSE component was specific to library staff. It comprised of a suite of ten domains which were Acquisitions management, Cataloguing (Appendix 6), Serials management, Circulation, Collection development, Library information technology, Indexing, Reference, User education and a General domain. Each domain comprised of five levels with the minimum requirements of skills and knowledge defined for each level. Each professional staff selects the domains that apply to them depending on their job responsibilities.

At the beginning of each assessment year, staff and their head of department work closely to plan the work they would be doing for the coming year. This is recorded in the KRA component of the system. This process ensures that the tasks to be carried out by the individual are aligned with the department’s goals, that there is transparency regarding the work to be done and greater clarity of expectations. KRAs contribute to 50% of the total score for the evaluation of each individual.

For core competencies, the Library set a higher weightage for the competencies it deemed to be very important. Teamwork and customer focus were the two core competencies the Library assigned the highest weightage, at 30% each.

**Outcomes**

The Library did well in 2004. It carried out all the 11 goals that it set for that year. Feedback from the Library’s in-house survey for 2004 (Appendix 7) was also very positive. 92% of the feedback on library resources and 90% on service rated the Library as good to excellent.

A very proud moment for all staff was when President Shih acknowledged in his 2004 State of the University address the Library’s achievement in obtaining for two years in a row the highest scores for providing efficient and courteous service in the Students’ Perception Survey.
The years 2002-2004 were very challenging ones for the Library but it had also provided staff with a rich learning experience. The tasks gave senior management the opportunity to examine afresh what the Library was about, where it was heading as an institution and how it was going to get there. The vision and mission were deliberated on, clarified and rephrased. Key strategic goals were identified, the Library’s strategies were examined from four different perspectives and the different expectations from users, staff and stakeholders were addressed.

Working as a group under these challenging conditions had bonded senior management staff closer together. It drove home in a tangible way the importance of teamwork and instilled greater confidence in staff to meet new challenges.

Developing goals as a group also helped to ensure that there would be greater acceptance of the goals set and that there would be unity of purpose among senior management. At meetings and discussions, staff learned to aim for greater understanding, clarity and consensus.

Equally important was that the plans and goals formulated did not remain as documents on a shelf but were cascaded down to staff at other levels and integrated into daily work activities.

**Conclusion**

The new approaches adopted are moving staff towards a culture of assessment within the library and towards greater accountability for both the organization and the individual.

In the last few years we had just started to use these new approaches to formulate strategic plans, scorecards, performance indicators and KRAs. As we become more familiar with the techniques, we would in the coming years strive to wield these tools more effectively to enable us to deliver our goals, measure our achievements and realize the Library’s vision.
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## Appendix 1


#### Total Annual Statistics (as at June 2004)

- **Collections:** 1,228,130 unique titles
- **Membership:** 62,345 registered members
- **Loans:** over 1.22 million loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books (unique title)</strong></td>
<td>612,047</td>
<td>23,798</td>
<td>262,549</td>
<td>46,021</td>
<td>54,541</td>
<td>122,793</td>
<td>65,909</td>
<td>1,145,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books (volume)</strong></td>
<td>1,109,617</td>
<td>49,682</td>
<td>452,368</td>
<td>153,218</td>
<td>165,895</td>
<td>278,713</td>
<td>88,057</td>
<td>2,319,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Periodicals Subscriptions</strong></td>
<td>26,413 (5,935)</td>
<td>751 (267)</td>
<td>3,090(871)</td>
<td>4,394 (1,800)</td>
<td>4,439 (1,298)</td>
<td>5,315 (1,664)</td>
<td>3,567 (1,565)</td>
<td>48,117 (13,513)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internet Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD-ROMs</strong></td>
<td>925</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audio-Visual Materials</strong></td>
<td>14,395</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>22,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microforms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Primary Users

- **Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences, School of Design & Environment, Faculty of Engineering and their Graduate Divisions, University Scholars Programme, Yong Siew Toh Conservatory of Music**
- **Members who need to use Japanese language resources**
- **Members who need to use Chinese language resources**
- **Faculty of Law and its Graduate Division**
- **Faculty of Dentistry, Faculty of Medicine and their Graduate Divisions**
- **Faculty of Science, School of Computing and their Graduate Divisions**
- **School of Business and its Graduate Division**

| Area (m²) | 15,000 (Located in one building) | 4,000 | 2,900 | 6,500 | 3,000 | 31,400m² |
| Seating   | 1,184 | 132 | 494 | 375 | 1,128 | 606 | 3,919 seats |

[http://www.lib.nus.edu.sg/about/stats03-04.html](http://www.lib.nus.edu.sg/about/stats03-04.html)
NUS Libraries Survey

FEEDBACK

Your feedback is very important to us. It will help to further improve our services and resources. Please spare us a few moments to fill out this form.

Name ___________________________________________ Date ____________________________

Contact No./Email Address ___________________________________________________________

Dept./Organisation _________________________________________________________________

Please tick one:  NUS Staff  NUS Student  External Member  Others

1. How would you rate the resources of the Library? Please circle ONE number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you’ve circled 1 or 2, please tell us why: ___________________________________________

2. How would you rate the accessibility of our books and journals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you’ve circled 1 or 2, please tell us why: ___________________________________________

3. How would you rate the accessibility of our electronic resources?
(to be answered by NUS staff and students only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you’ve circled 1 or 2, please tell us why: ___________________________________________

4. How would you rate the service of our staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you’ve circled 1 or 2, please tell us why: ___________________________________________

5. Overall, how would you rate the NUS Libraries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you’ve circled 1 or 2, please tell us why: ___________________________________________

Other comments/suggestions: ________________________________________________________

Thank you for your feedback. We hope to serve you better in the future.

http://www.lib.nus.edu.sg
NUS Libraries Balanced Scorecard 2004 -- cause and effect

VISION:
To be a premier knowledge hub that promotes the University's global enterprise vision

Resources to facilitate teaching, research & learning
- Positive customer experience
- Timely & Quality services
- Innovative initiatives

Resources to facilitate teaching, research & learning
- New revenue
- Image, Reputation (Goal 11) KPI 16
- Maximizing resources

Positive customer experience
- High-touch services
- Ambience (physical) (Goal 9) KPI 13
- Alignment

Timely & Quality services
- Entrepreneurial services
- Provide proactive / value added services (Goal 4) KPI 4, KPI 5
- Acquire Info assets (Goal 5) KPI 6, KPI 7
- Organise Info assets (Goal 6) KPI 8
- Deliver Info assets (Goal 7) KPI 9, KPI 10, KPI 11
- Provide effective User education (Goal 8) KPI 12
- Leverage collaboration / consortia (Goal 3) KPI 3

Innovative initiatives
- Staff initiated changes
- Staff development (Goal 1) KPI 1
- Highly skilled & innovative staff (Goal 2) KPI 2
- Empowered staff
- Happy staff
- Supportive Environment
- Communication

Best HR practices
- Retain talented staff
- New revenue
- Image, Reputation (Goal 11) KPI 16
- Maximizing resources

7 Jan 2004
### NUS Libraries Balanced Scorecard 2004 -- Goals and KPIs

#### Balanced Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balanced Scorecard</th>
<th>Targeted Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 1. Innovative initiatives

**Goal 1** Staff development

- **KPI 1** Achieve 40 hours of training per staff per year for 90% of staff

**Goal 2** Highly skilled & innovative staff

- **KPI 2** Implement at least 5 new IT applications to facilitate the provision of services

#### 2. Timely & Quality services

**Goal 3** Leverage collaboration / consortia

- **KPI 3** Lead in consortia agreements for Plus 8, consortia of IHLs in Singapore; work with consortia of IHLs in Malaysia

**Goal 4** Provide proactive / value added services

- **KPI 4** Centralise loan counter service for Central Library
- **KPI 5** Launch Library Portal

**Goal 5** Acquire info assets

- **KPI 6** Expand the electronic resources collection by 5% (subject to fund availability)
- **KPI 7** Median time of acquisition of books from overseas that are commercially available -- 4.5 weeks

**Goal 6** Organise Info assets

- **KPI 8** Median time of cataloguing urgently required titles -- 1 working day

**Goal 7** Deliver Info assets

- **KPI 9** Median time of delivery of articles (not in library collection) received electronically -- 3 working days
- **KPI 10** Median queuing time at the information desk -- 3 minutes
- **KPI 11** Median queuing time at counter for general loans -- 5 minutes

**Goal 8** Provide effective User education

- **KPI 12** Number of user education programs -- 90 sessions

#### 3. Positive customer experience

**Goal 9** Ambience (physical)

- **KPI 13** Complete the upgrading of Central Library premises

**Goal 10** Accessibility

- **KPI 14** Median time of books returned at General Loan Counter of holding library accessible within 30 minutes
- **KPI 15** To ensure that the 98% accessibility to the Digital Library Services and collection is maintained

#### 4. Resources to facilitate teaching, research & learning

**Goal 11** Image, Reputation

- **KPI 16** 70% of users rate the performance of library 4 and above on a scale of 1 (Very Poor) – 6 (Excellent), based on the Feedback forms received (either online or hardcopy)

---

7 Jan 2004
Example: Job Grade 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objectives</th>
<th>KSE</th>
<th>Core Competencies</th>
<th>Managerial Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KRA</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To be defined by Job Holder</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade: 100% 0.00
Weightage: 50%

Overall Score: 100%
Overall Grade: 100%

Appendix 5
Performance Management System -- Evaluation template
## Knowledge, Skills & Expertise – Cataloguing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defn</strong></td>
<td>It defines the minimum requirements of the skills and knowledge in order to perform the cataloguing process so as to provide accurate bibliographic information for easy access to library materials in LINC, the Library Integrated Catalogue as well as to organise and maintain the quality of these records in LINC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 1: Basic
- Understands the cataloguing procedures and workflow.
- Familiarity with the cataloguing tools and the cataloguing module in Innopac so as to be able to catalogue materials basically in English for printed materials with some guidance and supervision.
- Demonstrates basic knowledge of authority record creation by being able to check headings and import authority records especially name headings into Innopac.
- Basic understanding of the Library of Congress (LC) Classification Schedules and Local Practice so as to be able to check/edit call numbers on copy-matching records and to assign call numbers to less COMPLEX, original records.
- Basic knowledge of the form and structure of the Library of Congress Subject headings (LCSH) and Demonstrates ability to verify and edit Subject headings for copy and close copy matching records as well as to assign Subject headings to less COMPLEX original records with some guidance and supervision.

### Level 2: Competent
- Working knowledge of the cataloguing procedures and the workflow.
- Demonstrates a working knowledge of the cataloguing tools and the cataloguing module in Innopac by being able to perform original cataloguing in more than one format and in more than one language which may require occasional guidance and assistance.
- Demonstrates a working knowledge of authority record creation sufficient to make additional references when necessary, to identify and resolve discrepancies and to create new authority records especially for name headings with occasional guidance.
- Working knowledge of the classification scheme sufficient to assign call numbers for original and copy-catalogued items and able to make decisions with minimal guidance whenever discrepancies occur.
- Working knowledge of the form and structure of LCSH and demonstrates the ability to assign headings for more complex records and able to recognise discrepancies in order to make decisions to refer.

### Level 3: In-Depth
- In-depth understanding of the cataloguing policies and workflow sufficient to guide the staff in their cataloguing work.
- Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of cataloguing by being able to catalogue materials in all formats and languages independently.
- Able to create new authority records and resolve discrepancies effectively without supervision.
- In-depth understanding of the classification systems used in the Library and able to apply the knowledge in making decisions for new and conflicting call numbers.
- In-depth knowledge of LCSH and demonstrates the ability in handling complex subject contents for all formats and languages as well as able to recognise discrepancies and make decisions in resolving them independently.

### Level 4: Expert
- Detailed knowledge of the cataloguing tools so as to be able to set directions for the Library's interpretation and observance to changes made by the cataloguing agencies.
- Knows the latest trends and changes pertaining to cataloguing and is the resource person for the Library.
- Set guidelines on authority records and resolve any discrepancies when necessary.
- Detailed knowledge of the classification systems used in the Library and able to expand the call numbers used under local practice when needed.
- Detailed knowledge of LCSH and able to set guidelines and resolve discrepancies when necessary.

### Level 5: Mastery
- Mastery of the various cataloguing-related matters including areas pertaining to authority and subject headings and is recognised as a national expert.
- Contributes to publications, present papers at conferences and invited to speak/lecture on cataloguing-related issues.
## Result of NUS Libraries Survey on user perception of library services and collection for 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>R1-R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R5</th>
<th>R6</th>
<th>No rating</th>
<th>Subtotal R4-R6</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books &amp; Journals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Resources*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service of Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R1 - Very Poor  
R2 - Poor       
R3 - Satisfactory  
R4 - Good      
R5 - Very Good  
R6 - Excellent