



## Open Research Online

### Citation

Manecke, Ute; Tsiplaki, Vasileia and Blunt, Mike (2025). Putting Peer Support into action in the OU Library's Enquiries Team. Performance Measurement and Metrics (Early access).

### URL

<https://oro.open.ac.uk/102643/>

### DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1108/pmm-12-2023-0045>

### License

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0) Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

### Policy

This document has been downloaded from Open Research Online, The Open University's repository of research publications. This version is being made available in accordance with Open Research Online policies available from [Open Research Online \(ORO\) Policies](#)

### Versions

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding



---

**Putting Peer Support into action in the OU Library's  
Enquiries Team**

Journal:	<i>Performance Measurement and Metrics</i>
Manuscript ID	PMM-12-2023-0045.R1
Manuscript Type:	Case Study
Keywords:	Academic libraries, Information service management, Peer support, Peer evaluation, User service management, Case study

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Putting Peer Support into action in the OU Library's Enquiries Team

### Abstract

#### Purpose

The Open University Library's Enquiries team developed and implemented a peer support and review process within its service. The aim was to develop a mechanism for staff that is supportive, shares good practice and informs learning and service improvement.

#### Study design/methodology/approach

In this case study, members of the Enquiries team were randomly assigned into small groups that met every other month to provide constructive feedback on how they responded to customer enquiries. Enquiries were evaluated based on criteria such as the use of template answers, tone, referral procedures and consideration of EDI principles. Feedback collected from the groups was shared with the whole team during the Enquiries team meetings.

#### Findings

Our team has already seen benefits from the process which confirms it as a promising and useful tool we can use to improve our service. It allows the team to identify training gaps and areas for improvement as well as share best practice. Adjustments had to be made to the sessions' frequency based on staff workload capacity. Concerns regarding the exposure of confidential information were also addressed.

#### Originality/value

We feel our approach is innovative and unique because it is tailored to the needs of the Enquiries team of a distance-learning institution. Our approach emphasises collaboration, reflective practice and continuous improvement.

#### Keywords

Academic libraries; information service management; professional development; user service management; peer support; peer evaluation; library enquiries team;

1  
2  
3 knowledge sharing; best practice sharing; team building; distance-learning; case  
4 study.  
5

## 6 7 Introduction

8  
9 This case study provides an insight into the newly developed peer support and  
10 review process by the Open University Library's Enquiries team.  
11

12  
13 The Open University (OU) is the UK's largest distance-learning institution and is the  
14 UK's largest university in terms of student enrolments (HESA, 2023). The OU Library  
15 provides a full range of academic library services to both students and staff. Library  
16 staff work on campus and remotely from locations throughout the UK. The OU  
17 Library building, The Betty Boothroyd Library, is located at the OU's Walton Hall  
18 campus in Milton Keynes and is open to the public.  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 The Library's Enquiries team is a customer-facing team comprising a mixture of  
25 eleven Library Assistants, a Senior Library Assistant, and fourteen Librarians. The  
26 team is managed by the Library Manager (Enquiries Services) who reports to a  
27 Senior Library Manager. The Enquiries team currently consists of around twenty-six  
28 members of staff working across various library areas in a multi-functional 'matrix'  
29 arrangement. Matrix areas include but are not limited to document delivery,  
30 accessibility, Reader Services and SCONUL - a reciprocal scheme in the UK and  
31 Ireland that allows students registered at a university to use the library facilities of  
32 any another university in the scheme. The Enquiries service operates in a triage  
33 style, with Library Assistants providing the first line of contact and Librarians the  
34 second line.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 As can be expected of an institution primarily concerned with distance-learning, the  
45 work of the Enquiries team consists mainly of answering enquiries from students and  
46 staff remotely via webchat, email or by telephone. There is also an enquiries desk in  
47 the library building which is staffed during standard office hours. The nature of the  
48 enquiries made to the team can vary. From book renewals and access to e-  
49 resources to referencing support or subject searches. Enquiries are recorded as  
50 Service Requests (SRs) on the OU's central Customer Relationship Management  
51 system (CRM), and as such can easily be shared with other members of the team or  
52 referred on to other departments of the University.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Background, scope and context

The Enquiries Team Manager measures the performance of the team through statistical means. A monthly report of data drawn from the various library systems is created to show the number of enquiries received, by what method the enquiry was made, and the response times in relation to a Service Level Agreement. However, aside from anecdotal reporting in regular one to one conversations between front-line staff and line management, no robust performance measurement process in terms of the quality of the Enquiries Service was in place until we began our project.

Choosing not to measure the quality of the interactions with patrons can impact a library service in two ways. Firstly, in cases when staff did not provide answers of the highest quality, they would not usually be made aware of this, and this has implications for staff development in that it can lead to stagnation and confidence/belief in staff members' work. Secondly, customers' experiences when making enquiries may be impacted, as they could be given out-of-date, partial, or low-quality responses to their enquiries. Measuring quality can also bring an improvement in the consistency of answers made to enquiries, and staff are exposed to a wider range of queries. Setting up a robust measure also has advantages for service managers. Staff training needs can be more easily identified and remedial action taken to address any knowledge gaps or systemic issues inherent in existing processes.

An example of a quality measure currently in place (for webchat patrons only) is a short feedback option presented to patrons at the end of their chat. Any responses left are collated by the Senior Library Assistant. However, responses are shared only if a strongly negative or positive response is noted, and when they are it is only with the Enquiries Service Manager. Also, as the majority of responses are positive, it tends to be only these which are shared with the wider team, and only then on an annual basis. This measure also relies on the goodwill of the patron to participate and is therefore not a regular source of data about how things are going with the service.

Review processes for measuring service quality had been successfully adopted by other customer-facing services at the OU. However, the quality assurance work that goes on in other OU enquiries services involves managers reviewing calls and

1  
2  
3 emails against agreed standards and discussing with staff on a one-to-one basis.

4 This is not possible for the Enquiries team because not all the line managers of the  
5 Enquiries staff will know what a 'good' answer looks like on the Library Helpdesk,  
6 and the Enquiries Service Manager doesn't have the time to do this on a regular  
7 basis for everyone in the team.  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 Therefore, the Senior Library Manager responsible for the Enquiries team brought  
13 forward the idea of the peer support and review process as an alternative approach  
14 and asked for volunteers (us) to develop the library's own, innovative approach. The  
15 rationale was to identify areas of improvement through a peer support and review  
16 process and put the necessary elements in place to achieve this.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Using peer support and review processes as a tool for improving service quality is  
22 important because it appears to offer a solution to the uneasiness that both  
23 managers and employees feel around more traditional forms of performance  
24 appraisal (McGregor, 1987, cited in George, 1995, p.141).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 In addition, Edwards and Sproull showed that "... when many individuals rate an  
31 employee's performance, the consensus they reach is more reliable, credible, and  
32 defensible (and often less biased) than the supervisor's sole judgment" (1987,  
33 quoted in George, 1995, p.146).  
34  
35  
36

37 There are also examples in the literature which support a plan that involves staff in  
38 their own measurement activity. As expressed by Brophy  
39  
40  
41

42 one of the keys to measuring the performance of staff actually lies with the  
43 staff themselves. Ways have to be found to encourage reflective practice, so  
44 that staff are assessing their own performance and learning from it all the time  
45 (2006, p.127).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Brophy also goes on to say, "Reflective practice can also be a group activity when  
52 staff come together... to think about their experiences in delivering services and to  
53 learn from each other's insights" (2006, p.127).  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 It is for these reasons that we felt informal group sessions which relied on  
59 constructive feedback being shared between staff would be the best way forward for  
60

1  
2  
3 us. The idea of staff 'coming together' was also important to us because following  
4 changes made to working practices after the advent of COVID-19, fewer Enquiries  
5 staff were now working regularly in the open-plan Library offices. This meant the  
6 environment for serendipitous sharing of knowledge about enquiries and the  
7 organisation was not there in the same way as it was pre-pandemic. Therefore, one  
8 of our primary aims alongside the quality and performance measurement of the  
9 Enquiry Service, was to try to re-create that water cooler environment; something  
10 which is of particular benefit to newer employees (Woo, D. *et al.* 2023).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Throughout the development of the new process and its subsequent iterations, we  
20 also bore in mind its place within the wider context of The Open University's values  
21 and goals as an organisation. These include, but are not limited to, a commitment to  
22 continuous personal development; being true to ourselves, respectful of others and  
23 collaborating in a spirit of openness which builds trust and common purpose (The  
24 Open University, 2023).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 Design, methodology and approach

32 Planning the Enquiries team's peer support and review process involved looking at  
33 other services' performance measurement methods as well as at the process the  
34 team used in the past and considering what could be adapted for our purposes.  
35  
36  
37

38 In the peer support and review process the team used in 2019, enquiries were  
39 randomised to different teams by the manager. The teams then met face-to-face.  
40 The staff member whose enquiry was reviewed was not usually in that review team  
41 and therefore not in the review sessions but received written feedback on how they  
42 had handled their enquiry by the team. We realised at the time that this approach  
43 had not worked very well, as staff members were not able to contextualise the  
44 enquiry they had dealt with verbally and the feedback had also not always been  
45 written up in a way that staff felt was supportive. Written feedback does not allow for  
46 nuances in tone in the way oral communication does and can therefore easily give  
47 rise to misunderstandings.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 The process we decided to pilot involved creating small groups of Enquiries  
57 Librarians and Library Assistants. We used a freely available online tool to create  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 randomised groups, the Team Picker Wheel tool (Team Picker Wheel, 2023). We  
4 chose this particular tool, because it was free to use and suited our needs.  
5  
6

7 We felt that randomising group members would allow transparency and lead to a  
8 better mix of skills and knowledge within each group. This approach aligns with the  
9 principles of effective teamwork as well as collaborative learning. Additionally,  
10 randomised groups would lead to more diverse teams that come up with more  
11 innovative approaches and improved communication among members (Garcia-  
12 Milian et al., 2013). By randomly assigning individuals to groups, we could also  
13 ensure that colleagues from different backgrounds and skill levels work together,  
14 fostering an environment where novel ideas and approaches could flourish. Previous  
15 research suggests that positive attitudes toward teamwork can emerge from diverse  
16 groups composed of individuals with varying skills and knowledge (Konak et al.,  
17 2019).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Moreover, transparency was deemed essential in building trust and accountability  
28 within our Enquiries team. Effective group work relies not only on the composition of  
29 the team but also on how members interact with one another (Chang and Brickman,  
30 2018). Therefore, randomised groups could help mitigate biases and allow for more  
31 open communication and collaboration, with colleagues more likely to share their  
32 insights and contribute to discussions.  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 We then asked the teams to organise their own monthly virtual peer review sessions.  
39 The groups would meet four times, until each group member had a chance to set up  
40 and facilitate one of these sessions with the rest of their group. After that, we would  
41 randomise Enquiries staff again. Maintaining groups for a few months would allow  
42 team members to get to know each other better and develop greater trust, which is  
43 particularly important when selecting enquiries that might not have gone well.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Randomising Enquiries staff again would allow colleagues to develop good and  
49 trusting relationships with yet more of their peers. Furthermore, it would help prevent  
50 team dynamics from stagnating and encourage more learning to occur, as different  
51 team members have different specialist areas, and there is more than one way of  
52 approaching an enquiry as long as objectivity is maintained.  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 Additionally, teamwork in a library setting supports both adaptability and continuous  
58 learning. Library staff must be comfortable with technology and willing to upgrade  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 their skills to meet the changing needs of users (Saunders, 2020). Therefore,  
4 randomly assigning team members can help promote knowledge sharing and skill  
5 development, as individuals learn from one another and adapt to new challenges  
6 together.  
7  
8  
9

10 The reason for the decision to hold the sessions monthly was that this frequency  
11 would allow us to identify inconsistent practice more quickly and that learning would  
12 take place on a continuous basis, which was likely to result in faster improvements.  
13  
14

15 We asked participants to choose their own enquiries and send them out to other  
16 group members by email. This was done by providing the group members with the  
17 SR number in the case of email or webchat correspondence, which could then be  
18 located on our CRM system. Unfortunately, it was not possible to retrieve a transcript  
19 for phone calls, but phone enquiries could still be chosen as an enquiry type to be  
20 reviewed by providing a summary of the communication. The basis of the review was  
21 the evaluation criteria on the peer review form that we used (attached in full in the  
22 appendix), which was an amended version of the form that had been applied during  
23 the previous Enquiries peer support and review process in 2019. Enquiries staff were  
24 then expected to discuss their selected enquiries at their peer review sessions.  
25  
26  
27

28 We encouraged the person whose enquiry was reviewed to start the conversation by  
29 doing a quick evaluation of what they thought went well and what might not have  
30 gone so well. The idea behind this was to empower participants to take ownership of  
31 their enquiry and engage them in critical thinking and self-reflection. The others  
32 would then take turns providing their feedback on the enquiry. Whilst the prompts on  
33 the review form were considered, the way the feedback was presented did not have  
34 to be structured in the same way and was less formal and more conversational. As a  
35 result, the review became more of a conversation and allowed the reviewee to  
36 immediately clarify anything that was unclear in the feedback. The following prompts  
37 were used as criteria to aid in the review:  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

- 51 • Were standard phrases / templates used for answering enquiries?
- 52 • Have we taken a contextual approach to the enquiry?
- 53 • Have we asked questions that enabled the patron to describe their problem in  
54 a comprehensible way?
- 55 • Did we help the patron find support to address their enquiry?
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- Was the enquiry referred if appropriate and the patron informed?
- Did the patron receive a correct and clear answer that was pitched at the right level, free from unnecessary library jargon and the appropriate amount?
- Was the overall tone of the response appropriate?
- Was good use made of the OU's own resources to help answer the patron's question?
- Have Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) principles been considered?

Many of the prompts had been used in the previous peer support and review process, but we refined, updated and added to them. This was partly achieved through brainstorming of what the team members thought constituted a successful enquiry interaction in our service, which was based on experience. In addition, the criteria were closely aligned to the Enquiries' team's objectives, the latter stating the need to respond to enquiries in a manner that is clear, relevant, accurate and timely. Some recommendations from the literature were also considered such as ensuring that we provide the right amount of information to the enquirer (Buckley Owen, 2006, pp. 18-24). The last prompt in the list is a new one that we introduced in the context of the Open University's increased EDI focus. It covers aspects such as the accessibility of our communication with a patron as well as inclusion by paying attention to patrons' different needs and by making recommendations of diverse resources.

Every team member had an enquiry reviewed in those sessions that took place. Suggestions were made for best practice and training needs were identified, which were then taken to the Enquiries team meeting.

## Findings

### Initial team feedback

In the monthly Enquiries team meeting that followed our first round of peer support and review process, each review group was asked to share their recommendations with the wider team. We also elicited feedback in that meeting on how the early stage of the process had worked for participants. It became apparent that participants had found it overwhelmingly positive, as it provided an opportunity to get other views on how an enquiry should best be handled and encouraged reflection on current practice, which in turn is the first step towards greater insight and frequent

1  
2  
3 enhancements in turn. Participants also stressed that the tone had been supportive  
4 throughout.  
5

6  
7 We had to tackle a few misconceptions about the process though before we felt we  
8 could resume. Several team members were concerned that we would not have  
9 enough unique enquiries to make the peer support and review sessions worthwhile,  
10 as the enquiries were likely to repeat themselves at some point. We therefore  
11 explained that there was no need to find a unique enquiry every time the peer groups  
12 met, as the process was not only about providing the correct factual information to a  
13 particular question; it was also about the way an enquiry was handled. For example,  
14 a staff member might not be as patient or as concise with a patron as they might  
15 need to be, and they might even differ in their approach on different days and at  
16 different times. This is where the quality measurement part of the process comes to  
17 the fore.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 In the aftermath of the meeting, the Enquiries Manager and Senior Library Manager  
28 offered additional support for the process as they circulated details about training on  
29 how to provide constructive feedback that each team member was encouraged to  
30 attend.  
31  
32  
33

### 34 Subsequent changes and the current situation

35  
36 As previously mentioned, the peer support and review process was met with  
37 positivity by our colleagues and that was reassuring to us. It was vital for the team to  
38 ensure the process met their needs as this would also ensure uptake. However, due  
39 to the process being a new part of our workflows and procedures, we needed to  
40 seek feedback from its early stages to shape it around the team's requirements.  
41 Therefore, upon completing an initial session, we asked for feedback from each  
42 group during our monthly Enquiries team meeting. This is when we discovered that  
43 team members found it hard to fit the new process into their existing workload.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 After discussing the matter with the Enquiries Manager and Senior Library Manager,  
52 we decided to send out a survey to understand how often Enquiries staff would like  
53 to have these sessions. When we received the results from the survey and reviewed  
54 our team's answers, it was apparent that most survey respondents would prefer the  
55 sessions to run every other month. We thus subsequently sent an email to all  
56 Enquiries staff notifying them of the change. The randomised groups remained  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 unchanged, and the sessions were then scheduled once every two months. At the  
4 time of writing, we have not received any further comments regarding the frequency  
5 of sessions, which we interpret as the new pattern meeting staff needs whilst also  
6 not over-burdening their workload.  
7  
8  
9

10 Furthermore, the team expressed another concern regarding the collection of  
11 personal data. The issue was around the use of the evaluation criteria form. More  
12 specifically, there was some concern that the peer support and review sessions  
13 could accidentally expose personal identifiable information if staff were to use and fill  
14 in all the relevant fields of our updated form. In response to these concerns, we  
15 emphasised that the form will only be used to help the team and the groups to review  
16 the enquiries and as a tool to steer conversations when either requesting feedback  
17 from or providing it to colleagues. Staff were also advised not to include any personal  
18 and identifiable information in their notes or comments as neither names nor  
19 identifying numbers are necessary to discuss an enquiry. We communicated this  
20 clearly to the team suggesting everyone avoids storing such information, not only to  
21 ensure compliance with GDPR policies but also to alleviate concerns.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 In its first year of implementation, a variety of data and information has become  
33 available to us: Quantitative and qualitative data allow us to evaluate and assess the  
34 effectiveness of the process as well as the elements we can improve. For instance,  
35 we have tracked the approximate number of peer support sessions conducted and  
36 the most frequent topics discussed. This kind of data can help us assess the uptake  
37 of the peer support process and even help us pinpoint patterns and themes during  
38 peak times for the Enquiry Service. Additionally, incorporating outcomes or  
39 suggestions generated from the group sessions, can be included to our Enquiries  
40 Manager's data collection and business reporting.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Additionally, thanks to the process we are better equipped to understand the training  
49 and development needs of the Enquiries team. As we put together the process, we  
50 realised that the sessions could help us and the Enquiries Manager to identify  
51 training and development needs based on the challenges and knowledge gaps  
52 identified. Through the peer support and review process, we have identified recurring  
53 topics that require new or additional training and resources. This information is  
54 guiding us in the creation or update of relevant service training and we have started  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to incorporate it into the induction and training plan for new staff members too. We  
4 hope that this approach will enable us to shape future training based on an informed  
5 decision-making model.  
6  
7

8  
9 Furthermore, we share all feedback and insights from these group sessions during  
10 our Enquiries team meetings which also means that they are recorded in the meeting  
11 minutes. This method allows us to gather and revisit feedback from both the peers  
12 providing support and the recipients of the support. It also enables us to monitor and  
13 track knowledge sharing activities within the peer support process, particularly in  
14 specialised subject areas or practice areas such as law database searching,  
15 referencing or document delivery advice.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 The process is undeniably a beneficial addition to our workflows, but it still requires  
22 more time to fully integrate it and reveal its full impact on our service and  
23 professional growth. It is also expected that the process itself evolves at the same  
24 pace and in the same way we do as professionals while undertaking it. The more  
25 sessions our team undertakes, the more feedback we hope to receive, allowing us to  
26 not only improve it but also adjust it to the objectives of the OU Library.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 Limitations

33 Implementing the process presented some challenges and limitations. For instance,  
34 we expected that some team members might initially be apprehensive about the  
35 requirement to share their work and then seek feedback. Sharing one's thoughts  
36 about and approach to enquiries can make staff uneasy or defensive as well as  
37 vulnerable and exposed, which is why we had to ensure the process we designed  
38 aimed to encourage both informal and light discussions whilst making them  
39 constructive and meaningful too.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Our approach was chosen to inspire trust among colleagues and allow them to carry  
48 out sessions where they feel safe to discuss their ideas without fear of judgment or  
49 their work being recorded. We made it clear that no comments or forms should be  
50 stored and that group members should choose the enquiries they would like to bring  
51 forward and discuss. Furthermore, we emphasised that the purpose of the process is  
52 to develop their skills and confidence rather than simply monitoring their work and  
53 scrutinising specific enquiries.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Due to a similar process being adopted in the past, we were under pressure to  
4 address any preconceived notions that staff might have based on this past  
5 experience. While we used some elements of the previous process, we actively  
6 focused on tailoring the new one to our team's needs and expectations. The old  
7 process suggested that the staff member whose enquiry was reviewed was not  
8 present in the session and was not given the opportunity to contextualise the way  
9 they handled an enquiry. The new process we put together made sure that was  
10 rectified and required all group members to be present and participate in their  
11 scheduled sessions. The group sessions had to be a safe space for team members  
12 to discuss anything related to how they handled an enquiry. Staff were kept fully up  
13 to date with all our steps and approach, allowing them to provide feedback and  
14 contribute to shaping the process along the way.

15  
16 Furthermore, as mentioned previously, the Library has a physical enquiries desk  
17 which is staffed during standard office hours. The staff member at this desk handles  
18 in-person enquiries, although the volume is relatively low since our Library is part of  
19 a distance learning institution and our patrons primarily contact us via phone,  
20 webchat and email. Even though in-person enquiries are recorded in our CRM  
21 system, we decided not to include them in the peer support sessions for now as they  
22 often relate to the physical aspects of the library space and not all Enquiries staff  
23 work on the Library's enquiries desk. Nevertheless, this is a potential area for future  
24 consideration.

25  
26 Lastly, our research is not generalisable. It is a case study that has been carried out  
27 within a specific context. Other services will have to evaluate carefully what is useful  
28 about this case study for them and how they can possibly implement those aspects  
29 they might consider beneficial. This might require adaptations.

### 28 Next steps

29 One of our next steps in the evaluation and progression of the peer support and  
30 review process is to have a close look at and analyse the annual Helpdesk User  
31 Experience report, which the library's Engagement and Insight team have recently  
32 introduced. The report asks many of our patrons about various aspects of their  
33 experience with our Enquiry Service. Our regular peer support and review sessions  
34 will allow us to compare the feedback received in next year's survey with this year's.

1  
2  
3 Not only will this allow us to spot any increase or decrease in positive, negative or  
4 neutral feedback but also correlate discrepancies. For instance, if we observe more  
5 positive feedback on law search queries than the previous year's survey, we can  
6 investigate whether law search tips were shared in peer support sessions. However,  
7 it is important to note that any comparison of data will be carried out in addition to  
8 analysing general complaints logged by patrons of the Enquiry Service and any  
9 changes observed after a year's worth of peer support and review sessions.

10  
11 We are now in the process of designing and distributing a questionnaire to our peers  
12 that allows them to feed back on how well the process has worked for them. The  
13 questionnaire will address whether staff have a good understanding of the process,  
14 whether they feel they have actively participated in it and if they have noticed any  
15 individual and team benefits of the process and if they do, what these benefits are.  
16 There will be a question about possible challenges they have encountered and what  
17 kind of improvements can be made to better meet the needs of the Library Enquiries  
18 team. In addition, the questionnaire will ask the question whether the current  
19 frequency of peer review sessions is now manageable. The questionnaire will use a  
20 mixture of multiple-choice options, rating scales and free text boxes. This mixture of  
21 question types should provide us with both qualitative and quantitative information  
22 that will then allow us to adjust the process if necessary.

### 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 Conclusion

38 Although peer-review evaluation practices are not new, this case study contributes  
39 something unique to existing practices insofar as we have tailored the process  
40 specifically to the needs of our Enquiry Service and team. Our process so far is  
41 proving to be a promising mechanism when it comes to improving our service by  
42 supporting continuous professional development. The group sessions provide  
43 opportunities to discuss enquiries and identify gaps in our knowledge or areas that  
44 could be improved. As a result of the sessions, it is now easier to share best practice  
45 and the nature of the process enables staff not only to reflect on how they handle  
46 enquiries but also actively contribute to their own learning and development.

47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 Members of the team have responded well to the supportive tone, open dialogue and  
56 learning from peers that have characterised the sessions. Based on early feedback,  
57 changes were implemented to fine-tune the process to fit with the team's needs and  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 preferences. A survey early on when the process was introduced revealed that most  
4 staff supported a change in the frequency of the sessions, indicating sessions every  
5 other month would better fit their workloads and schedules. Other concerns around  
6 the risk of personal or confidential information being exposed were addressed by  
7 highlighting to staff that they should avoid including any identifying details in the  
8 evaluation criteria form, notes and any kept record of the discussions.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 The feedback survey on how well our current process works almost a year after it  
15 was first launched will provide us with more valuable qualitative and quantitative  
16 insights into how successful it has been and how we can adapt it further to meet the  
17 needs of the team.  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 The peer support and review process has so far proven a valuable tool and a  
23 positive addition to our workflows, but we are aware that it still requires ongoing  
24 evaluation to reveal its full impact on our service and professional growth. We hope  
25 that the more sessions we complete as a team, the more feedback we may receive  
26 which in turn will allow us to not only improve it but also align it with the objectives of  
27 the Library and the Open University.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 REFERENCE LIST  
4

5 Brophy, P. (2006) *Measuring Library Performance: Principles and Techniques*.  
6 London: Facet Publishing.

7  
8  
9 Buckley Owen, T. (2006) *Success at the enquiry desk*. 5<sup>th</sup> edn. London: Facet.

10  
11 Chang, Y. and Brickman, P. (2018) 'When Group Work Doesn't Work: Insights from  
12 Students', *CBE life sciences education*, 17(3), ar52. Available at:  
13 <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.17-09-0199>  
14

15  
16  
17 García-Milian, R. et al. (2013) 'Librarians as Part of Cross-Disciplinary, Multi-  
18 institutional Team Projects: Experiences from the VIVO Collaboration', *Science &*  
19 *technology libraries*, 32(2), pp. 160–175. Available at:  
20 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0194262X.2013.791183>  
21

22  
23  
24 George, V. E. (1995) 'Performance Appraisal in an Academic Library: A Case  
25 Study', *International Conference on TQM and Academic Libraries*, Washington DC,  
26 20-22 April 1994. Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED391541> (Accessed: 13 June  
27 2023).  
28  
29

30  
31  
32 Higher Education Statistics Agency (2023) *Higher Education Student Statistics: UK,*  
33 *2021/22 - Where students come from and go to study*. Available at:  
34 [https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/19-01-2023/sb265-higher-education-student-](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/19-01-2023/sb265-higher-education-student-statistics/location)  
35 [statistics/location](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/19-01-2023/sb265-higher-education-student-statistics/location) (Accessed: 15 May 2023).  
36  
37

38  
39  
40 Konak, A., Kulturel-Konak, S. and Cheung, G.W. (2019) 'Teamwork attitudes,  
41 interest and self-efficacy between online and face-to-face information technology  
42 students', *Team performance management*, 25(5/6), pp. 253–278. Available at:  
43 <https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-05-2018-0035>  
44

45  
46  
47 Saunders, L. (2020) 'Core Knowledge and Specialized Skills in Academic Libraries',  
48 *College & research libraries*, 81(2), pp. 288-. Available at:  
49 <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.81.2.288>  
50

51  
52  
53 *Team Picker Wheel: Randomize people into groups* (2023) Available  
54 at: <https://pickerwheel.com/tools/random-team-generator/> (Accessed: 14 June 2023).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The Open University (2023) *Live our values*. Available  
4 at: <https://www.open.ac.uk/about/main/strategy/enablers/valuesty> (Accessed: 15  
5 May 2023).  
6  
7

8  
9 Woo, D., Endacott, C. G., & Myers, K. K. (2023). 'Navigating Water Cooler Talks  
10 Without the Water Cooler: Uncertainty and Information Seeking During Remote  
11 Socialization' *Management Communication Quarterly*, 37(2), 251–280. Available  
12 at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/08933189221105916>  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Appendix

<b>Enquiries - Peer Review Criteria</b>			
SR / webchat reference: {insert reference number of SR/Webchat/phone call being reviewed}			
Criterion	Answer	Comment	What could be improved?
Were the standard phrases / templates used for answering enquiries, e.g. greetings and offers of further help on webchat and VOICE?	Choose an item.		
Have we taken a contextual approach to the enquiry, e.g. for an SR activity, have we taken previous correspondence into account?	Choose an item.		
Have we asked questions that enabled the patron to describe their problem in a comprehensible way?	Choose an item.		
Did we help the patron find support to address their enquiry?	Choose an item.		

Was the enquiry referred if appropriate and the patron informed?	Choose an item.		
Did the patron receive a correct and clear answer that was <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Pitched at right level</li> <li>➤ Free from unnecessary library jargon</li> <li>➤ Appropriate amount</li> </ul>	Choose an item.		
Was the patron informed when there were breaks in the communication, e.g. when staff looked something up? (chat)	Choose an item.		
Was the overall tone of the response appropriate? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Polite/friendly</li> <li>➤ Appropriate to a patron-library staff relationship</li> </ul>	Choose an item.		

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Well laid out with good grammar and spelling</li> </ul>			
<p>Was good use made of the OU 's own resources (Library website / OU website /wiki) to help answer the patron's question(s)?</p>	<p>Choose an item.</p>		
<p>Have EDI principles been considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Patrons' needs</li> <li>➤ Alt text for screen shots</li> <li>➤ Diverse resources</li> </ul>	<p>Choose an item.</p>		

Source: Authors' own work

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Performance Measurement and Metrics