**SCONUL Website: Feedback from SCONUL Access Contacts**

1. **Joining the scheme:**

There is still a lot of confusion around joining the scheme; users do not find the site intuitive.

* Students do not understand why they need to identify a potential host library before they can join
	+ They assume that a host will be informed of their application
	+ They assume that they need to make multiple applications to join different libraries
	+ They are concerned that they might change their mind and identify a library that they then do not use
	+ They want to join the scheme and then investigate suitable libraries
* Students are mixing up host and home libraries on the online form
* Staff have to direct users to the application form
* Users sometimes Google SCONUL Access application form and then miss the stage of identifying their user type and home institution
* Users find the map confusing as it suggests only a small sub-set of potential libraries
* Students frequently ask for logins as the login button suggests that they need to login to use the scheme

***Possible solutions to confusion on joining the scheme***

* *Provide better information on how to join; make access to the application form more public on the top level of the Access section of the site. (We could continue to offer secondary access to the application form from inside host library records.)*
* *Change the wording on the “Apply for access” button to “Join SCONUL Access”.*
1. **Processing applications:**
* There was a great deal of support for the introduction of new fields (expiry date and Band) and getting the system to note the date on any changes to application (staff work in progress, date approved, date denied etc so all activity is time stamped).
* Contacts supported the idea of using database as the ultimate proof of eligibility as host libraries would be given access to all data input by user and approving library.
* Strong request for all this information to be fed through to emails as not all libraries would wish to check the database before offering membership. Noted: libraries willing to accept a printed email need to be aware that there are potential security issues: fraudulent editing of email, student lost good standing status since email was issued.
* Request for a “read only” level which could be used by front line staff to check the status of incoming students. Strong support for this to be issued to generic team logins.
* Contacts support the idea of a “pending / in progress” status on applications where staff needed to delay approval. The idea of a free text notes field so that staff could track progress on the application was noted. Contacts reported that many libraries had teams of people working on applications and needed to be able to communicate progress to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.
* Need to be able permanently to remove records from the database. At the moment they are deleted from the “manage applications workspace” but remain on the database and can be found in a search.
* Need for the bulk removal of users when a cohort leaves.

***Steering Group reaction to feedback***

*Ideas on the “read only” level and generic login needed to be put to the web project team. Also ensure that we review the ideas on deletion of records.*

1. Collecting management information and general communication.
* Some contacts queried the need for so much management information and cautioned against collecting data for the sake of it.
* Members of senior management teams reported that statistics and other management information were essential at director level.
* Adding band and expiry information plus giving front line staff a “read only” level of access would allow host libraries to check to see if the user was still eligible without the need for the general emails.
* Contacts reported that they had hoped that the new website would do away with the need for constant emails reporting students no longer eligible for the scheme.
* The idea of a “blue sky” vision for the scheme was re-visited. This would allow a user to pre-select a host library and the information would be fed through to the relevant library. Some contacts supported this vision but others were cautious that much of this pre-registration would never be taken up.

***Looking to the future:***

*The Chair of the Steering Group suggested that we could look at the idea of getting host libraries to add their details to the user record. This would allow home libraries to target communication at institutions a student had joined, rather than bulk emails about defaulting users.*

*Contacts gave a cautious support to this idea but acknowledged that larger libraries would need to review workflows and dici9vision of labour between the front line and office staff.*
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