

NARA RECORDS SCHEDULING AND APPRAISAL SERVICES
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT
SEPTEMBER 2006

UPDATED SEPTEMBER 2007

ABSTRACT

In May of 2006, the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) conducted its second Records Scheduling and Appraisal Services Customer Satisfaction Survey. The survey helps NARA determine how to best distribute the resources necessary to improve customer satisfaction in the areas of scheduling and appraisal. This objective is in accordance with Goal 1, Target 3 of NARA's 2003 Strategic Plan, "By 2008, 95% of customers are satisfied with NARA scheduling and appraisal services."

The 2006 survey was sent to Federal Records Officers (FROs) of "active" scheduling agencies. Active is defined as those agencies that had an open records schedule with NARA since the first survey in 2004. The survey measures the overall satisfaction level of these FROs with respect to the timeliness, adequacy of communication, and utility of the guidance products provided by NARA's scheduling and appraisal services. NARA distributed 112 questionnaires and received 85 completed surveys for a response rate of 76%.

The overall satisfaction rate of FROs surveyed is 78%. This is a significant improvement over the 2004 survey that measured a 56.5% overall satisfaction. Overall dissatisfaction reported in the most recent survey is 22%, which compares favorably with the first survey's results of 20.9% dissatisfied and 22.6% neutral. Although the 2004 survey included a "neutral" response option that does not appear in the 2006 version, it is important to note that this absence of a "neutral" response option did not result in a large increase in the percentage of dissatisfied customers.

The timeliness of the records schedule approval process continues to be the area of most concern to FROs; however, there has been some improvement since 2004. In 2006, eight percent fewer customers disagree or strongly disagree that the time it takes to approve a records schedule is satisfactory. This may be due to the fact that the most significant improvement recorded in the 2006 survey was in the area of communication with agencies. Three-quarters of this year's respondents agree that NARA staff keeps their agency informed about the progress of their records schedules; only half of respondents agreed in 2004. In the area of NARA guidance products, about 80% of all respondents agree or strongly agree that scheduling and appraisal guidance is produced in a timely fashion, comprehensive enough, easy to work with, and consistently interpreted by NARA staff.

Information gathered by this 2006 survey will be used to improve customer satisfaction in three broad areas: timeliness of processing schedules, communication on schedule status, and utility of guidance products. Details of these steps are described on pages 12-14 of this report. NARA is dedicated to continually improving the services and products necessary to achieve a high level of customer satisfaction with our scheduling and appraisal responsibilities.

PURPOSE

This survey (Appendix A) was designed to help the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) increase customer satisfaction with its scheduling and appraisal services. By receiving periodic, systematic feed-back from its customers, NARA will know where to invest its resources to make the most effective changes to its business processes. This survey was originally conducted in 2004 to help NARA meet Goal 1, Target 3 of its 2003 Strategic Plan, "By 2008, 95 percent of customers are satisfied with NARA scheduling and appraisal services."

METHODOLOGY

NARA conducted this scheduling and appraisal customer satisfaction survey for the second time in May 2006, about two years after the first survey was conducted in August 2004. It asks FROs (who oversee each agency's scheduling efforts) or their designee, how they feel NARA is doing in this area. The survey inquires about each respondent's overall satisfaction level as well as satisfaction with the following aspects of NARA's scheduling services: timeliness, adequacy of communication, and utility of guidance products.

This 2006 version of the customer satisfaction survey was modified in two ways. First, it was sent only to FROs of "active" scheduling agencies (i.e., FROs of those agencies that have had an open records schedule [SF 115] with NARA since the last customer satisfaction survey). In 2004, FROs in all Federal agencies received the survey. NARA modified the definition of the survey audience this year and surveyed only "active" agencies that would have actually experienced the changes we have made to our services since the 2004 survey. The second modification to the questionnaire was that all "neutral" response options were dropped from all survey questions. This allowed us to gather more useful information and more clearly identify our customers' concerns.

For the purposes of this report, "satisfied" FROs comprise survey participants who indicated they are either satisfied or very satisfied with scheduling and appraisal services overall and "dissatisfied" FROs comprise those who indicated they are either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied overall.

RESULTS

1. Background

This report compares the 2006 survey results with a subset of the 2004 results (i.e., those that most closely resemble this year's respondents). The subset consists of those respondents who indicated they had either submitted more than one schedule to NARA during the year prior to the survey or did not know the number of schedules they had submitted to NARA during that time. This report refers to this subset of 2004 respondents also as "active" agencies. This subset is not small; it represents 70 percent of the 2004 survey respondents.

Granted, this comparison is not perfect. This subset of the 2004 respondents would exclude those agencies that may have had an open schedule with NARA during the 12 months prior to the survey, but had submitted it to NARA before this period. However, the discrepancy is most likely very small. As noted above, we sent the 2006 survey only to agencies that had an open records schedule with NARA since the last customer satisfaction survey. Only four of the 2006 survey's respondents (5%) indicated they had submitted no schedules to NARA during the year prior to completing the survey.

Another factor complicating the comparison of 2006 and 2004 results is that the 2004 survey questions included a "neutral" response option while the 2006 version does not. While it may be impossible to categorically interpret how responses that did include a "neutral" response option compare with those that did not, this report at least shows the two sets of results side-by-side.

The percentages included in this report are rounded numbers. Because each set of percentages must equal 100, the same number in a set may be arbitrarily rounded both up and down. This happens when a number falls in the mid-range (e.g. a 1.6 or a 1.5) and the other numbers in the set round strongly up (e.g. 1.9) and strongly down (e.g. 1.1).

Survey results reported in the text of this report do not include "I do not know" responses. This is because the percentage of survey participants who chose this option for each question is very small: it is only between two and five percent.

2. Response Rate

NARA distributed 112 questionnaires and received 85 completed surveys for a response rate of 76%.

3. Demographics

Survey Questions 11-13

		Office with Department-wide responsibilities in a Cabinet-level department. <i>This includes, for example, the Department of Transportation (DOT).</i>	Bureau or agency within a Cabinet-level department. <i>This includes, for example, the Federal Aviation Administration within DOT.</i>	Independent agency. <i>This includes, for example, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).</i>
11. Please indicate your agency type.	2006:	16 (19%)	47 (55%)	22 (26%)
	2004 active:	16 (20%)	41 (51%)	23 (29%)
	<i>2004 total:</i>	<i>21 (18.3%)</i>	<i>56 (48.7%)</i>	<i>38 (33.0%)</i>

		1,000 or less	1,001-5,000	5,001-20,000	20,001-50,000	50,001-100,000	Over 100,000	I do not know.
12. Please indicate the number of full-time employees in your agency.	2006:	18 (21%)	20 (24%)	18 (21%)	13 (15%)	3 (4%)	4 (5%)	9 (10%)
	2004 active:	12 (15%)	24 (30%)	15 (19%)	9 (11%)	5 (5%)	4 (5%)	11 (14%)
	2004 total:	26 (22.6%)	34 (29.6%)	20 (17.4%)	11 (9.6%)	6 (5.2%)	6 (5.2%)	12 (10.4%)

		0	1-5	6-10	11 or more	I do not know
13. How many SF 115s has your agency submitted to NARA during the past 12 months?	2006:	4 (5%)	59 (69%)	10 (12%)	10 (12%)	2 (2%)
	2004 active:	--	46 (57%)	14 (18%)	15 (19%)	5 (6%)
	2004 total:	35 (30.4%)	46 (40.0%)	14 (12.2%)	15 (13.0%)	5 (4.4%)

The majority of survey respondents report that they work in bureaus or agencies within a Cabinet-level department (55%), have 20,000 full-time employees or fewer (66%), and submitted between one and five schedules to NARA during the twelve months prior to the survey (69%).

The demographics of respondents to the 2006 survey and “active” scheduling agency respondents to the 2004 survey are very similar. The main difference is a decrease of 15% in the amount of 2006 respondents indicating their agency had submitted more than five schedules to NARA during the 12-month period prior to the survey.

4. Core Questions (Questions 1-9)

See attached appendixes B and C for graphs of response statistics related to the survey’s core nine questions:

- Appendix B – Results: 2006 (by number of responses)
- Appendix C – Comparative Results: 2006 vs. 2004 (by rounded percentages)

a. Overall Satisfaction:

Survey Question 9

		Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
9. How satisfied are you with NARA scheduling and appraisal services?	2006:	22 (26%)	44 (52%)	--	19 (22%)	0 (0%)
	2004 active:	12 (15%)	32 (40%)	20 (25%)	15 (19%)	1 (1%)
	2004 total:	18 (15.7%)	47 (40.8%)	26 (22.6%)	22 (19.1%)	2 (1.8%)

Very Satisfied and Satisfied = 78% (rounded up from 77.6%)

- This is a 23% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Dissatisfied and Very Dissatisfied = 22%

- This is a 2% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

The vast majority of FROs who completed this 2006 survey (77.6% which rounds up to 78%) report they are satisfied or very satisfied with NARA appraisal and scheduling services. Twenty-two percent of respondents state they are dissatisfied. No respondents indicate they are very dissatisfied.

This year’s results are a marked improvement over 2004’s customer satisfaction levels. The 2004 survey report shows 56.6% of all survey participants were satisfied, 22.6% were neutral, and 20.9% were dissatisfied. The response statistics of 2004 survey participants in “active” scheduling agencies are virtually identical to the response statistics of all survey participants: 55% reported they were satisfied or very satisfied, 25% indicated they were neutral and 20% stated they were dissatisfied.

Part of the rise in 2006’s customer satisfaction level is likely due to a design change made to the questionnaire: the 2006 version of the questionnaire dropped all “neutral” response options. However, it is significant to note that while the 2006 customer satisfaction rate rose significantly, there was not a large increase in the percentage of dissatisfied customers. While customer satisfaction rose 21% from 2004’s total responses, customer dissatisfaction only rose 1%.¹

¹ This updated version of the report does not include schedules backlog data, as they came from a one-time analysis that NARA could not re-create.

b. Timeliness of Records Schedule Approval Process:

Survey Question 1

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I do not know
1. The time it takes to approve a records schedule is satisfactory.	2006:	7 (8%)	30 (35%)	--	33 (39%)	12 (14%)	3 (4%)
	2004 active:	4 (5%)	11 (14%)	13 (16%)	33 (41%)	16 (20%)	3 (4%)
	2004 total:	7 (6.1%)	22 (19.1%)	19 (16.5%)	38 (33.0%)	21 (18.3%)	8 (7.0%)

Strongly Agree and Agree = 43%

- This is an 18% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Disagree and Strongly Disagree = 53%

- This is an 8% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Respondents express the highest level of concern with the timeliness of the scheduling process. Just more than half of all respondents (53%) affirmatively state that the length of time is unsatisfactory. Less than half (43%) of respondents agree or strongly agree that the time it takes to approve a records schedule is satisfactory. In addition, it is telling to note that this question received by far the largest number of “strongly disagree” responses from survey participants (14%).

While the satisfaction rate with the timeliness of the scheduling process is lower than we would like, the good news is that customer satisfaction in this area is improving. In 2004, 61% of all “active” agency respondents stated that the length of time to approve a schedule was unsatisfactory. About one in five respondents (20%) strongly disagreed that timeliness was satisfactory. The 2006 results show an overall 8% decrease in FROs who disagreed or strongly disagreed that the time to approve a records schedule is satisfactory. The amount of respondents who strongly disagreed dropped by 6%.

Half of all respondents who submitted comments (28 out of the 57) state that one of the most important things NARA could do to improve its scheduling services is to shorten the schedule processing time. In addition, about two out of every three dissatisfied customers (12 out of 19) included this in their comments as well as one out of every four satisfied customers (16 out of 66). See Appendixes D and E for compilations of respondents’ comments by satisfaction level and topic.

c. Communication:

Survey Question 2

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I do not know
2. NARA staff keeps my agency informed about the progress of our records schedules throughout the approval process.	2006:	16 (19%)	49 (57%)	--	16 (19%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)
	2004 active:	13 (16%)	27 (34%)	11 (14%)	20 (25%)	5 (6%)	4 (5%)
	2004 total:	19 (16.5%)	38 (33.0%)	17 (14.8%)	24 (20.9%)	6 (5.2%)	11 (9.6%)

Strongly Agree and Agree = 76%

- This is a 26% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Disagree and Strongly Disagree = 20%

- This is an 11% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

The 2006 responses to Question 2 show the most improvement over 2004 responses. While this question regarding keeping agencies informed about the progress of records schedules continues to receive the second-lowest rating from survey respondents overall, it has improved significantly since the last survey. Just over three-quarters of this year’s respondents agree that NARA staff keeps their agency informed about the progress of their records schedules while only 20% disagree. In 2004, only half agreed, 31% disagreed, and 14% were neutral. This represents a 26% increase in customers who affirmatively agree they are kept informed and an 11% decrease in customers who disagree. This is the largest decrease in the percentage of respondents who disagree with any of the survey questions.

This marked improvement may be directly attributed to NARA’s decision to initiate a new report called the Status Report of Registered Schedules. NARA designed this report as a new tool to communicate with our scheduling and appraisal customers. Each NARA appraisal archivist is responsible for sending the status report to their assigned agencies every month. NARA has been sending it to agencies since August 2005. This new procedure is a direct result of our 2004 survey efforts.

Eight survey respondents provided comments about being kept informed about the progress of their schedules. One very satisfied customer wrote, “Receiving a monthly ‘Status Report of Registered Schedules’ is a plus and for me is one of the most important things that NARA can do to continue improving our scheduling and appraisal process.” The other respondents who commented on this area show that we may be able to improve how reliably we send the status report or include information in it. These respondents either did not show they were aware of the report or requested more consistency from

NARA. In response to the question about the most important thing NARA could do to improve its records scheduling services, they included in their comments the following:

- “I would like to receive tracking information on my schedule as it goes through the various stages at NARA” (Satisfied respondent.)
- “We are in the process of changing our records disposition and in the beginning I was receiving regular monthly updates on how that was progressing . . . not any more . . . I don’t mind making the calls but, the monthly emails were great.” (Dissatisfied respondent)
- “Improve on consistency of Monthly Status Reporting (it is currently inconsistent. 1 month, then 2, then 1 month, etc.).” (Dissatisfied respondent)
- “We have several items from back in 2001 that we have heard nothing on and do not show on the monthly status reports.” (Dissatisfied respondent)

Survey Question 4

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I do not know
4. My agency’s staff has a good working relationship with our NARA appraisal archivist.	2006:	38 (45%)	38 (44%)	--	5 (6%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)
	2004 active:	36 (45%)	32 (40%)	9 (11%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
	2004 total:	45 (39.1%)	48 (41.8%)	15 (13.0%)	3 (2.6%)	1 (0.9%)	3 (2.6%)

Strongly Agree and Agree = 89%

- This is a 4% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Disagree and Strongly Disagree = 7%

- This is a 4% increase over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

As in 2004, this year’s survey respondents express the highest satisfaction rate with the working relationship they have with their appraisal archivist and the response they receive when they contact NARA for assistance. About 90% of survey respondents agree or strongly agree that they have a good working relationship with their NARA appraisal archivist.

Nine satisfied respondents submitted positive comments about working with NARA staff. For example:

- “Your Scheduling and Appraisal Group is outstanding.”
- “I really enjoy working with my appraisal archivist. I know he has other customers but you would think that our agency is his only customer. I have also had the pleasure of working with several other appraisal archivists at

NARA and they too were very professional and attentive to all of our issues and concerns.”

- “Your staff was VERY professional and I enjoyed working with them.”
- “The NARA staff is very capable and helpful in reviewing and approving schedules.”

Survey Question 3

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I do not know
3. When my agency’s staff contacts our NARA appraisal archivist for assistance, we receive a response that meets our needs.	2006:	28 (33%)	48 (56%)	--	5 (6%)	1 (1%)	3 (4%)
	2004 active:	24 (30%)	40 (50%)	8 (10%)	5 (6%)	2 (3%)	1 (1%)
	2004 total:	32 (27.8%)	55 (47.9%)	12 (10.4%)	10 (8.7%)	3 (2.6%)	3 (2.6%)

Strongly Agree and Agree = 89%

- This is a 9% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Disagree and Strongly Disagree = 7%

- This is a 2% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

As mentioned above, this question received one of the two most positive response rates. The vast majority of all survey respondents (89%) agree or strongly agree that they receive a response that meets their needs when they contact NARA for assistance. Only a small number of survey respondents (three) submitted comments requesting more timely responses from NARA staff.

Survey Question 8

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I do not know
8. My agency receives consistent guidance from NARA staff regarding records scheduling policy and procedures.	2006:	15 (18%)	54 (63%)	--	13 (15%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)
	2004 active:	16 (20%)	35 (44%)	13 (15%)	12 (15%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)
	2004 total:	20 (17.4%)	50 (43.5%)	22 (19.1%)	17 (14.8%)	2 (1.8%)	4 (3.4%)

Strongly Agree and Agree = 81%

- This is a 17% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Disagree and Strongly Disagree = 15%

- This is a 3% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

A large percentage of survey respondents (81%) agree that their agency receives consistent guidance from NARA staff regarding records scheduling policy and procedures. Only a small number of survey respondents (four) submitted comments requesting more consistent guidance from NARA staff. Respondents asked for:

- more consistent guidance about working with the “21” questions for scheduling electronic records;
- NARA headquarters and agency staff give consistent answers to questions;
- NARA to stick to agreements made about schedule processing time; and
- appraisal archivists to be made aware of issues discussed at BRIDG meetings.

d. Guidance Products:

Survey Question 5

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I do not know
5. NARA produces guidance on records scheduling policy and procedures in a timely fashion.	2006:	13 15%	55 65%	--	13 15%	2 3%	2 2%
	2004 active:	7 (9%)	39 (49%)	13 (16%)	17 (21%)	2 (3%)	2 (2%)
	2004 total:	12 (10.4%)	58 (50.4%)	18 (15.7%)	22 (19.1%)	3 (2.6%)	2 (1.8%)

Strongly Agree and Agree = 80%

- This is a 22% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Disagree and Strongly Disagree = 18%

- This is a 6% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Survey Question 6

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I do not know
6. NARA guidance on records scheduling policy and procedure is comprehensive enough to meet my agency's scheduling needs.	2006:	11 13%	58 68%	--	9 10%	4 5%	3 4%
	2004 active:	10 (12%)	38 (47%)	18 (23%)	10 (12%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)
	2004 total:	13 (11.3%)	61 (53.0%)	22 (19.1%)	15 (13.0%)	2 (1.8%)	2 (1.8%)

Strongly Agree and Agree = 81%

- This is a 22% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Disagree and Strongly Disagree = 15%

- This is the same as 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Survey Question 7

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	I do not know
7. It is easy to work with NARA guidance products containing records scheduling policy and procedures.	2006:	10 11%	57 67%	--	12 14%	2 3%	4 5%
	2004 active:	10 (12%)	35 (44%)	21 (26%)	11 (14%)	1 (1%)	2 (3%)
	2004 total:	13 (11.3%)	57 (49.5%)	25 (21.7%)	16 (13.9%)	2 (1.8%)	2 (1.8%)

Strongly Agree and Agree = 78%

- This is a 22% improvement over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

Disagree and Strongly Disagree = 15%

- This is a 2% increase over 2004 results for “active” agencies.

The responses of FROs to these three questions about NARA guidance products fell in the mid-range of ratings and were roughly equivalent, with about 80% of all respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that NARA scheduling and appraisal guidance is produced

in a timely fashion, comprehensive enough, easy to work with, and consistently interpreted by NARA staff. About 17% of respondents disagree or strongly disagree.

Three out of the five comments regarding guidance products requested assistance with or expansion of the General Records Schedule (GRS). Another one asked for better written guidance to help agencies schedule all kinds of records and one asked for guidance to help schedule electronic records.

Five other comments request additional scheduling resources from NARA such as:

- sharing an agency's success with flexible scheduling;
- providing easy access to schedules of other agencies;
- creating an information collection tool agencies could use to gather information about and determine the appropriate disposition of records; and
- providing examples of good schedules.

5. Survey Respondents' Ideas for Improving Scheduling Services:

Several respondents provided ideas about improving NARA's scheduling services. These comments generally either ask for more staff resources from NARA or suggest changes to the scheduling process. Two respondents advised NARA to hire more appraisers and one commented that appraisers seem overworked. Other suggested changes include ideas to:

- allow for electronic submission of records schedules;
- set up more pre-appraisal meetings with agencies;
- assign more than one appraisal archivist to each agency; and
- provide hands-on assistance to agencies developing records schedules.

See attached appendixes D and E for complete comments submitted by respondents.

- Appendix D – Comments (Arranged by Respondent's Satisfaction Level)
- Appendix E – Comments (Arranged by Topic)

NEXT STEPS

NARA is committed to improving its scheduling and appraisal services to raise customer satisfaction levels. NARA will carry out the following actions in order to meet the needs FROs express in this survey:

1. Timeliness of Schedule Approvals

Survey participants across the board express the highest level of concern with the amount of time it takes to approve a records schedule (see Appendix A, Survey Question 1). Overall, 43% of respondents agree or strongly agree that the time it takes to approve a records schedule is satisfactory. About half of all respondents (53%) state that the length of time is unsatisfactory.

To expedite timeliness of processing schedules:

- NARA plans to decrease the Federal Register public request period from 45 days to 30 days.
- During Fiscal Year 2008, NARA is scheduled to implement an electronic Request for Records Disposition Authority (SF 115) as part of the first phase of its Electronic Records Archive (ERA). As the electronic SF 115 comes into wider use throughout the Federal records management community, NARA expects it to expedite the processing of schedules. The electronic SF 115 will streamline workflows and eliminate the amount of time it currently takes to carry out paper-based transactions.
- In addition, in July 2006, NARA announced via Bulletin 2006-04 that agencies may use GRS 20 Items 13 and 14 to cover temporary e-mail and word processing system records; these no longer need to appear as items on a proposed records schedule (SF 115). By eliminating those items, records schedules that otherwise consist only of items that are all proposed as permanent will not be required to go through the Federal Register process.

2. Communication on Schedule Approval Status

NARA has made substantial progress in increasing communication with FROs about the status of their schedules; however, one-fifth of respondents (20%) disagree or strongly disagree that NARA staff keeps their agency informed about the progress of their records schedules throughout the approval process (see Appendix A, Survey Question 2). We are unsure exactly what factors contributed to these responses; however, a few respondents' comments indicate that some monthly registered schedules status reports might be missing registered schedules or might not be sent as consistently as they could be.

To improve monthly communication with agencies about the status of their schedules:

- NARA will review and tighten internal procedures and controls to ensure the Monthly Status Report on Registered Schedules is consistently disseminated to agencies; and
- NARA will modify the Records Scheduling and Appraisal Services Customer Satisfaction Survey to determine why a survey participant feels they are not being kept informed about the progress of their records schedules.

3. Utility of Guidance Products:

The responses of FROs to the three questions about NARA guidance products (see Appendix A, Survey Questions 5-7) were roughly equivalent, with about 80% of all respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that NARA scheduling and appraisal guidance is produced in a timely fashion, comprehensive enough, and easy to work with.

To help maintain and improve this level of satisfaction:

- NARA will continue to expand its records scheduling and appraisal guidance products by disseminating the following guidance products:
 - an expanded GRS 1 (Civilian Personnel Records) to cover flexi-place and Employee Assistance Program (EAP) records;
 - an expanded GRS 10 (Motor Vehicle Maintenance and Operation Records), containing additional records series related to aircraft operations and maintenance;
 - an FAQ to provide basic records management information relating to instant messaging;
 - guidance examining the applicability of *NARA Guidance on Managing Web Records* to portals, web logs (blogs), wikipedias and Real Simple Syndication (RSS) feeds; and
 - guidance for integrating records management into electronic information system (EIS) planning processes, which will identify critical pre-deployment junctures for EISs at which records managers may exert influence.
- NARA will modify the Records Scheduling and Appraisal Services Customer Satisfaction Survey to gather more specific input from our customers about ways to improve and expand the GRS.

CONCLUSION

The vast majority of survey respondents continue to agree that they have a good working relationship with their appraisal archivist and that they receive a response that meets their needs when they contact NARA for assistance. Survey respondents also continue to express the highest level of dissatisfaction with the time it takes to approve a records schedule. While there was a marked improvement this year in the percentage of survey respondents indicating they are kept informed about the progress of their schedules, it remains the second lowest ranked question on this survey. The responses of FROs to the questions about NARA guidance products were roughly equivalent and received relatively high ratings.

In order to raise the overall satisfaction level of its customers from 78%, NARA will work to implement its electronic Request for Records Disposition Authority, review internal procedures to make sure the monthly Status Report on Registered Schedules is consistently disseminated to agencies, continue to expand its records scheduling and appraisal guidance products, and modify the Records Scheduling and Appraisal Services Customer Satisfaction Survey to gather more specific input from our customers about ways to improve and expand the GRS.