

BenchmarkPortal One-Minute Surveytm # 385

Survey Category:	Call Quality Monitoring
Survey Date:	04/15/2004
Sponsored By:	Witness
Principal Investigator:	Dr. Jon Anton Purdue University Center for Customer-Driven Quality
Industry Sectors Represented:	All
Document Tracking Number:	SRV385-042304
Find More Surveys At:	BenchmarkPortal.com

One-Minute Survey™ Results

Question 1

What is your approximate call volume?

Description Of Answer	Respondents
5,001 – 50,000 calls/month	40.40 %
200,001 – 500,000+ calls/month	20.91 %
50,001 – 100,000 calls/month	13.50 %
1,000 – 5,000 calls/month	13.50 %
100,001 – 200,000 calls/month	11.69 %

Question 2

How many agents (FTEs) are currently employed by your call center?

Description Of Answer	Respondents
	375.98

Question 3

Do you currently have a call quality monitoring system (QMS) installed in your contact center?

Description Of Answer	Respondents
Yes	66.10 %
No	33.90 %

One-Minute Surveytm Results

Question 4

How long has your quality monitoring system been installed?

Description Of Answer	Respondents
1 – 2 years	32.94 %
3 – 4 years	28.02 %
0 – 11 months	21.31 %
5+ years	17.73 %

Question 5

How many calls are actually monitored and scored per agent per month?

Description Of Answer	Respondents
	78.64

Question 6

In total, how many hours per month does the call monitor spend evaluating one agent each month?

Description Of Answer	Respondents
	5.19

One-Minute Survey™ Results

Question 7

In your opinion, what is the agents' reaction to your current monitoring and coaching process? Please select the one response that best characterizes the opinion of the majority of agents.

Description Of Answer	Respondents
Most appreciate the feedback and value the process.	61.83 %
Most are neutral about the feedback and the process.	31.16 %
Most dislike the process and do not value the feedback.	7.01 %

Question 8

Which one of the following responses characterizes how satisfied you are with your current call quality monitoring system?

Description Of Answer	Respondents
Satisfied	53.52 %
Neutral	20.13 %
Very satisfied	13.42 %
Dissatisfied	10.80 %
Very Dissatisfied	2.13 %

Question 10

Are you planning to upgrade or replace your current quality monitoring system within the next 12 months?

Description Of Answer	Respondents
No	67.58 %
Yes	32.42 %

One-Minute Surveytm Results

Question 11

Which of the following reasons describes why you do not have a quality monitoring system in place?
Check all that apply.

Description Of Answer	Respondents
Lack of funds allocated for such a system	74.56 %
Lack of need for such a system	25.44 %

Question 12

Are you planning to have a quality monitoring system installed within the next 24 months?

Description Of Answer	Respondents
Yes	50.30 %
No	49.70 %

Thanks for participating in our BenchmarkPortal One-Minute Survey™.

If you have a specific question that you want us to ask our very large database of participants, please email your specific question(s) to Dr. Jon Anton at:

**The Center for Customer-Driven Quality
Purdue University**

**Please Visit
www.BenchmarkPortal.com/AskDrJon/**

**Telephone
765.494.8357**

Copyright Notice

The results of this One-Minute Survey™ are the exclusive property of BenchmarkPortal, Inc. If you want others at your company to have a copy, please send them to our website to download their own copy, free of charge. Any commercial use, or reprint of these results is strictly forbidden without the prior written approval of the Public Relations Department at BenchmarkPortal.

Question 9 What is your biggest complaint regarding your current quality monitoring system?

Responses

insufficient information re: customer experience

none

At this point we have no major complaints about the call monitoring equipment - we just wish there were more hours in the day to do it!

Scores down if you miss any portion of the call handling skill

Only being able to record in 2 hour blocks. If we are having a low contact volume day, it is difficult to obtain a complete monitor.

It does not provide for instant capture of call in progress.

Some system problems that result in a small amount of lost production each month. User interface could be simpler for matching database information collected during the call to the call recording.

none

The biggest agent complaint is that the focus on meeting CQA expectations, zaps away any individuality from the individual.

It is not automated. Agents can tell their calls are being recorded.

inconsistent results depending on who the monitor is. Supervisors are the monitors.

We had an outside service, Telemonitor, doing the evaluations and they went out of business so now we're using internal resources which takes additional time and can be biased.

None, I really like the software we use.

How I can only listen by agent and not by company

lack of flexibility

Does not record data.

The OS is NT and once a month randomly it fails [Blue screen of death.]

We were not large enough to justify a very sophisticated system. We have to manually trigger the monitoring/recording process for each agent.

Homegrown system, no screen capture

Inability to customize reports.

Requires too much set-up time. It takes as long to set up and arrange the monitoring equipment as it does to monitor the call.

None.

from a technology perspective, the system requires alot of "hand holding" - many server outages, etc which causes the system to go down

We do not have an automated means to monitor calls. We have to "catch" an agent at the start of a call, and listen for the entire transaction to be able to evaluate it appropriately. Therefore, there is always wait time while we are hoping to "catch" a new call. In addition, we don't have a means to monitor screen action on the part of an agent, therefore we can judge the results of the call by listen to what is said, but we can't determine how efficiently the information was gathered.

our recording process is not very efficient

slow

We are not currently able to capture keyboard and screen activity although the quality tools we use do have that feature.

Calls are sometimes not fully recorded. They cut off when there is a long silence.

Ability to quickly resolve technical issues

The vendor does not keep up with the changes in technology - they are slow to make improvements on their system. The system must be rebooted every other week to clear problems. The support line is front ended with people who do not know the system and it takes several calls to get to an analyst that can help with the problem.

NOne

Installed within past 2 months and have had static on playback since day 1. Still trying to get the bugs out of it.

Don't have e-learning

that we are not realizing any cost savings or improvements in service

No way to ensure monitors are selecting calls at random instead of just selecting the shortest calls. This results in some of the longer AHT call types rarely being monitored.

Consistency across product lines

Not able to capture ALL calls for each agent.

The actual time it takes for someone to sit down and review random calls and rate them

Time invested in monitoring and speed in which the calibration feedback is received.

The problems during the install. The administration steps to update agents. Creating the formulas in the form was not intuitive.

does not allow free seating

Older system using tape. Must go to "phone room" to monitor and make copies. Would like to upgrade available technology.

It has only been implemented a couple of months ago, so we don't have a good point of reference to answer this question.

Home maid, so, we have to "hunt" the call. We always have to be online to intercept a call

It's controlled by the corporate headquarters. I have no input.

Difficulty searching calls (our calls are all recorded). No integrated scoring system.

the last of automation in the data reporting.

Limited Reporting.

Does not do continuous monitoring of all agents.

Too many subjective areas.

What is measured or monitored is not what is really important to the customer

New database and reporting that we are still getting used to and learning to use all of the tools. Our system does not show cumulative results of the department only individual results for each CSR. Trend reporting is limited.

technical issues

capacity to record calls

Needs more structure.

Reporting

Flexibility with the system

current system does not allow us to see snapshots of the screens as the calls are taken, we just hear the audio (screen views are a new upgrade in the near future)

The time it takes to do on a regular basis is a challenge. Also all the data is summarized with monthly standards and submitted to management. I also want to mention we monitor the outgoing (return) calls to clients. We are a medical laboratory client services and it is critical the standards be maintained.

It is not as user friendly as it could be.

Would like us to do even more monitoring but dedicating the time is often a challenge.

wewe

The system limitations and its inability to scrape screens

Alloting the appropriate time to monitor agents

No complaints

It is sometimes difficult to record calls the way I would like.

We need to monitor more.

It is not so much the hardware we are using but the "process". Current QA analysts spend too much time on 1 call, tend to over do the comments. They need more calibration so that agents feel confident in their analysis.

Lack of standards\poor quality of feedback

varies

No complaints

upgrade process is cumbersome and time consuming. Requires too much IT involvement and coordination to successfully introduce new versions of the software.

Interpretation between the agent on the phone and the person monitoring the call

Technology to access calls to monitor.

none noted

Software not originally fully compatible with our network.

Software somewhat cumbersome to use.

none

We employ a "Mystery Caller" process.. Process is time consuming and I am not sure if we really are getting enough pertinent information.

No complaints..

none

When we want to make a change or addition to our evaluation template, our system requires that we create an entirely new template. As a result, we are then prevented from trending over time on pre-existing measures. For example, if we've always scored for the measure "Used appropriate greeting," and we decide to add a new measure to our form in April 2004, we can no longer run reports for "Used appropriate greeting" which will span the old form and the new form. Thus, the ability to change evaluation forms due to business needs is always a trade-off with the ability to trend over time.

Information is not captured on a database system for analysis

None...it does digital call recording, digital screen capture, detailed reporting on QA results defined by date range and summarized by program, team, agent, and the average score given per reviewer (used in calibration efforts).

From a technical standpoint, we seem to incur issues with the system not working properly at all times, and the company's help desk isn't always as responsive as we would like them to be. That is matched by the limits to what the system can do presently. It is a very good system, we just want more than it can provide at this time.

We have a very distributed workforce (1800 in around 160 sites. Our biggest issue is getting local call center managers to use system. With around 500,000 calls per month we are only getting around 2000 completed monitors per month.

We have the capability and are starting up a program, but currently are not doing it. Unfortunately, the survey gave no options for this answer.

WE are not making the improvements as quickly as I had anticipated in call quality.

Not all the components are working.

the lack of follow up from the supervisory team to ensure that the goals and improvement is occurring on a daily basis.

Time consuming

No complaints, just don't understand warnings that pop up. Haven't had it long enough or enough info on them.

Database integrity

Ad hoc reporting is not flexible enough.

Server space to store the calls

Not all supervisors complete what is expected of them.

Monitoring in a unionized environment provides many, many challenges monthly.

We don't record calls. Makes it a challenge to capture all opportunities to improve service.

Requires the call monitoring to be done "live time" by the monitoring agent. The module to allow for recording and later retrieval is available but not budgeted for the near term.

Mostly reporting flexibility and system issues.

None

Technical connectivity issues to other systems

not having used it as we should

xxx

sample size and calls monitoring alongwith screen capture

x

One of the biggest challenges is giving our QR team the confidence to coach customer service. Procedures are pretty much right/wrong, but customer service skills are often a judgement and QR does not always have confidence to score. We recently just changed our QR form and we are having a difficult time getting "buy-in" from all staff-managers to phone staff.

Reporting, particularly building ad hoc or custom reports.

Takes time; agents complained it is objective

It system is very old and no formal procedures exist.

we can not view the agents' screens

Price

There is so much more we would like to do but our clients don't understand the importance - so why bother

Retrieving calls

can't monitor enough calls and can't monitor at our convenience--must monitor live calls because we don't have a recording system.

HAS SOME BUGS IN THE SOFTWARE SO ITS NOT 100% RELIABLE YET

none

none

it only monitors the call and not the process

Cannot record calls.

It's at end of life. Calls go on archived tapes after 4-5 weeks. Very hard to access calls from these tapes.

System gives limited space for comments on evaluated calls.

Does not have voice and data capture functionality and is 5 years old

personal calls

1) Call recording does not disconnect at the end of the call, records for long duration when not required 2) Reporting interface does not work most of the time 3) Audio does not record most of the time

none

Some of the processes are manual - I wish we could automate the entire thing.

We currently perform live monitoring. Our QM system really only provides the ability to evaluate calls, generate a score and reports. We ultimately want to move to voice and data recording.

the parameters that they use to qualified our op's

limitations of file size

Playback/sharing limitations

playing the beep tone - it sometimes interferes with the conversation.

Some customers are upset - do not want to be recorded.

Too manual. When it gets busy, we don't use it

We use a Radio Shack tape recorder. We're a small IT department that is part of a large FI but don't have access to the larger call centres' automated systems.

Problems with the recordings being played back - incorrect agents tagged to recordings, etc.

Additional resources are required to do a better job.

ease of use

lack of support from the vendor

Agents can sometimes tell when they are being monitored.

No major issues

Our inability to report on detail that is extremely granular. As well, we find it difficult to track trends across all the call monitors.

Too much focus on compliance, not enough customer focus

software instability

Consistency in evaluating calls

While monitoring is often done as required. Coaching sessions are unscheduled and hard to track properly.

none

We need more hard drive space to store the recordings.

IT IS A MANUAL PROCESS OF RECORDING THE CALL AND THEN NEEDING TO LISTEN TO THE TAPE AND SORT THE GOOD ONES FROM THE BAD.

x

The random recording

Flexibility and difficulty running reports

Our "system" is maintained in an Access database and we have an antiquated taping system that causes many hours spent searching for calls. We have no reporting or trend analysis with our current system.

It has to be supported in-house.

Dependability

limited reporting

N/A

Lack of ad-hoc and detailed reports. No direct access to the database of the call monitoring system.

We had to integrate with a dialer that does both inbound/outbound dialing. We are an a non-EAS Avaya shop however, our agents do move from seat to seat on a daily basis.

Cannot take appropriate times for evaluating calls because supervisor is very busy.

Our call monitoring is performed where the supervisor logs onto a CSRs phone and listens to their calls. If they are on hold or available with no calls coming in, the supervisor needs to wait until a call comes in. The supervisor then fills out a form that can sometimes be hard to do, while trying to evaluate the call. Also, we try to listen to several calls to get an idea of consistency. This entire process is very time consuming. Our system does not allow us to record and listen with the CSR to review together at a later date.

none currently

No screen capture

Delay in response time for support

Slow response when used by 5 or more users

We use a combination of things to monitor and impact quality, not just the monitoring system. Our current monitoring system vendor, Witness, is excellent and is continually improving and adding to their product line, often directly in response to my company's requests.

Actually we can't interact "on line" with the agents, I mean, if we need to correct or feedback to the agent about something we can't do it in the same instant the call is been attending (at least by system).

Limited ability to store and perform analysis on data.

Limited number of concurrent licenses

standardization of processes

Occasional unavailability of retrieving some calls, occasional impossibility to connect a call to agent's log-in ID.

storage capacity to record all the calls

It does not plot an overall progress report of an agent thru the months. We need to do it manually. Vendors keep saying that it is available in crystal report if we know how to use it but why can't they just prepare it.

haven't found one yet

None

too slow in retrieving the call

It could be more automatized

Lack of consistency

none

No real-time feedbacks

Ability to monitor more calls per agent.

Unfare rating

I do not have one.

System goes down a lot.

not enough!

Inability to utilize our current monitoring form exactly as is.

with no CTI integration its hard to reconcile what i get with my CRM

We are using the (old) version of Auto Quality, and are preparing to upgrade to the latest version of E-Talk.

Needs to be automated. Currently use tape recorders.

Not shopping for system right now.

The reps feel pressure of quality versus quantity

Technical issues/compatibility issues that are not always easily addressed by the manufacturer

xxx

We aren't monitoring enough calls to make our score a valid performance measurement, yet it has become a key metric for our department.

None.

limitations for expansion

Can not support 100% calls recorded.

It is difficult to change the questions, etc., on the grading questionnaire.

Doesn't record the entire call. We get a lot of bit's and pieces.

Nothing particular

sample size is too small - very labor intensive process

As many different kind of calls are managed in our call centers, it takes a lot of time and effort to make or system objective, as we should retrieve and treat many different KPI for each kind of service (each one may have its own quality drivers)

Costs and lack of additional functionality to leverage the data

none

Quality monitoring is done by the team leaders and their performance scores are calculated according to the teams quality score.

The cost to acquire and maintain is extremely excessive.

The selection process as it is manual at this time. However, this will change as the NICE system has been approved for purchase.

abc

non

The inability to print out the actual problem ticket for review along with the call.

Time to conduct additional evaluations. (number of calls being recorded)(

call not selected on a random basis

We do not have enough ports to record more employees in a half hour time frame.

none

Reporting reponse time is very slow making reporting too time consuming.

We do not currently record all calls.

we don't have enough samples from which we would be positive that the current score per agent, reflects real picture of his work. we don't have enough samples because we don't have enough specialists who do the call monitoring.

None with the system more with the process and making it work for different parts of the organization.

no easy way to monitor outbound calls

not enough QA staff to allow us to monitor more calls

Need more Qa reps to monitor more calls per month

Scoring tool inadequate. Cannot easily make changes.

supervisor not doing what is required

Interface with other systems is relatively poor. Reporting/Analysis is difficult. Weighting of questions (especially with N/A category) can be a challenge.

The biggest problem would be limitations due to speed of system and space capabilities. These issues cause delays in production and can be frustrating to the user.

Effective Quality Monitoring requires a great deal of WAN and LAN space. Implementation caused the need for unbudgeted network upgrades.

The current process is a bit overwhelming. There are 3 people responsible for the monitoring. 2 managers and the Training & Quality Specialist. All input is valuable and finding a way to streamline without having the feedback to the agent suffer is a challenge.

The technology is great, but it still comes down to make time to monitor, evaluate and provide the agent with feedback.

It is a numeric checklist whose emphasis is on a "score", as opposed to, concentrating on the behaviors that make up the score.

Not automated.

we would like a 360 degree view of our customer contact. the call monitoring system is a standalone system where all other systems (IVR customer survey, outbound surveys and quantitative measures) are integrated within our data-warehouse. Moreover there is a problem with report customization. until our call monitoring system is not fully integrated in our data-warehouse there will be no possibility to get to a 360 degree view.

The fact that the current version of our system does not allow us to export a file with voice and data to the agents desktops.

There never seems to be enough time (due to call volume) to complete the evaluations and provide coaching.

None

System malfunctions periodically, and calls cannot be sorted easily.

We use tape recorders.

Regarding the system, our biggest complaint would be not having enough calls recorded.

Ease of use of the backend database. Currently a maze trying to figure out where everything is linked.

volume/capacity

None

Too much manual work

no recording/playback for representative to hear call to assist with constructive feedback

Limited reporting capabilities

gd

setting up a procedure to take advantage of the ability to monitor calls and selecting the calls to monitor

Data consistency

niounhi

It makes the agent uncomfortable.

Does not allow screen capture

Reporting ease

Would like to do more.

The equipment is getting old, storage capacity is low in view of the large number of calls we have.

We are pleased with the monitoring system we have selected.

We have a "home grown" system that does not afford us great flexibility in recording or reporting.

no complaints

It is not user friendly and reporting is all manual. Again very time consuming and difficult to use and administer.

none- We use DigiVoice, a program supplied by VoiceLogger. All calls are digitally recorded within individual agent buckets. I can randomly select calls to monitor, even forward the content within an email to a third party.

Old system - labor intensive

Score is attached to a single recording vs and aggregate score for several calls

Lack of resources to spend 1 on 1 time coaching the call agents. Additionally, due to lack of hardware on computers not all agents could listen to the call monitored at their desk; they have to sit w/ the person doing the monitoring to hear the call so that the feedback can be validated.

Technical limitations

management reporting capabilities

user interface

1. Printed Forms have a poor format and look

2. Lack of flexibility in scoring system, ie bonus points

Nothing comes to mind -- it is the Witness application and works very well.

no complaints

well, it is time-consuming to monitor calls, and i feel that this only tells one side of the story. We have a general sense of agent performance, but it is hard to pinpoint the real trouble spots and gauge the overall customer experience.

Still too new to determine. Barely even launched

n/a

Scoring a process rather than searching out business intelligence, improvement opportunities.

Reporting is very difficult.

Certain amount of subjectivity relative to agent tone and presentation. While an agent could precisely follow the script, their tone might be so unpleasant that the customer has a poor experience. However, an agent who receives a lower score by not following the script but is upbeat and pleasant might leave the customer with a good experience. It is difficult to score these anomalies.

Not easily configurable.

No real major problems with system

we don't have software installed yet, so it's very manual to capture calls.

no online scoring tool

nothing

Would like to have screen capture included.

no good measure for First Call Resolution

It does not allow us to monitor our agents by their agent ID. Monitoring by desk location does not accommodate the CSRs who move around and desk share.

channel interaction storage

Gathering phone statistics.

Not being able to monitor from a "neutral" phone - not having to sit with the rep.

Non

inst an automated work. most of the selecting process must be done manually.

they

There is an internal issue of who is responsible for maintenance of the system.

We hear the consumer side of the conversation and if the consultant puts the consumer on hold to call someone for assistance, we do not hear that side of the conversation.

time constraints, hard to make changes

Non-standard architecture, system is delicate, lacks long-term storage capabilities.

The monitoring system is actually a human being.

None

We have 2 types monitoring system in our center. One is a monitoring done by team supervisors and the other is total monitoring by the third section which does not manage the operators directly.

I am afraid that each monitoring system goes to each way independently not cooperating to each other. How do we locate two systems?

Not enough time to do more calls - the system is fine

Out of the box reporting capability mostly concerning the ability to track over a period of time

Does not work properly all the time. My IT department is having problems getting the system to work for my Supervisors and me.

Equipment is obsolete

precision

Small percentage of calls monitored in terms of call volume.

Scoring Consistency.

technical issues

Manual scoring and reporting.

Too complex

not much flexibility in reporting capability

nothing at this time

You cannot score calls that are not recorded, such as live calls or client center calls.

Not supportive and technical issues

We can't get the reports we'd like to get.

Time consume and 80 % accurate.

none

It's never working correctly.

None

not enough channels to record all incoming calls

Not be able to run reports on call types or scores in archive

It's outdated.

Accurate scoring. Reporting

Reporting is predefined and not fitting our needs. Therefore we are creating our own reports with Business Objects direct from db.

1. Manpower

2. spend time for evaluation

I would like to be able to do more monitoring as the number only represents about 1% of the total calls. Tools are not in place to randomly record calls.

Reporting package is weak.

I don't have one.

It does not allow the agent to be pro-active in selecting calls they feel they need help on because it is a random selection process.

Difficult to create custom reporting.

inability to track call from agent to agent in transfer, as well as screen pop tracking to see screen used at same time call recorded.

none so far

Length of time it takes to monitor the call then take an agent off the queues to provide coaching.

Call recording criteria currently not integrated with ICM events.

never seem to have time to take agent off phone to review calls

Many functions is manualy

Poor reporting facility - require internal knowledge of Crystal reporting to develop

Associates perception that it is not fair

Some things are "black and white", others are not. Injecting subjection into the process is necessary, but causes problems at times.

consistency of tie up between voice and screen grabs.

Size of .wav files

0

calls are recorded but can not be flagged for future reference

In outbound environment, difficult to record calls to monitor that are a live contact

Limited time available for Supervisors to evaluate the calls and discuss it with the Agents.

No complaints

Secure external segmented access is difficult.

none

We need more time spent on monitoring and we can't seem to find the extra time.

It is not integrated with the scoring database

none

Would like to interact with CSR during the call. We are currently working on that.

None I can think of at this time.

Consistency in monitoring each agent as targeted

some feel it is subjective.

Can be cumbersome when pulling reports

No response.

Low sample size and too strict.

That people who monitor are not always fair. Some managers score lower than others and that some managers have "favorites" and score them higher or the reverse. Some managers do not like a person and therefore score them lower.

Lack of ability to monitor based on business rules.

None

nothing

Sample size is too small.

The system itself is very good but has not fit in well with our culture. We were promised more features that have not been installed yet. These features are critical to us.

Getting adequate support from our vendor and limitations on the reports we can process.

Not enough recordings

We haven't yet gotten it deployed so that we can capture excerpts of different calls to use for training purposes. It is not build into the products we have and we have to program and deploy this.

hard to build subjectivity into the process.

complexity if we need different monitoring calender for different agents

Not enough time to give feedback to agents

system up time

Lack the ability to provide automated narrative feedback to the agent. Currently, feedback is mostly quantitative/scored

It is a paper-based system.

lack of sufficient resources to do quality monitoring

Reporting of results in a management format.

It is a home grown system that is not automated.

The system goes down a lot which prevents the quality specialist from being able to pull the reports.

The score system

It is inhouse system to we change the system to reflect the compliant from the users

.

Very basic system using tape recorders hooked up to the phone

The age of the system limits our ability to utilize new technology that has come into existance since its inception. The system requires a separate license per manager that enables replay of recorded calls and does not have a single enterprise license agreement option. Therefore, to be cost effective, only line managers have the licenses to playback calls and other managers must use line managers computers to view and replay calls. A browser based, enterprise-wide license agreement would be very beneficial.

does not include call recording

that it's time consuming and calls are waiting

Coaching is not timely to quality monitoring system

Reports! I need more reports to help with Coaching Plans

Biggest complaint relates to the low volume of calls that are currently being captured for evaluation.

It only labels the call by date and time. It would be great if it could also include the caller's phone number.

not enough evaluations per rep

Unable to record and store enough calls.

downtime

stability

not that efficient and user-friendly

The ability for agents (or more likely their supervisors) to "dispute" their evaluations and the time and effort spent in reviewing these calls instead of spending time to improve agent performance for increased customer sat.

Agents randomly drop off the system. IT needs to be contacted to add them back on.

lack of reporting

Time to monitor.

Ability to integrate with ACD to map quality monitoring results/metrics with agent performance/productivity.

Quite time consuming, if there was a faster way to do this then more calls could be monitored.

No off-the-shelf monitoring system can meet the reporting needs without having back end report queries. We always have to find some other mechanism to capture and report against our data because none of the tools have the flexibility to meet our needs.

Takes too much time

No flexibility in reporting. Requires Crystal Reports to write new reports, and then is difficult to mine the data we need.

Some areas are subjective to what the Qm thinks about the call.

Not enough

Technical system reliability issues.

Reliability; Reporting

The sample of calls monitored is not large enough. Totals less than 1%.

Management Information Reporting, reporting functionality is not adequate, requires additional time to create ad hoc reports and drill downs.

Subjective and Soft skills are included in the program. Staff feels that these categories should not be scored but rather used for coaching purposes.

It captures a block of time rather than the full contact. It is therefore difficult to find full calls to score.

none

It is all done manually by me and my team leads. We do real time call monitoring.

Form flexibility is OK but changes are difficult to make. I'd also like to be able to change the "date completed" information on the evaluation form.

We are currently upgrading our system, so we do not have any complaints yet.

training

NOTHING

None

We are using a Beta system that is still under development. The lack of a complete package can be frustrating. Also, the linking of training documents into the appraisal would really add to the value.

support , reporting, functionality

Inadequate support from the vendor. The system (Witness) does not have an alerting capability that advises us when the system goes down. As a result, we have lost multiple days worth of data without knowing it. We do 100% recording and it is critical to us that the system is up and available 7X24.

Ability to monitor and evaluate simultaneously

Expensive

Hard to gauge the results other than in Call Coaching scores.

Java scripts take long time to load and sometimes won't load at all unless IE cookies and files are deleted. Sometimes, a hard boot is required.

Must log out of Interactions folder in order to view historic Evaluations. Both require Java scripting and then this goes back to above situation.

Inability to fully integrate with our CTI product

We have recently installed ETalk and are very happy with its performance. At this point we have no complaints. We have both screen capture and voice capture with this system hard to weed through the data

fairness of what the client wants delivered

Inability to gain screen dumps or similar activity of agents desktop activity due to the relative cost of systems for such a small centre

No screen capture

The attitude of the agents...They think that call monitoring is intrusive.

Contact quality, product knowledge, and productivity measurements integration

Skill wise call monitoring is a problem

No Complaints

does not provide support to handle evaluation forms and scoring

Not able to record the monitoring.

bbbbbbbb

nil

The parameters (soft skills) need to be defined more specifically to avoid any doubt.

1. Cost

2. Not geared towards how an outsourcer does business

Very manual

It is a pretty new system so I don't currently have any complaints.

QA to Agent ratio

Escalation of queries not dealt with timeously.

Monitor does not have the amount of time necessary to devote to this important process.

n/a

Time consuming

Not enough calls monitored on a monthly basis

Reporting inadequate

System outdated

Getting the respect from the rest of the management team to buy into it.

They continue to say that they don't have time to monitor their staff.

It doesn't affect the staff's bonuses at this time.

Inability to record all of the monitorings

Scoring system

Not enough flexibility in scheduling the number of calls and hours to monitor a specific agent.

If an agent has a bad day or call the sampling can hurt the agent's overall monthly score.

Scalability and Cost

We don't have a sophisticated system; we use a device from Radio Shack to record calls only.

none

not a complaint as such but more of a challenge is to do Quality monitoring for various teams across various languages. In order to evaluate a contact the quality monitor needs to have the relevant skills and knowledge to evaluate it. And then we need these skills and knowledge for each of these various teams but also in each of the languages we support.

The main question is how many headcount we would need to measure quality in such volume that it actually is meaningful in each of the languages we support and across all our teams.

The second question is how do we see the ROI on investing in a Quality team / process.

I have seen too many times quality been pushed aside when call volume increase in favour of more productivity hours.

Non

none, our customer satisfaction surveys reflect over 83% in the "very satisfied" category over our service.

Time-consuming and insufficient calibration

none

the system is in development and so far, it seems to be going quite well - no complaints

some agents expressed discomfort initially in the side-by-side aspect (only one of the ways we monitor) - but once used to it, appreciate the feedback -- we strive to make it a positive experience for the agent

There is better technology out there.

none

The system is fine. We simply don't dedicate adequate staff resources to taking advantage of it. We're considering a much simpler, post-survey and first-call-resolution based approach.

u

Too slow

Time and attention required for maintenance

The lack of ability to perform random outbound monitoring.

With call quality tied to compensation, we've had few complaints

The current monitoring system gives us the ability to observe agent calls. We've not yet implemented the process of monitoring the calls and providing the feedback to our agents but expect to in the next 1 - 2 months.

Weighing (scoring) the components of the call for comparative analysis.

It is not reliable when pulling recordings. Many times the call information registry varies from the actual recording. Experience many service outages as well.

...

Calls are archived too early. Would like to see digital process for pulling calls.

The system we have now is a temporary system until the full blown system is implemented next year. The short term solution we are using now records calls only and does not capture screen shots nor does it have an on-line evaluation form.

none

labour intensive

We would like to have a system which enable us to have voice and screen monitoring.

That I can't do more-I'm the QMS.

No current complaints.

We've recently revamped the entire process and set a standard across the company; prior to this the approach and form used were varied, resulting in an unfairness being perceived

Agents do not want to be told areas they need to work on

would like to be able to do more monitoring

Our's is a home grown solution. Too much manual labor required.

None

does not do screen capture. DQEs not allow for data mining

The default reporting capabilities.

Manual

It has not been approved by Senior Management to use

It takes a lot of time

There is not a mechanism to gather information and condense for feedback to training, knowledge base, process improvement etc. on what needs to be fixed to reduce the number of calls, time on calls, etc.

we are experiencing difficulty partnering with operations in order to deliver effective and immediate feedback. Our feedback processes are lacking considerably. There is not enough awareness and emphasis for the agents regarding quality. They are aware of it's importance through critical element indicators - negative behaviors that must be coached but in my opinion we are not allowing our agents to receive the vital feedback - positive feedback.

Within our contact centre the Agent's motto has become no news is good news.

Too many upgrades required, not enough support.

Technical problems when upgraded and lack of a timely response from our vendor to our concerns.

No reliable measurement for 1st call resolution.

Simple audio monitoring. No screen data, recording, or reporting.

Reporting is limited and difficult to generate summary reports

Believe it or not, I have no complaints. Any issues we have raised, have been addressed in upgrades to our Quality Monitoring solution.

We have two centers in different cities, and it does not work the same at the second center. Also, you cannot record AND listen to a person live at the same time. That can get annoying.

QA converting interpreted trends into uptraining opportunities

It is channel driven and not enough channels available.

The monitors (supervisors) can fudge on when they actually monitor CSRs calls, i.e. instead of monitoring 3 calls a month, they can monitor 9 in one month.

Time necessary to evaluate all users.

Not real-time feed-back to associates.

Expensive

no complaints

Retention of recorded calls and screens isn't robust enough.

Having enough channels so listen to the calls

It is a new system so no major issues so far

It takes too long to schedule recordings and retrieve once completed.

Takes a few seconds to "start" recording the contact, which makes it difficult to judge the greeting.

System is not supported by vendor for any length of time. This is done to try to get clients to purchase new systems (unnecessarily)

Our system captures both voice and screens. That piece is a wonderful coaching tool. Reps like to see and hear their calls. The biggest complaint is How calls are scored by the evaluation team.

soft factors not considered with fully automated statistical gathering and banding.

Next level analysis: "slice & dice" metrics to isolate problem areas, identify trends, track progress longitudinally, ROI, etc.

Not having much ease in customizing the reporting.

Lack of flexibility -- QA processes have changed over the years, the systems lack the ability to change on the fly when customer expectations demand it.

The process is fairly time consuming

The reporting tool is easy to do and navigate, but it is not friendly on the eyes.

Difficulty updating online form

n/a

It is still in its infancy and time consuming.

It is not accurate in some of the screens.

Call monitoring evaluation form is somewhat limited.

We are having problems with the screen capture portion, and storage.

benefit

no possibilities to monitor what is happening on the computer screen

The application is not user-friendly, in that you cannot tell which calls have been evaluated or just reviewed. Also, you cannot move call records from one call bucket to another, you must first move to the journal file, than back to one of the call buckets. I wish the reporting tool was more robust (gave us more options when reporting evaluations).

Unrealistic expectations.

We should monitor more frequently.

not automated

n/a

We are just in the process of installation from the vendor for eQuality (Witness Systems)and find that the 1 technician they sent on site was not as knowledgeable on the overall system and was unable to answer alot of my questions; he wasn't going to escalate until I pushed the issue. For the amount of capital invested in purchasing the system, I expected more than what was delivered with regards to install service. There were more sales and technical people available during the initial stages of when we were evaluating vendors than during the implementation stage after we have already purchased the call monitoring software.

It experiences down time when you are ready to do the monitoring so you have to start over.

Can't see the agent's screen. (We are going to get a new system.)

Monitoring agent perception - as we have a team of 20+ agents who monitor each month.

The need to calibrate our answers, goals and coaching methods can be a challenge.

The reality of achieving calibration. We work hard at it. However we still have inconsistencies between how each monitors evaluates an agents performance for the same task. Sometimes an agent's supervisor may not want to cause conflict and sometimes is too easy on agent evaluation... and it in not consistent with the monitoring's evaluation of the same call.

calibration for consistency

it's perceived to be personally intrusive as opposed to a performance evaluation

The current system we use places too much emphasis on technical skill with the software, and not enough skill on improving customer service.

None

Storage costs

none

The process and goals set by the QA team could be better.

small sample size due to length of calls

Reporting detail.

Our current system is far superior to the one it replaced. The installation process hasn't been perfect, but one would expect a little bumpiness.

Limited ability to track feedback from the agent. Our current system (Verint) does not provide an agent interface in which the agent can validate the feedback has occurred. Other systems such as NICE provide this functionality.

Inefficient call capture process. No screen shots

I would like to record all calls in our center. Otherwise, I'm good with the system. It's been a great coaching tool for us.

Does not record screen activity along with the call

There are not enough complete monitorings done per agent. The scoring tool used is not calibrated.

I find the system quite slow with "java" – from the main menu it is difficult to go from "interactions" to "evaluations" – I most often have to logoff. I think it could be more efficient.

None

Does not allow for detailed reporting

Unable to support multi switch environment

n/a

Not able to monitor the employees enough and give timely feedback.

Action plans that are needed to be done when an agent fails the monitoring.

Our monitoring system doesn't allow the QA agent to record and play back each call so the representative can listen to the call and use the information for coaching and development.

awkward to create/save a .wav file

We measure both customer service and internal procedures. Since the customer service aspect is so subjective, I would like to begin conducting customer satisfaction surveys to the same calls that we are completing performance reviews on (or vice versa).

Nothing important at that moment

Space for saving calls.

I do know

Some of our monitoring criteria is subjective.

For get it

Scoring of agents can be subjective depending on coach, although calibration sessions are held monthly to create more objectivity.

Can't get to enough of them in one month

The system itself is a good system, but I'd like to expand the QSR roles to span coaching the managers who are responsible for providing the feedback to employees.

no complaints

The issue is not the system, but helping Senior Management, Management and line level employees buy into migrating from traditional call center legacy metrics to a more balanced call monitoring approach. Most seasoned call center managers have not bought into this transition as customer relationship management (not CRM in the traditional sense) is becoming increasingly important to develop measures at the agent level that gives a more balanced approach - an integration of traditional call center metrics with customer satisfaction measures at the agent level.

The time it takes and I wish I could listen to more calls

More calls should be monitored

There is very little inbuilt MIS while trying to identify historical progress and development in specific areas.

na

No complaints at this time

Complaint to call monitor and his evaluation

Breakdowns & recording quality.

time consuming

Not enough calls evaluated

not that effective in making change

We must start and stop the recording with each call. It will not allow us to set up a certain time frame to record

Slow to export calls

It takes a teamleader out of circulation to prompt the system for information.

attention to details

Feedback mechanism and Capturing/ Documenting/ Distributing the learning

We are using Microsoft Access as a scoring tool. We'd like to find something more stable.

.

calibration about subjective matters

Not fast enough to provide timely feedback

Not enough automation to their scorecard results, (e.g. retyping scores, graphing them, etc.)

Reporting functionality

Only get random recordings, would like to record all calls. Also, ability for analysts to listen to their calls can be difficult. I have to schedule time for them to do so with me because of this, in addition to the normal monitoring and scoring.

That it doesn't allow voice recognition programs to convert speech to text so quality validations could then be undertaken by system and database processes.

The system is not automated. Managers must monitor calls in real time. Calls are not recorded so agents are unable to review monitored calls.

Lack of systematic call monitoring

Satisfied

It is biased towards words used rather than the actual customer experience.

completing the feedback loop to get the information back to the reps and training in general

No complaints

impersonal

Time spent on recording calls. Inconsistency in rating.